



## SB10-191 Implementation Support Planning Tool

Last Updated February 4, 2013

### WHY WAS THIS TOOL CREATED?

- The Colorado Legacy Foundation (CLF), through the [Integration Initiative](#), supports districts to implement Senate Bill 08-212 (standards and assessments) and Senate Bill 10-191 (educator evaluation) to target supports to teachers and principals to improve instruction for all students.
- This tool was created as a resource for districts to use in implementing requirements of the state's new evaluation system and to outline the requirements of [Senate Bill 10-191](#). This tool is intended to be a one-stop-shop for access to resources developed by the Colorado Department of Education (CDE), CLF, CLF's numerous partner organizations and examples of how districts involved in the CLF Integration Initiative are implementing the requirements of the new evaluation law.

### WHAT IS THIS TOOL?

- This tool is a web-based application developed by CLF, an independent non-profit, non-partisan partner to CDE focused on improving educational supports for educators and outcomes for students in Colorado.
- This tool organizes information regarding the major requirements of the state's new evaluation law in one place.
- This tool is **not** an exhaustive compendium of SB 10-191 requirements, but does include major requirements. Districts and BOCES should familiarize themselves with the full requirements of the law and use this tool as a resources in implementation of the law.
- Information in this tool is organized into four categories.
  - [Communications and Engagement](#): Includes requirements of SB 10-191 for communicating with and engaging stakeholders, as well as related resources and district examples;
  - [Evaluation System Development and Components](#): Includes the nuts-and-bolts requirements of the law as well as resources and district examples;
  - [HR System Components](#): Includes changes to HR practices and policies mandated by the law including Mutual Consent; and

- [Meeting SB10-191 Implementation Challenges](#): Includes the top challenges as reported by Integration Districts as well as resources and district-identified strategies for meeting these challenges.
- CDE has the legal authority for implementing Senate Bill 10-191. This tool is a resource to districts for voluntary use and does not include legal advice.

#### WHO SHOULD USE THIS TOOL?

- This tool is intended for use by superintendents, principals and other district administrators and educators implementing requirements of the state’s new educator evaluation system.

#### WHEN AND HOW SHOULD THIS TOOL BE USED?

- All districts can use this tool now to support current and future implementation efforts and to understand the new requirements of the educator evaluation law in the 2013-14 school year.
- The CDE-developed State Model Educator Evaluation System is currently being piloted by [27 districts](#), including the [Integration Districts](#), and is scheduled for full statewide implementation in the [2013-14 school year](#).
- For more information on timelines and requirements for districts, see the CDE [sample evaluation work plan and timeline](#).

#### HOW CAN THIS TOOL SUPPORT DISTRICTS/BOCES IN MEETING SB 10-191 ASSURANCES?

- All Districts are required to submit documentation to CDE every year beginning July 1, 2013, that assures CDE that they are implementing the requirements of the state’s new educator evaluation system. There are three components, or three [Assurances](#), that districts must confirm that they meet.
- The [Evaluation System Development and Components](#) section of this tool outlines requirements as outlined in the CDE [checklist](#) for Assurance 2. While this tool is not a mirror of the checklist, it is organized so that districts can quickly search by the criteria in the checklist to identify resources and district examples.

**SB10-191 Requirements**

**Available Resources**

**Examples from Integration Districts**

**Communications and Engagement**

Senate Bill 10-191 requires annual evaluations of EVERY teacher, principal and licensed instructional professional EVERY year, 50 percent of which must be based on multiple measures of student academic growth. There are specific sections of the law and rules requiring communications with and engagement of various stakeholders. This section of the SB10-191 Implementation Support Planning Tool includes requirements for districts and BOCES related to outreach and engagement as well as citations for quick and easy reference to statute and rule.

<p>1</p>	<p><b>Boards/BOCES Consult with Administrators, Principals and Teachers</b>                  In developing the licensed personnel performance evaluation system and any amendments thereto, the local board/BOCES is required to consult with administrators, principals, and teachers employed within the district or participating districts in a BOCES, parents, and the school district/BOCES 1338 Committee.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)</a> and <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-107</a></p>	<p><b><a href="#">CDE Communications Toolkit</a></b>                  CDE created a communications toolkit to assist districts in communications efforts. Some of the CDE communications resources that can be used when engaging administrators, principals and teachers include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">CDE Educator Evaluation System Transition &amp; Implementation Toolkit (pdf)</a>; This is a comprehensive toolkit to walk districts through the process of transitioning to a new system.</li> <li>• <a href="#">CDE Video Re: Preparing for Change, Timelines: State/District/School Implementation</a>; Watch this 3 minute video to hear tips on implementing the new evaluation system and also gain an understanding of associated timelines.</li> </ul> <p><b><a href="#">CASB guidance and policy language</a></b>                  The Colorado School Board Association develops resources for local school boards in aligning policy to new evaluation system requirements.</p>	<p>All districts and BOCES are required to have a <a href="#">1338 Committee</a> also known as Advisory Personnel Performance Evaluation Councils. Many <a href="#">Integration Districts</a> use these Councils to consult with stakeholders regarding development and implementation of the new evaluation system.</p> <p><b>Durango District Example</b>                  Durango has an active 1338 Committee. They meet monthly and review and decide on key components of the new evaluation system. Some specific examples of work of the Committee include reviewing and providing feedback on the state evaluation rubric for educators, making decision on how to engage student perceptions in the evaluation process and informing the student growth component of the evaluation for educators.</p> <p><b>Eagle County Schools District Example</b>                  Eagle County recently decided to make revisions to Board policy to clarify that the 1338 Committee is a committee independent from the Board that reports to the Board. This Committee provides input on the rollout of the evaluation system and is currently developing recommendations regarding the weighting of student growth measures to make up fifty percent of an educator’s evaluation. The Committee recently submitted recommendations to the Board regarding the weighting of measures of professional practice that make up the other 50 percent of an educator’s evaluation.</p>
----------	---	---	--

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p><b>2 Engage Parents</b>            Districts and schools are required to create systems and structures that focus on providing parents and guardians with meaningful opportunities to support the academic achievement and growth of their children. These systems and structures must proactively encourage and support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) High-quality and ongoing communication between parents/guardians and educators and schools using a variety of methods, such as various media, resources and languages;</li> <li>2) Involvements of parents/guardians in school and district leadership as currently supported by law and further identified through the implementation of local evaluation systems;</li> <li>3) The engagement of parent/guardian and community partnerships to ensure the successful implementation of the principal and teacher quality standards.</li> </ol> <p>Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 7.01</a> and <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-107</a></p>	<p><b><a href="#">CDE Communications Toolkit</a></b>            CDE created a communications toolkit to assist districts in communications efforts. Some of the CDE communications resources that can be used to communicate with parents include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Customizable "101" PowerPoints with Talking Points</a> (high-level overviews of key educator effectiveness issues)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Educator Effectiveness Talking Points</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Educator Effectiveness Communications - Strategies and Pitfalls</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Drop-in Articles</a> (pre-written updates that can be personalized and used for electronic communications)</li> </ul> <p><b><a href="#">CLF District Leader's Guide: Communicating Effectively with Stakeholders</a></b>            CLF produced a guide which may be helpful when developing strategies to communicate with and engage parents.</p> <p><b>Parent Surveys</b>            CLF may develop a parent survey. In the meantime, there is a <a href="#">parent survey</a> being developed by Harvard/Survey Monkey which may be of interest to districts.</p>	<p>The majority of Integration Districts engage parents as members of 1338 Councils and District and School Accountability Committees.</p> <p><b>Montezuma-Cortez District Example</b>            Cortez Superintendent Alex Carter uses various social media vehicles to communicate with parents in his community, including podcasts and blogs. He plans to use these methods of communicating to keep parents informed regarding new evaluation system requirements.</p> <p><b><a href="#">Durango District Example</a> (Link to Middle School Survey Page)</b>            Every year, Durango's District Accountability Advisory Committee (DAAC) surveys parents about schools and climate. The purpose of these surveys is to provide key information to building School Accountability Committees (SACs) and to help guide goal setting school Unified Improvement Plans (UIP). The survey is available online and is also mailed to parents in registration packets.</p> <p><b>Ignacio District Example</b>            Ignacio solicits input from parents and the community regarding priorities for school and community. Through this process the district has gathered feedback from upwards of 80% of the families within the district – an impressive feat.</p>

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts	
<p>3</p>	<p><b>Gather Student Perceptions</b>  Districts are <i>strongly encouraged</i> to gather student perceptions of their learning experience in order to provide teachers with feedback on their performance. Where appropriate, districts are encouraged to use student perception data as part of the multiple measures used to evaluate teacher professional practice.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 7.04</a></p>	<p><b><a href="#">CLF Student Perception Survey</a></b>  CLF, in partnership with CDE, has developed a student perception survey which is being piloted in the Fall of 2012 and Spring of 2013 across Integration Districts. After validation, this survey will be made available for use by all districts in the 2013-14 school year. The CLF survey was informed by the Tripod Survey being used across the nation; however, CLF-developed a Colorado-specific survey based on feedback we received from districts. The CLF survey is shorter, more affordable, tailored for Colorado and the results will be made available to educators in a timely manner.</p> <p><b><a href="#">Tripod Project</a></b>  The Tripod Project is an integral part of the <a href="#">Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project</a>, which is funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. For more information about the Tripod Project, visit <a href="http://www.tripodproject.org">www.tripodproject.org</a>. or download <a href="#">Tripod Assessment Flyer</a>.</p>	<p>Some districts report having student representation on school boards. A number of the Integration Districts report using district-developed surveys to solicit input from students. The majority of Integration Districts, in addition to other volunteer districts, are piloting the CLF-developed student perception survey in the 2012-13 school year.</p> <p><b>Denver Public Schools District Example</b>  The Denver Public Schools (DPS)-developed educator evaluation system (LEAP) includes a <a href="#">student perception survey</a>.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p><b>Communicate Requirements to Educators</b>  Districts and BOCES are required to make performance evaluation system standards and criteria available in writing to all licensed personnel and to ensure that they are communicated and discussed by the person being evaluated and the evaluator prior to and during the course of the evaluation.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(e)(II)</a></p>	<p><b><a href="#">CDE User's Guide for Evaluating Colorado's Teachers; 2012-13 School-Year</a></b>  The CDE User Guide is a comprehensive compendium of requirements for the State Model Educator Evaluation System. There are a number of resources available to districts to communicate evaluation system standards and criteria to educators. Some are specific to the State Model Educator Evaluation System, but can also be adapted to local systems that meet or exceed state requirements.</p> <p><b><a href="#">Principal Survey - Perceptions of New Evaluation System Effectiveness as Compared to Previous Systems</a></b></p>	<p>Integration Districts have approached this requirement in a number of ways through in-person trainings, rolling this out through PLCs, through presentations, newsletters and other avenues. Feedback from districts indicates that investing time and planning on the front is critically important to successful rollout of the system. Leadership is key to success.</p> <p><b>Eagle County Schools District Example</b>  Eagle County Schools administrators visited every school in the district during the beginning of the school year to hold informational training sessions early in the first year of rolling out the new evaluation system to teachers.</p>

**SB10-191 Requirements**

**Available Resources**

**Examples from Integration Districts**

--

--

Initial findings from the pilot that show an increase in the perceived effectiveness of the new evaluation system over previous systems. Communicating this may help to demonstrate that stakeholders find the new evaluation system promising in terms of providing a better way to support educational professionals to increase instructional effectiveness.

**CDE Communications Toolkit**

- [Commonly Asked Questions and Answers](#)
- [Customizable "101" PowerPoints with Talking Points](#) (high-level overviews of key educator effectiveness issues)
- [Educator Effectiveness Talking Points](#)
- [Educator Effectiveness Communications - Strategies and Pitfalls](#)
- [Drop-in Articles](#) (pre-written updates that can be personalized and used for electronic communications)
- Stay informed; subscribe to the [CDE Educator Effectiveness Newsletter](#)

**CDE Regional Trainings**

In-person trainings offer educators a high quality way to gain in-depth information on the requirements of the State Model Educator Evaluation System and also prepare attendees as trained evaluators.

**CEA SB10-191 Resources**

**Educator Effectiveness Overview** (April 2012) CEA presentation describing frameworks, definitions, policies and requirements around the implementation of the educator effectiveness evaluations system of SB 10-191.

--

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
	<p><a href="#">CEA's Summary of SB10-191</a> (May 2010) review of the legislation, defining terms in effectiveness and standards, and examining the role of the State Council on Educator Effectiveness</p> <p><a href="#">CLF District Leader's Guide: Communicating Effectively with Stakeholders</a></p>	
<p><b>Evaluation System Development and Components (aligned to CDE Assurances <a href="#">checklist</a>)</b></p> <p>There are three options for districts in implementing the new educator evaluation system requirements. Districts are able to adopt the CDE-developed <a href="#">State Model Educator Evaluation System</a>, which meets the requirements of the law. If districts adopt the state system, they will be able to take advantage of the vast array of resources developed and validated through CDE and CLF for the state system. Alternatively, districts are also able to use their own unique system of evaluation as long as they are able to demonstrate that they meet or exceed the requirements of the law, including meeting or exceeding the Quality Standards for educators outlined in <a href="#">Rule</a>. Finally, districts can use a hybrid approach whereby they adopt components of the State Model system, but not the entire system (e.g. they use the evaluation system for principals and a different model for evaluating teachers).</p> <p>This section of the tool is organized to align <a href="#">with the CDE Assurance Checklist</a> requirements. However, it includes two additional sections not currently included in the CDE assurances checklist which are requirements of SB 10-191: sections V and VI below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. <a href="#">Develop Written Evaluation System</a> – Assurance 2, checklist #1 and #2</li> <li>II. <a href="#">Evaluate Every Principal Every Year</a> – Assurance 2, checklist #3 - # 5</li> <li>III. <a href="#">Evaluate Every Teacher Every Year</a> – Assurance 2, checklist #6 - #8</li> <li>IV. <a href="#">Report to CDE Every Year</a> – Assurance 2, checklist #9</li> <li>V. <a href="#">Evaluate Every Specialized Service Provider Every Year</a></li> <li>VI. <a href="#">Have an Appeals Process for Teachers</a></li> </ul>		
I	<p><b>Develop a Written Evaluation System</b> Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)</a>; <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-107(1)-(3)</a>; <a href="#">CDE Checklist, #1 &amp; 2</a></p>	
1	<p><b>1338 Committees Provide Input</b> School district/BOCES Advisory Personnel Performance Evaluation Councils (<a href="#">1338 Committees</a>) are required to consult with the BOCES or district leadership as to the fairness, effectiveness, credibility, and professional quality</p>	<p><a href="#">CDE Sample Work Plan</a> This sample work plan outlines the steps districts should be taking now to implement SB10-191. The first step in this process is for the district to meet with the 1338 Council, School Board and/or other committees (such as District</p> <p>A number of Integration Districts are leveraging their 1338 committees to support the rollout and implementation of the new evaluation system.</p> <p><b>Durango 1338 Committee</b></p>

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p>of the evaluation system and its processes and procedures and are required to conduct a continuous evaluation of the system.</p> <p><i>Note: The council for a school district may be composed of any other school district committee having proper membership.</i></p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)</a>; <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-107(1)-(3)</a>; <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist #1</a></p>	<p>Accountability Committees) to determine whether the district will use the Colorado State Model Evaluation System or develop/use a district developed system.</p>	<p>Durango’s 1338 Committee meets monthly. They have been active in reviewing the CDE teacher evaluation rubric and providing CDE feedback to improve the rubric. Further, they are guiding efforts to support teachers in developing a bank of formative assessments.</p> <p><b>Thompson Integration Committee</b> Thompson decided to merge a number of committees and councils to develop an Integration Council made up of members of the DAC, 1338 committee and other standing committees responsible for instruction, learning and assessment. This Integration Committee will provide guidance on the rollout of SB 10-191 including reviewing the guidance for deciding and incorporating multiple measures of student growth as 50 percent of an educator’s evaluation.</p>
<p>2 <b>DACs Provide Input on Assessment Tools for Measuring Student Growth (Districts Only)</b> District accountability committee’s (DACs) are required to provide input and recommendations concerning the assessment tools used to measure student academic growth as it relates to teacher evaluations.</p> <p><i>Note: The council for a school district may be composed of any other school district committee having proper membership. A number of Integration District DACs also serve as their 1338s.</i></p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(e)(III)</a>; <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #2</a></p>	<p><b>CDE Top Ten Readiness Questions</b> See pages 2 and 3 of the <a href="#">CDE Sample Work Plan</a>.</p> <p><b>CDE Guidance: Measuring the 50% Student Learning Outcomes</b> The following resources were developed by CDE to assist districts in deciding and incorporating student growth measures as 50 percent of an educator’s evaluation. CDE refers to multiple measures of student academic growth as Student Learning Outcomes (not to be confused with CLOs, or Student Learning Objectives).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Student Learning Outcomes Guidance</a> This 17 page document provides guidance and examples.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Assessment Review Tool</a> This review tool provides a way for districts to evaluate the data sources and measures they are</li> </ul>	<p>Integration Districts were provided with data support via Agency Fellows. Examples Coming Soon.</p>



SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
	already using and to prioritize development or adoption of new measures.	
<b>II Evaluate Every Principal Every Year</b> Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(c)(III)</a> , CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #3 - #5, and <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 5.01 (B)</a>		
<b>3 Adopt/Align Principal Quality Standards</b> The school district/BOCES must adopt the state’s principal quality <i>standards</i> , including all elements for each standard, or must adopt locally developed standards that meet or exceed the state’s principal quality standards and elements. For locally-developed standards, they must be cross walked to the state’s standards and elements.  Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-105.5 (3)(a)</a> , <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 2.02</a> and <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #3</a>	<b>Colorado Principal Quality Standards</b> See the SBE SB10-191 Rules which include Principal Quality Standards; <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 2.02</a> .  <a href="#">Framework for Evaluating Principals</a> The State Council for Educator Effectiveness developed a visual that outlines the major requirements and process for evaluating principals.  <a href="#">User's Guide for Evaluating Colorado's Principals; 2012-13 School-Year</a> See pages 8-16 of this user guide for both an overview of the Principal Quality Standards, but also examples of artifacts that can be used as components of a body of evidence for a principal to demonstrate their effectiveness.  <a href="#">CDE Components of the Rubric for Evaluating Colorado's Principals and Assistant Principals</a> This two page document demonstrates how the evaluation rubric for principals should be interpreted and used.  <a href="#">CDE Guided Orientation to the Components of the Rubric</a> This is a Power Point presentation with recorded guidance that walks viewers through a tutorial of the principal evaluation rubric aligned to Principal Quality Standards (this	

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
	<p>tutorial is specific to the State Educator Evaluation System).</p> <p><a href="#">CDE Video Re: Quality Standards for Principals and Teachers; Using and Scoring the Rubrics</a></p> <p>This 6 minute video begins with the frameworks for evaluating teachers and principals in Colorado then overviews the rubric and illustrates examples of how the rubric is scored during evaluations.</p>	
<p>4</p> <p><b>Adopt Measures of Professional Practice and Student Growth for Principals</b></p> <p>The school district/BOCES must adopt <i>measures of professional practice and student academic growth</i> that are included in the State Model Educator Evaluation System or the school district/BOCES must ensure that they have selected measures for principals that meet the requirements outlined in statute and rule. Specifically, the measures meet the requirements below.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(b)</a> and <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-103 (6), 1 CCR 301-87 5.01 (E)(2) and (3)</a> and <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #4</a></p>	<p><a href="#">CDE Principal User Guide</a></p> <p>See pages 10-16 of this guide for Principal Quality Standards and for example artifacts that can be used to build a body of evidence.</p> <p><a href="#">Framework for Evaluating Principals</a></p> <p>The State Council for Educator Effectiveness developed a visual that outlines the major requirements and process for evaluating principals.</p> <p><a href="#">CDE 2012-13 School-Year Rubric for Evaluating Colorado's Principals</a></p> <p>This is the CDE State Model Educator Evaluation rubric to be used for evaluating principals. This rubric is intended to gather both observable and non-observable evidence over the entire year and is not intended to constitute a single point in time. This rubric is also available <a href="#">electronically</a> and is hosted via <a href="#">BloomBoard</a>, a vendor who offers a low-/no-cost, high-tech option for rolling out Colorado's new state model educator evaluation system.</p> <p>See component requirements immediately below for additional information.</p>	<p>See component requirements immediately below for additional information.</p> <p>xx</p>

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p>4a <b>Professional Practices: Include Teacher Input</b>            At least one of the measures of professional practice must capture input from teachers employed at the principal’s school (clear expectations must be established prior to collecting the data and teachers must know that at least one of the purposes of collecting the input is to inform the principal’s evaluation; also, systems must be put into place to ensure that the information collected remains confidential).</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(b)</a> , <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-103 (6)</a>, <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 5.01 (E)(2) and (3)</a> , <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #4a</a></p>	<p><a href="#">CDE Principal User Guide</a>            CDE guidance indicates that teacher input collected through teacher perception surveys can be used as an artifact in building a body of evidence. CDE includes teacher perception surveys as evidence for all of the Principal Quality Standards focused on professional practice (standards I-VI). See pages 10-16 of this guide for Principal Quality Standards and for example artifacts that can be used to build a body of evidence.</p> <p><a href="#">CLF Teacher Perception Survey</a>            CLF is developing and validating a teacher perception survey to be used – once validated – for voluntary use by districts to meet the requirement to include teacher input within principal evaluations.</p> <p><a href="#">The Teaching, Empowering, Leading and Learning (TELL) Colorado survey</a>            The TELL survey is an anonymous statewide survey of licensed, school-based educators to assess teaching conditions at the school, district and state level. (Note: teachers and principals in charter schools are included and do not need to be licensed to participate.) The survey results are intended to support school and district improvement planning and to inform policy decisions. TELL’s purpose is not evaluative. Further, schools/districts will not receive data without specified response rates.</p>	<p>Examples coming soon.</p>
<p>4b <b>Professional Practices: Include Teacher Effectiveness Ratings</b>            At least one of the measures of professional practice must capture information concerning the percentage and</p>	<p><a href="#">CDE Principal User Guide</a>            CDE guidance indicates that teacher effectiveness ratings can be used as an artifact in building a body of evidence. CDE includes teacher effectiveness ratings as evidence for all of</p>	<p>Examples coming soon.</p>

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p>number of teachers in the school who are rated as effective, highly effective, partially effective, and ineffective.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(b)</a> and <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-103 (6), 1 CCR 301-87 5.01 (E)(2) and (3)</a>, <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #4b</a></p>	<p>the Principal Quality Standards focused on professional practice (standards I-VI). See pages 10-16 of this guide for Principal Quality Standards and for example artifacts that can be used to build a body of evidence.</p>	
<p>4c <b>Professional Practices: Include Teacher Improvement Data</b></p> <p>At least one of the measures of professional practice must capture information concerning the number and percentage of teachers who are improving in their performance, in comparison to the goals articulated in the principal’s professional performance plan.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(b)</a> and <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-103 (6), 1 CCR 301-87 5.01 (E)(2) and (3)</a>, <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #4c</a></p>	<p><b><a href="#">CDE Principal User Guide</a></b></p> <p>CDE guidance indicates that UIPs, teacher turn-over rates and personnel evaluation records can be used as artifacts in building a body of evidence. Including this information within UIPs will allow for the UIP to serve as evidence for this requirement. See pages 10-16 of this guide for Principal Quality Standards and for example artifacts that can be used to build a body of evidence.</p>	<p>Examples coming soon.</p>
<p>4d <b>Growth: Include Student Growth Measure Based on School Performance Framework Data</b></p> <p>At least one of the measures of student academic growth must include the data included in the school’s performance framework.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(b)</a> and <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-103 (6), 1 CCR 301-87 5.01 (E)(2) and (3)</a>, <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #4d</a></p>	<p><b>CDE Guidance: Measuring the 50% Student Learning Outcomes</b></p> <p>The following resources were developed by CDE to assist districts in deciding and incorporating student growth measures as 50 percent of an educator’s evaluation. CDE refers to multiple measures of student academic growth as Student Learning Outcomes (not to be confused with SLOs, or Student Learning Objectives).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b><a href="#">Student Learning Outcomes Guidance</a></b> This 17 page document provides guidance and examples.</li> <li>• <b><a href="#">Assessment Review Tool</a></b> This review tool provides a way for districts to evaluate the data sources and measures they are</li> </ul>	<p>CDE and CLF are working collaboratively with Integration Districts to select measures of student growth. Stay tuned for district examples of selecting Student Growth Outcomes which will make up 50 percent of educators’ evaluations.</p>

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts	
		<p>already using and to prioritize development or adoption of new measures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">The Colorado Content Collaboratives</a> CDE Content Collaboratives work to identify assessments for the <a href="#">CDE Resource Bank</a>. CDE Resource Bank includes measures of student learning over time which can be used for educator evaluation. Assessments go through a pilot and peer review process and adjustments are made.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">CDE School Performance Framework</a></p> <p><a href="#">School View</a> The CDE School View Data Center includes a wealth of information by school (e.g. TCAP and other performance indicators). Districts and schools should consider this a resource in determining and incorporating measures of growth within principal evaluations. UIPs are also available by school on this site. <i>Note: This site will not work properly with certain browsers. Firefox and Google Chrome seem to work best.</i></p>	
4e	<p><b>Growth: Include At Least One Other Student Growth Measure</b> At least one other measure of student academic growth must be used.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(b)</a> and <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-103 (6), 1 CCR 301-87 5.01 (E)(2) and (3), CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #4e</a></p>	<p><a href="#">School View</a> The CDE School View Data Center includes a wealth of information by school (e.g. TCAP and other performance indicators). Districts and schools should consider this a resource in determining and incorporating measures of growth within principal evaluations. <i>Note: This site will not work properly with certain browsers. Firefox and Google Chrome seem to work best.</i></p>	<p>CDE and CLF are working collaboratively with Integration Districts to select measures of student growth. Stay tuned for district examples of selecting Student Growth Outcomes which will make up 50 percent of educators’ evaluations.</p>
4f	<p><b>Student Growth Measures Correspond to UIP</b> The school district/BOCES must seek to ensure that the</p>	<p><a href="#">School View</a> The CDE School View Data Center includes a wealth of</p>	<p>CDE and CLF are working collaboratively with Integration Districts to select measures of student growth. Stay tuned for</p>

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p>measures of student academic growth correspond to implementation benchmarks and targets included in the Unified Improvement Plan for the school at which a Principal is employed.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(b)</a> and <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-103 (6), 1 CCR 301-87 5.01 (E)(2) and (3), CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #4f</a></p>	<p>information by school (e.g. TCAP and other performance indicators). Districts and schools should consider this a resource in determining and incorporating measures of growth within principal evaluations. UIPs are also available by school on this site. <i>Note: This site will not work properly with certain browsers. Firefox and Google Chrome seem to work best.</i></p>	<p>district examples of selecting Student Growth Outcomes which will make up 50 percent of educators' evaluations.</p>
<p>5 <b>Adopt/Develop Evaluation Scoring Matrix</b> The school district/BOCES must adopt the personnel <b><i>evaluation scoring matrix</i></b> for principals included in the State Model system or the school district/BOCES must adopt a locally developed matrix to aggregate evidence collected on multiple measures of principal professional practice and multiple measures of student academic growth into a single score.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 2.03 (A)</a>, <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #5</a></p>	<p><b>CDE Evaluation Scoring Matrix (Coming Soon)</b></p>	<p>Examples coming soon.</p>
<p>5a <b>Locally Developed Matrix Requirement</b> A locally developed matrix must ensure that fifty percent of each principal's evaluation is determined by the measures of professional practice and the other fifty percent is determined by measures of student academic growth.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 2.03 (A)</a>, <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #5a</a></p>		<p>Examples coming soon.</p>
<p>5b <b>Locally Developed Matrix Requirement</b> A locally developed matrix also must ensure that each of the state's principal professional practice quality standards is weighted to have a measurable influence on</p>		<p>Examples coming soon.</p>

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p>the final professional practice score assigned to principals.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 2.03 (A)</a>, <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #5b</a></p>		
<p><b>5c By July 1, 2014: Student Growth Consistent with Growth Measures for Teachers</b></p> <p>The measures of student academic growth for each principal must be consistent with the measures of student academic growth used for the evaluation of teachers in the principal’s school.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 2.03 (A)</a>, <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #5c</a></p>		Examples coming soon.
<p><b>5d By July 1, 2014: Student Growth Measures are Valid and Aligned to Content Standards</b></p> <p>The school district/BOCES must seek to ensure that the measures of student academic growth are valid, meaning that they measure growth towards attainment of the academic standards adopted by the local school board and that analysis and inferences from the measures can be supported by evidence and logic.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 2.03 (A)</a>, <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #5d</a></p>	<p><b><a href="#">The Colorado Content Collaboratives</a></b></p> <p>CDE Content Collaboratives work to identify assessments aligned to Colorado Academic Standards for the <a href="#">CDE Resource Bank</a>. CDE Resource Bank includes measures of student learning over time which can be used for educator evaluation. Assessments go through a pilot and peer review process and adjustments are made.</p>	Examples coming soon.
<p><b>5e By July 1, 2014: Student Growth Measure are Reliable</b></p> <p>The school district/BOCES must seek to ensure that the measures of student academic growth are reliable, meaning that the measures should be reasonably stable over time and in substance and that data from the measures will be sufficient to warrant reasonably consistent inferences.</p>		Examples coming soon.

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p>Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 2.03 (A)</a>, <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #5e</a></p>		
<p>5f <b>By July 1, 2014: Non-State Model Systems Ensure System Validation (IRR, Consistency)</b>  For a school district/BOCES not using the State Model System, the school district/BOCES must use a process for validating the selected evaluation measures for principals. This process must address the issues of inter-rater reliability when the measures are applied by different evaluators and consistency between each of the selected measures and the final evaluation ratings that are assigned.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 2.03 (A)</a>, <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #5f</a></p>		<p>Examples coming soon.</p>
<p><b>III Evaluate Every Teacher Every Year</b>  <b><a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 5.01 (B)</a></b></p>		
<p>6 <b>Adopt/Develop Quality Standards for Teachers</b>  The school district/BOCES must adopt the state’s teacher quality <i>standards</i> for teachers, including all elements for each standard, or must adopt locally developed standards that meet or exceed the state’s teacher quality standards and elements and must produce a crosswalk that demonstrates how the local standards align with the state’s standards and elements.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 3.02</a>, <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, #6</a></p>	<p><b>Colorado Teacher Quality Standards</b>  See the SB10-191 Rules which include the State Teacher Quality Standards; <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 3.02</a>.</p> <p><b><a href="#">CDE Rubric for Evaluating Teachers</a></b>  See the rubric used in the State Model Educator Evaluation System for evaluating teacher professional practices. <a href="#">Click here to provide feedback on the Rubric for Evaluating Colorado’s Teachers</a></p> <p><b><a href="#">CDE-Development Templates:</a></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher Evaluation Process Tracking Form</li> <li>• Rubric for Evaluating Colorado’s Teachers</li> <li>• Teacher Summary Evaluation Worksheet</li> <li>• Teacher Summary Evaluation Sheet</li> </ul>	



SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goal-Setting Form for Colorado Teachers</li> <li>• Professional Growth Plan for Colorado Teachers</li> <li>• Mid-Year Performance Discussion</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">CDE Video Re: Colorado State Model Evaluation System Process</a> This video includes the 9 steps of the evaluation cycle and recommendations on the timeline for these 9 steps.</p> <p><a href="#">CDE Video Re: Quality Standards for Principals and Teachers; Using and Scoring the Rubrics</a> This 6 minute video begins with the frameworks for evaluating teachers and principals in Colorado then overviews the rubric and illustrates examples of how the rubric is scored during evaluations.</p>	
<p>7 <b>Adopt Measures of Professional Practice and Student Growth for Teachers</b> The school district/BOCES must adopt <i>measures of professional practice and student academic growth</i> that are included in the State Model System, or the school district/BOCES must select measures for teachers that meet the requirements outlined in statute and rule (in sections 5.01 (E) (6) and (7) of 1 CCR 301-87). Specifically, the measures must meet the requirements in 7a-f below.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 5.01 e (6) and (7)</a> and <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 7</a></p>	<p><a href="#">CDE User's Guide for Evaluating Colorado's Teachers; 2012-13 School-Year</a> See pages 9-11 of the teacher guide for Teacher Quality Standards and examples of artifacts for building a body of evidence to demonstrate effectiveness.</p>	<p><b>Eagle County Schools District Example</b> Eagle schools have experience with comprehensive evaluation systems. For the last decade, teachers in Eagle have participated in a robust evaluation system as a component of their pay-for-performance system. Eagle had planned on keeping their existing system for evaluating teachers and to adopt the State Model for evaluating principals. However, after reviewing the State Model Educator Evaluation System Quality Standards and rubric for evaluating teachers, Eagle County decided to make the transition to the state system as it is more comprehensive and provides more meaningful feedback to teachers to improve their practice.</p>
<p>7a <b>Include Observations</b> At least one of the measures of professional practice is gathered using observations.</p>	<p><b>COMING SOON - CDE-developed observational tools aligned to the State Model Educator Evaluation system rubric for evaluating teachers.</b></p>	<p><b>Thompson District Example</b> Principals in Thomson developed walk through forms aligned to the rubric. These walk-through observations are frequent</p>

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p>Probationary teachers must be observed at least two times a year as a part of their annual evaluation and nonprobationary teachers must be observed at least once annually as a part of their annual evaluation.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(c)</a> <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 7a</a></p>	<p><a href="#">CDE Rubric for Evaluating Teachers</a> See the rubric used in the State Model Educator Evaluation System for evaluating teacher professional practices. Observable practices as well as unobservable evidence are included – and designated - within the rubric.</p> <p><a href="#">Bloomboard</a> is software that helps evaluators schedule, manage, and complete observations and evaluations and is a free tool offered to districts through CDE.</p> <p><a href="#">Student Achievement Partners</a> This organization has produced tools and resources to support understanding of what shifts in instruction are required for educators to effectively instruct in a way aligned to the Common Core State Standards.</p>	<p>and used to supplement the formal evaluations.</p> <p><b>Dove Creek District Example</b> Form to consistently gather information through walk-through observations. The feedback is immediately provided to teachers allowing them to make immediate adjustments. It also reduces anxiety about walk-throughs as teachers have immediate and actionable feedback and related support.</p>
<p>7b <b>Additional Professional Practice Requirements</b> At least one of the measures of professional practices is one of the following: (a) student perception measures (e.g. surveys), where appropriate and feasible, (b) peer feedback, (c) feedback from parents or guardians; or (d) review of teacher lesson plans or student work samples.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(c)</a> <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 7b</a> <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 5.01 e (6) and (7)</a></p>	<p><a href="#">CLF Student Perception Survey</a> CLF, in partnership with CDE, has developed a student perception survey which is being piloted in the Fall of 2012 and Spring of 2013 across Integration Districts. After validation, this survey will be made available for use by all districts in the 2013-14 school year.</p> <p><a href="#">Tripod Project</a> The CLF survey was informed by the Tripod Survey being used across the nation; however, CLF-developed a Colorado specific survey because of feedback from districts. The CLF survey is shorter, more affordable, tailored for Colorado and the results will be made available to educators in a more timely manner. The Tripod Project is an integral part of the <a href="#">Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) Project</a>, which is funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. For more</p>	<p>Some districts report having student representation on school boards. A number of the Integration Districts report using district-developed surveys to solicit input from students. The majority of Integration Districts, in addition to other volunteer districts, are piloting the CLF-developed student perception survey in the 2012-13 school year.</p> <p><b>Denver Public Schools District Example – Student Survey</b> The Denver Public Schools (DPS)-developed educator evaluation system (LEAP) includes a <a href="#">student perception survey</a>.</p> <p><b>Eagle County Schools District Example – Peer Feedback</b> In Eagle, evaluations include an observation by Mentor and Master teachers, in addition to the principal and/or another administrator. The Mentor observation is not incorporated</p>

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
	<p>information about the Tripod Project, visit <a href="http://www.tripodproject.org">www.tripodproject.org</a>. or download <a href="#">Tripod Assessment Flyer</a>.</p>	<p>within the evaluation scoring process; rather it is centered around feedback and peer coaching. The Master teacher observation follows the Mentor teacher coaching opportunity and counts for 1/3 of the overall evaluation outcome. The administrator’s observation makes up the final 2/3 of the evaluation.</p> <p><b><a href="#">Durango District Example – Parent Engagement</a></b>  Every year, Durango’s District Accountability Advisory Committee (DAAC) surveys parents about schools and climate. The purpose of these surveys is to provide key information to building School Accountability Committees (SACs) and to help guide goal setting for school Unified Improvement Plans (UIP). The survey is available online and is also mailed to parents in registration packets.</p>
<p>7c <b>Include Individually-Attributed Measure of Growth</b>  At least one of the measures of student academic growth is individually-attributed, meaning that outcomes on that measure are attributed to an individual licensed person.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(c)</a>  <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 7c</a>  <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 5.01 e (6) and (7)</a></p>	<p><b><a href="#">CLF District Leader's Guide: Selecting and Using Multiple Measures of Student Growth to Evaluate Educators</a></b>  This report highlights how pioneering districts have approached incorporating measures of student growth within educator evaluations.</p> <p><b>CDE Student Learning Outcomes Guidance</b>  This recently released initial guidance is 17 pages in total and provides districts a starting place to identify and determine the 50% of educator evaluations based on student growth. At this point, the guidance is focused on teachers (principal and SSP guidance will be released in the near future). Following are quick links to segments of the 17 page guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Definition</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Steps/Method</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Additional Criteria</a></li> </ul>	<p><b>San Juan BOCES/Durango District Example</b>  Durango teachers, partnering with neighboring district teachers through their BOCES, are busy at work developing a bank of formative assessments that could also serve as a component of individually attributed measures of student growth. Lessons are peer-evaluated and must meet strict quality benchmarks. This site will link to this resource once it is available on-line.</p>

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">CDE Resources for Student Academic Growth</a></li> </ul>	
<p><b>7d Include Collectively Attributed Measure of Growth</b> At least one of the measures of student academic growth is collectively-attributed, whether on a school-wide basis or across grades or subjects, meaning that the outcomes on that measure are attributed to at least two licensed personnel (e.g., measures included in the school performance framework).</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(c)</a> <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 7d</a> <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 5.01 e (6) and (7)</a></p>	<p><b>CDE Student Learning Outcomes Guidance</b> This recently released initial guidance is 17 pages in total and provides districts a starting place in beginning to identify and determine the 50% of educator evaluations based on student growth. At this point, the guidance is focused on teachers (principal and SSP guidance will be released in the near future). Following are quick links to segments of the 17 page guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Definition</a></li> <li><a href="#">Steps/Method</a></li> <li><a href="#">Additional Criteria</a></li> <li><a href="#">CDE Resources for Student Academic Growth</a></li> </ul> <p><b>School View</b> The CDE School View Data Center includes a wealth of information by school (e.g. TCAP and other performance indicators). Districts and schools should consider this a resource in determining and incorporating measures of growth within principal evaluations. UIPs are also available by school on this site. <i>Note: This site will not work properly with certain browsers. Firefox and Google Chrome seem to work best.</i></p>	<p><b>Thompson District Example</b> Thompson has been developing model “pie charts” that provide guidance regarding the selection of multiple measures of student growth and weighting of these measures. Rather than include individual attribution this year, Thompson is focused on rolling out a model which only includes shared attribution. They will move toward individual AND collective measures as a next step.</p>
<p><b>7e Include Statewide Summative when Available</b> At least one of the measures of student academic growth is based on statewide summative assessment results, when available.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(c)</a> <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 7e</a></p>	<p><b>School View</b> The CDE School View Data Center includes a wealth of information by school (e.g. TCAP and other performance indicators). Districts and schools should consider this a resource in determining and incorporating measures of growth within principal evaluations. UIPs are also available by school on this site. <i>Note: This site will not work properly with</i></p>	

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
	<a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 5.01 e (6) and (7)</a>	<i>certain browsers. Firefox and Google Chrome seem to work best.</i>
7f <b>By July 1, 2014: Include Colorado Growth Model if Available</b> At least one of the measures of student academic growth is based on results from the Colorado Growth Model, for subjects with annual statewide summative assessment results available in two consecutive grades.  Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(c)</a> <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 7f</a> <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 5.01 e (6) and (7)</a>	<a href="#">School View</a> The CDE School View Data Center includes a wealth of information by school (e.g. TCAP and other performance indicators). Districts and schools should consider this a resource in determining and incorporating measures of growth within principal evaluations. UIPs are also available by school on this site. <i>Note: This site will not work properly with certain browsers. Firefox and Google Chrome seem to work best.</i>	
8 <b>Adopt/Develop Evaluation Scoring Matrix</b> The school district/BOCES has adopted the personnel evaluation scoring matrix for a teacher that is included in the State Model system or the school district/BOCES has adopted a locally developed matrix to aggregate evidence collected on multiple measures of teacher professional practice and multiple measures of student academic growth into a single score.  Source: Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 5.01 (E)(4)</a> <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 8</a>	Resources coming soon.	Examples coming soon.
8a <b>Locally Developed Matrix Requirement</b> This matrix ensures that fifty percent of each teacher’s evaluation is determined by the measure of professional practice and the other fifty percent is determined by measures of student academic growth.  <a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 8a</a>	Resources coming soon.	Examples coming soon.
8b <b>Locally Developed Matrix Requirement</b>	Resources coming soon.	Examples coming soon.

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p>This matrix also ensures that each of the state’s professional practice quality standards is weighted to have a measurable influence on the final professional practice score assigned to teachers.</p> <p><a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 8b</a></p>		
<p><b>Timeline for Receiving Evaluation Results</b> All probationary and nonprobationary teachers must receive written annual evaluations at least two weeks prior to the last day of class.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-9-106(1)(c)(I) and (II)</a></p>	<p><a href="#">CDE User guide on Evaluation Cycle</a> See page 15 of this guide for a visual of the nine-step evaluation cycle for the State Model Educator Evaluation System.</p>	
<p><b>IV Report to CDE Every Year</b></p>		
<p>9 <b>Have a System for Reporting</b> The school district/BOCES has a system in place for reporting to the Colorado Department of Education, as a part of the human resources data collection, the information included in 9a-e below.</p> <p><a href="#">CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 9</a></p>	<p><a href="#">CDE Assurances</a> Districts are required to address the three assurances identified by CDE. In order to submit your assurances to CDE, you must have a <a href="#">Colorado Tracker</a> account. If you do not have one, please e-mail Toby King at <a href="mailto:king_t@cde.state.co.us">king_t@cde.state.co.us</a>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Click here</a> for a step by step guide to submitting your assurances</li> <li>• <a href="#">Click here</a> to download the assurance document</li> <li>• <a href="#">Click here</a> to access the Colorado Tracker and submit your assurances</li> <li>• <a href="#">Click here</a> to access the checklist of requirements that will begin to be collected in July 2014</li> </ul>	
<p>9a <b>Include Performance Ratings</b> For each principal and for each teacher, the educator’s final performance evaluation rating (i.e., highly effective, effective, partially effective, or ineffective)</p>		

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 5.01(E)(2)(a)(ii), CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 9a</a>		
<p>9b <b>Include Validity Confirmation</b>  The school district/BOCES has sought to ensure that the measures of student academic growth are valid, meaning that they measure growth towards attainment of the academic standards adopted by the local school board and that analysis and inferences from the measures can be supported by evidence and logic.</p> <p><a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 5.01(E)(2)(a)(ii), CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 9b</a></p>		
<p>9c <b>Include Reliability Confirmation</b>  The school district/BOCES has sought to ensure that the measures of student academic growth are reliable, meaning that the measures should be reasonably stable over time and in substance and that data from the measures will be sufficient to warrant reasonably consistent inferences.</p> <p><a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 5.01(E)(2)(a)(ii), CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 9c</a></p>		
<p>9d <b>Locally-Developed System Requirements (Valid Measures and IRR)</b>  For a school district/BOCES that will not be using the State Model System, the school district/BOCES has used a process for validating the selected evaluation measures for principals. This process has addressed the issues of inter-rater reliability when the measures are applied by different evaluators and consistency between each of the selected measures and the final evaluation ratings that are assigned.</p>	<b>CDE Inter-Rater Agreement Training – Coming Soon</b>	<b>Eagle County Schools Example</b> Eagle has a training program for evaluators which includes passing an on-line calibration exercise intended to align evaluator scores with a ‘master rater’ score.

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
	<a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 5.01(E)(2)(a)(ii), CDE Assurance 2, Checklist, 9d</a>	
9e <b>By July 1, 2014: Include Quality Standard Results</b> For each principal and for each teacher, the results for each of the state’s quality standards (e.g., not evident, partially proficient, proficient, accomplished, exemplary).  <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87 5.01(E)(2)(a)(ii), CDE Assurance 2, Checklist</a>		
<b>V Evaluate All Other Licensed Personnel Every Year</b> C.R.S. 22-9-106(1); C.R.S. 22-9-107(1)-(3); 1 CCR 301-87, 5.01(B)		
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DEVELOPMENT</b>  SB10-191 requires all Other Licensed Personnel (OLP) to be evaluated every year. The State Council for Educator Effectiveness is in the process of developing recommendations to deliver to the State Board of Education. The requirement to evaluate OLPs will begin in the 2014-15 school year.  Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 5.01(B)</a>	<a href="#">Other Licensed Professionals CDE FAQ</a>  <b>Timeline for Evaluating OLPs</b> Instruments to evaluate other licensed personnel will be piloted in 2013-14 and implemented statewide in 2014-15. Please note that this timeline is not consistent with the timeline identified in statute which calls for implementation in 2013-14, but was supported by the bill sponsors in a March 2012 meeting with State Council for Educator Effectiveness members. Based on feedback from schools and districts, the State Council believes this timeline provides a more manageable sequencing of implementation of the many requirements of S.B. 10-191 while still remaining true to the spirit and intent of the law.  <b>State Council Recommendations Re: OLP</b> There are nine categories of OLP’s: school audiologists, nurses, occupational therapists, physical therapists, psychologists, social workers, speech-language pathologists, counselors, orientation and mobility specialists.	



SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts	
	<p>Each of the nine work groups is charged with identifying how the license categories align to the Quality Standards for teachers, to articulate how they don't align and to provide thoughtful rationale for any changes that need to be made to the Quality Standards (including draft language).</p> <p><a href="#">CDE Informational Drop-In Article (Includes OLP)</a></p>		
<b>VI Have an Appeals process for teachers</b>			
<p><b>By the 2015-16 School Year: Have an Appeals Process</b> Beginning with the 2015-16 academic school year, each School District shall ensure that a nonprobationary Teacher who objects to a second consecutive Performance Evaluation Rating of ineffective or partially effective has an opportunity to appeal that rating.</p> <p>Minimum requirements include appealing to the district's superintendent. The burden of proof rests with the teacher.</p> <p>The consequence of two consecutive ineffective or partially effectiveness ratings is a loss of status, not of employment.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">1 CCR 301-87, 5.04</a></p>			
<p><b>HR System Components</b> S.B. 10-191 has implications for employment contracts in terms of mutual consent hiring, priority hiring pool requirements, unpaid leave, limited-term assignment and portability of nonprobationary status. This section includes relevant statute requirements.</p>			
1	<b>Mutual Consent</b>	<a href="#">CLF Building Strong Instructional Teams Through Mutual</a>	

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p>For the fair evaluation of a principal based on the demonstrated effectiveness of his or her teachers, the principal needs the ability to select teachers who have demonstrated effectiveness and have demonstrated qualifications and teaching experience that support the instructional practices of his or her school. Therefore, each employment contract is required to contain a provision stating that a teacher may be assigned to a particular school only with the consent of the hiring principal and with input from at least two teachers employed at the school and chosen by the faculty of teachers at the school to represent them in the hiring process, and after a review of the teacher's demonstrated effectiveness and qualifications, which review demonstrates that the teacher's qualifications and teaching experience support the instructional practices of his or her school.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-202 (2) (c.5) (I)</a></p>	<p><a href="#">Consent Staffing</a></p> <p><a href="#">CASB Special Policy Update</a> A July 2010 update explains changes to teacher employment laws with the passage of SB10-191, including contracts, placements and transfers, waivers, nonrenewals and reductions in force.</p> <p><a href="#">CLF Advice from Practitioners: A Guide to Implementing S.B. 10-191 Staffing Provisions</a></p>	
<p>2 <b>Priority Hiring Pool</b> Any active nonprobationary teacher who was deemed effective during the prior school year and has not secured a mutual consent placement is required to be a member of a priority hiring pool, which priority hiring pool shall ensure the nonprobationary teacher a first opportunity to interview for a reasonable number of available positions for which he or she is qualified in the school district.</p> <p>When a determination is made that a nonprobationary teacher's services are no longer required the nonprobationary teacher shall be notified of his or her</p>	<p><a href="#">CLF Guide to Implementing a Priority Hiring Pool</a></p> <p><a href="#">CLF Advice from Practitioners: A Guide to Implementing S.B. 10-191 Staffing Provisions</a></p>	

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p>removal from the school. School districts are required to work with their local teachers association to develop policies for the local school board to adopt. If no teacher association exists in the school district, the school district is required to create an eight-person committee consisting of four school district members and four teachers, which committee shall develop such policies.</p> <p>Upon notice to the nonprobationary teacher, the school district must immediately provide the nonprobationary teacher with a list of all vacant positions for which he or she is qualified, as well as a list of vacancies in any area identified by the school district to be an area of critical need. An application for a vacancy shall be made to the principal of a listed school, with a copy of the application provided by the nonprobationary teacher to the school district. When a principal recommends appointment of a nonprobationary teacher applicant to a vacant position, the nonprobationary teacher shall be transferred to that position.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-202 (2) (c.5) (III) (A) and (B)</a></p>		
<p>3 <b>Unpaid Leave</b>            If a nonprobationary teacher is unable to secure a mutual consent assignment in a school of the school district after twelve months or two hiring cycles, whichever period is longer, the school district shall place the teacher on unpaid leave until such time as the teacher is able to secure an assignment. If the teacher secures an assignment at a school of the school district while placed on unpaid leave, the school district shall reinstate the teacher's salary and benefits at the level</p>	<p><a href="#">CLF Advice from Practitioners: A Guide to Implementing S.B. 10-191 Staffing Provisions</a></p>	

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p>they would have been if the teacher had not been placed on unpaid leave.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-202 (2) (c.5) (IV)</a></p>		
<p>4 <b>Limited-Term Assignment</b> Nothing in this section shall limit the ability of a school district to place a teacher in a twelve-month assignment or other limited-term assignments, including, but not limited to, a teaching assignment, substitute assignment, or instructional support role during the period in which the teacher is attempting to secure an assignment through school-based hiring. Such an assignment shall not constitute an assignment through school-based hiring and shall not be deemed to interrupt the period in which the teacher is required to secure an assignment through school-based hiring before the district shall place the teacher on unpaid leave.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-202 (2) (c.5) (V)</a></p>	<p><a href="#">CLF Advice from Practitioners: A Guide to Implementing S.B. 10-191 Staffing Provisions</a></p>	
<p>5 <b>Application of Mutual Consent</b> Mutual consent, priority hiring pool, limited-term assignment all apply to any teacher who is displaced as a result of drop in enrollment; turnaround; phase-out; reduction in program; or reduction in building, including closure, consolidation, or reconstitution.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-202 (2) (c.5) (VI)</a></p>	<p><a href="#">CLF Advice from Practitioners: A Guide to Implementing S.B. 10-191 Staffing Provisions</a></p> <p><a href="#">CASB Special Policy Update</a> A March 2011 update explains the impact the bill has on reductions in force (RIF) and licensed personnel evaluations.</p>	
<p>6 <b>Portability</b> Beginning with the 2014-15 school year, a nonprobationary teacher, except for a nonprobationary teacher who has had two consecutive performance evaluations with an ineffective rating, who is employed</p>		

SB10-191 Requirements	Available Resources	Examples from Integration Districts
<p>by a school district and is subsequently hired by a different school district may provide to the hiring school district evidence of his or her student academic growth data and performance evaluations for the prior two years for the purposes of retaining nonprobationary status. If, upon providing such data, the nonprobationary teacher can show two consecutive performance evaluations with effectiveness ratings in good standing, he or she shall be granted nonprobationary status in the hiring school district.</p> <p>Source: <a href="#">C.R.S. 22-63-203.5</a></p>		

SB10-191 Implementation Challenges	Resources and Integration District Approaches to Solving Challenges	
------------------------------------	---	--

### Integration District Trends and Resources in Meeting SB10-191 Implementation Challenges

CLF Integration Districts report that major challenges include the amount of time it takes principals and teachers to participate in the evaluation process; teacher perceptions and misconceptions regarding the purpose of the new evaluation system; ensuring that the student growth component of evaluations is fair, valid and reliable; ensuring inter-rater reliability and/or agreement across evaluators and linking teacher and student data. This section provides resources for districts to consider in meeting these implementation challenges.

#### Finding Enough Time is a Challenge

Overwhelmingly, stakeholders report that the time it takes principals and teachers to evaluate every teacher every year is a major challenge.

Resources coming soon.

Administrators from sites around the country including Memphis City Schools and Charlotte-Mecklenburg recently presented on the challenge of increased time it takes to evaluate every teacher every year as a part of evaluation systems similar to the new system in Colorado. While there is agreement that the amount of time administrators spent in classrooms and serving as instructional leaders increased significantly, there were also interesting and consistent outcomes.

- Time spent on discipline decreased (in some cases 10-30 percent).
- Time spent responding to parent concerns dropped.

Principals reported that the drop in the time spent on the above is an outcome of students seeing principals in classrooms more frequently.

Administrators documented their time and were able to show an increase in instructional leadership from roughly 20% to 50% of their overall time. One actionable strategy to off-load work is to draft a 'first responder' list of staff or other point people who should be contacted first for numerous issues so that principals were not constantly responding to non-essential work and could focus more time on being instructional leaders.

[DPS District Example](#)

		<p>DPS acknowledges that they have to learn about how the new evaluation requirements impact the role of the principal. DPS Leadership and the Principal Effectiveness Design Team are currently discussing this matter. The LEAP pilot will also provide insights on the principal role. One hope for the LEAP system is that it supports the identification of teacher leaders and allows educators in DPS to begin thinking about how to build a strong team and more capacity within schools to support student achievement.</p>
--	--	--

<p><b>Overcoming Misconceptions is a Challenge</b> Stakeholders across Integration Districts continue to report that teachers and other stakeholders often fear the intent of the system is to ‘get rid of bad teachers.’ This creates a level of anxiety and mistrust which needs to be addressed for successful implementation of the new evaluation system.</p>	<p>A number of Integration Districts reported that teachers and other education stakeholders are concerned that the new evaluation system is ill-intended. Specifically, there are fears that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evaluation system is focused on getting rid of ‘bad teachers’; and</li> <li>• Half of a teacher’s evaluation will be based on TCAP.</li> </ul> <p>The above fears, while understandable, are far from substantiated. Further, even skeptical teachers and administrators who have initiated the evaluation process report that they believe that the evaluation process has the potential to improve their practice in the near-term and to provide them with targeted support that will help them achieve their highest potential as professionals over time.</p> <p><a href="#"><u>CDE Initial Pilot Data - Principal Perception Survey</u></a> CDE focused on principal evaluation the first year of the two year pilot of SB 10-191. Principals across all 27 of the pilot districts completed pre- and post-perception surveys. The findings are striking. For example, when asked at the beginning of the pilot if their current system was intended to guide professional growth, 32% of principals agreed that it was. Compare that to the 87% of principals surveyed a year later asking them the same question of the new evaluation system. While this is indicative of substantially more principals believing that the new system has increased potential to provide professional supports, the data also point out areas for improvement. CDE continues to evaluate these types of data to improve the evaluation system.</p>	<p>Examples coming soon.</p>
<p><b>Ensuring Validity and Fairness of Incorporating Measures of Student Growth is A Challenge</b> Stakeholders across Integration Districts are in varying stages of deciding and incorporating multiple measures of student growth as 50 percent of an educator’s evaluation. To date, the CDE pilot of the evaluation system has focused on rolling out the professional practices side of the evaluation system. In 2013, CDE will</p>	<p>Resources coming soon.</p>	<p>Examples coming soon.</p>



<p>work with pilot districts to begin to address the requirement that 50 percent of evaluations be based on multiple measures of student growth.</p>		
<p><b>Ensuring Trained Evaluators and Inter-Rater Agreement is a Challenge</b>          SB10-191 requires evaluators to be trained. CDE is currently the sole trained evaluator. Further, CDE and districts are required to ensure Inter-Rater Reliability. Ensuring principals and other administrators are trained and prepared to evaluate all teachers every year is challenging.</p>	<p><b>CDE Inter-rater Agreement Work Plan (Coming Soon)</b></p> <p><a href="#">Ensuring Accurate Feedback from Observations</a>          This report from the Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation focuses on the three “areas of action” for states and districts to ensure that feedback from observations is as accurate and use</p> <p><a href="#">Ensuring Accurate Teacher Observations</a>          In this April 2012 post for the Impatient Optimists blog, Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation Senior Program Officer Mike Copeland discusses the challenges involved with making sure new observations accurate and reliable.</p>	<p><b>Eagle County Schools Example</b>          Eagle has a training program for evaluators which includes passing an on-line calibration exercise intended to align evaluator scores with a ‘master rater’ score.</p>
<p><b>Ensuring Links Between Teachers and Students is a Challenge</b>          A prerequisite of incorporating individually attributed student growth to educators is the ability to accurately and reliably connect students with their teachers. Many districts are currently not able to do this. Even districts who are able to link data report a number of challenges in attributing growth to individual educators (e.g. student transition, appropriate weighting of attribution for support personnel, etc.).</p>	<p><a href="#">CDE TSDL Pilot</a>          CDE is piloting a Teacher Student Data Link project, many components of which are currently required of all districts. Visit this site to learn more.</p>	<p>Examples coming soon.</p>