Principal Roles, Work Demands, and Supports Needed to Implement New Teacher Evaluation

Shelby Cosner
University of Illinois at Chicago

Steven M. Kimball
University of Wisconsin - Madison

Elizabeth Barkowski
SEDL

Bradley Carl
University of Wisconsin - Madison

Curtis Jones
University of Wisconsin - Madison, jones554@uwm.edu

Recommended Citation

Cosner, Shelby; Kimball, Steven M.; Barkowski, Elizabeth; Carl, Bradley; and Jones, Curtis (2015) "Principal Roles, Work Demands, and Supports Needed to Implement New Teacher Evaluation," *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*: Vol. 27: Iss. 1, Article 6.
Available at: https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/mwer/vol27/iss1/6

Principal Roles, Work Demands, and Supports Needed to Implement New Teacher Evaluation

Shelby Cosner
University of Illinois at Chicago

Steven M. Kimball
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Elizabeth Barkowski
SEDL

Bradley Carl
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Curtis Jones
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Policy makers at the federal level have embraced an educator effectiveness agenda, which in turn has driven many states across the country to rapidly develop and implement new and more complex teacher evaluation systems. It is increasingly clear that the success of these nascent teacher evaluation systems partly depends on the will, skill, and capacity of school principals, individuals who have historically been tasked with evaluating teachers. School principals have traditionally had, and will in most cases continue to have, primary responsibility for evaluating the 3.7 million public school teachers nationwide. While teacher evaluation innovations present several opportunities for improving instructional supervision and teacher quality, they also involve several challenges, especially on the part of principals. Time demands and cognitive challenges will be inevitable as principals learn about and implement new teacher evaluation systems. Simultaneously, other educational changes going to scale, including Common Core State Standards with aligned assessments and state school accountability systems, will compete for the attention of school leaders and teachers. Negotiating these changes to maximize the positive potential of evaluation reforms requires a commitment by states and districts to resources for training and support as well as policy coherence.

Introduction

In an ongoing quest to improve student learning across the US, policy makers at the federal level have embraced an educator effectiveness agenda. This new policy agenda targets the improvement of educator practice and effectiveness as a key mechanism for improving student learning. This emphasis had driven many states across the country to rapidly develop and implement new and more complex, standards-based teacher evaluation systems (McGuinn, 2012). As these new evaluation systems are developed, federal initiative such as the Race to the

Top Fund (RTT) grants,[1] waivers from provisions to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA),[2] and the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grants,[3] have encouraged these new systems to include several key design features. In particular, new evaluation systems typically base teacher evaluations on multiple measures of teacher performance. These measures often include measures of teachers' professional practice that draw on observations of practice and analysis of teaching artifacts, along with some measures of student achievement and /or growth.[4] These new evaluation systems also tend to examine teacher practice through rubrics aligned to model teacher standards[5] that emphasize the collection of varied sources of data as evidence of teacher practice across a range of domains and more specific elements of teacher work.

---

[1]Twelve states (including the District of Columbia) were awarded Phase 1 and 2 Race to the Top grants in 2010, with an additional seven states receiving Phase 3 awards in 2011 (www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/awards.html). A total of 21 districts received Race to the Top-District awards in two separate competitions in 2012 and 013 (www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetopdistrict/awards.html).

[2] Flexibility waivers have been awarded thus far to 42 states from provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These waivers require the adoption of new educator evaluation systems that include multiple ratings categories and a "significant emphasis" on student growth measures, as well as the use of decisions to inform personnel decisions. An additional three states' ESEA flexibility requests are currently under review by the U.S. Department of Education (http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html).

[3]Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF), which is intended to center human resource systems on new performance-based teacher and principal evaluations, encourages related compensation changes in high-need schools, with grants awarded thus far to more than 100 grantees across four cohorts between 2006 and 2012. See www2.ed.gov/programs/teacherincentive/awards.html.

[4] Center on Great Teachers and Leaders, "Databases on State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies," http://resource.tqsource.org/stateevaldb/. The percentage, or weight, of each component in an educator's overall evaluation rating varies by state. About half of the states require or recommend that student achievement, or student growth, measures comprise 50% of the teacher evaluation score. The other 50% is made up of measures of teacher professional practice, including classroom observations (See also National Council on Teacher Quality, "2013 State Teacher Policy Yearbook: National Summary," www.nctq.org/dmsView/2013_State_Teacher_Policy_Yearbook_National_Summary_NCTQ_Report; Jim Hull, "Trends in Teacher Evaluation: How States are Measuring Teacher Performance," www.centerforpubliceducation. org/Main-Menu/Evaluating-performance/Trends-in-Teacher-Evaluation-At-A-Glance/Trendsin-Teacher-Evaluation-Full-Report-PDF.pdf). Other states may have a smaller percentage dedicated to other outcome measures.

[5] Many states and districts, for example, have aligned teacher professional practice rubrics to standards developed by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC).

Several state evaluation systems have also included student perceptions of teaching as one of the other teacher evaluation measures. Moreover, numerous states that did not receive RTT grants, ESEA waivers, or TIF grants have since passed legislation on their own to establish new teacher evaluation systems. Indeed, it is likely now the case that very few states have not revised or are not in the process of substantially revising their educator evaluation processes.

The policy emphasis on teacher evaluation has been motivated by a number of factors and developments. For decades there have been concerns about the level of student performance in core academic subjects such as reading, mathematics, and science (Reardon, 2011; Rich, 2013). Although a range of federal policy initiatives have been introduced over the years to address these student performance concerns, recent research documenting the critical role that effective teachers play in promoting student success (Chetty, Friedman, & Rockoff, 2011; Hanusheck, 2010; Hanusheck & Rivkin, 2010; Goldhaber & Anthony, 2007) has clearly encouraged policy that targets the improvement of teacher practice and effectiveness. At the same time research on traditional teacher evaluation systems has documented a range of concerns with these systems, such as the quality of measurement in teacher evaluation ratings (Medley & Coker, 1987; The New Teacher Project (TNTP), 2007) and the very limited differentiation in teacher ratings produced by existing evaluation systems (Sawchuck, 2013; TNTP, 2007; Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, & Keeling, 2009) (which among other implications means that existing systems have not been conducive for the identification of the most and least effective educators) (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Kennedy, 2010; TNTP, 2007). Equally important is the growing recognition that traditional evaluation systems have not consistently proven helpful to educators in identifying specific areas for improvement and have demonstrated little relation to the overall improvement of teacher quality and student learning (Horng & Loeb, 2010).

It is increasingly clear that the success of these new teacher evaluation systems partly depends on the will, skill, and capacity of school principals, individuals who have historically been tasked with evaluating teachers (Hallinger, Heck, & Murphy, 2013; Halverson, Kelley, & Kimball, 2004; Liu & Moore Johnson, 2006). School principals have traditionally had, and will in most cases continue to have, primary responsibility for evaluating the 3.7 million public school teachers nationwide (Herlihy et al., 2014). While states have taken slightly different approaches to teacher evaluation, as we will illustrate in this brief, principals will shoulder the main responsibility for a range of new and expanded teacher evaluation tasks. This work in turn necessitates that principals have access to certain resources, develop expanded procedural and conceptual knowledge, and build new skill sets if new evaluation systems are to be enacted in robust and meaningful ways (Derrington, 2011; Firestone, Nordin, Kirova, & Shcherbakov, 2013). Assistant/associate principals, where they are present in schools, will likely assist in the teacher evaluation process. Other evaluators, to a more limited extent, may also assist with evaluations (district leaders or peer teacher evaluators). But it is the school principal who must lead and oversee the change process at the school level.

To set the stage for our examination of the principals' role in teacher evaluation policy implementation, we begin by exploring historical work roles of principals. Next, we look specifically at the enactment of traditional and more recent standards-based teacher evaluation systems by principals and how these systems have impacted principals' work. Using three states with new teacher evaluation systems as illustrations, we more closely examine the work

demands, learning and resource needs, and available supports for principals generated by these new teacher evaluation systems. Drawing directly from these findings, as well as additional literature that reports on the implementation of new teacher evaluation systems across the U.S., we close with a set of policy, practice, and research recommendations.

Teacher Evaluation and the Work of Principals/Looking Back

Historically, the principal role was loosely defined as independent teacher leader, primarily engaged in instructional leadership and support (Rousmaniere, 2013). As school districts became more bureaucratized, so did the principalship. Over time, the role evolved into one of a middle manager, primarily responsible for enforcing district, state, and federal policies while simultaneously supporting the instructional practices of teachers (Rousmaniere, 2013). Yet, even within this more formalized framework, research has shown that principals spend their time engaged in myriad activities not well captured by the term "middle-manager." The work of Peterson (2001), for example, documented the ever-expanding principal role, which involved the completion of literally hundreds of tasks each day, with as many as 50 or 60 occurring in a single hour. These can involve everything from data requests from central office to dealing with student and parent conflicts. Documenting where such tasks occurred, a recent study revealed that principals in the Miami-Dade school district spent about half (54%) of their time in their office and 40% in various places around the school, with the remainder of the time spent off campus (Horng, Klasik, & Loeb, 2010). Moreover, these principals engaged in instructional leadership activities roughly 13% of the time, which includes 8% of the time spent in classrooms.

Research has found that while the movement from more traditional to standards-based evaluation systems continues to be particularly time consuming work for school leaders, it is also characterized by new complexities that will likely need to be negotiated by principals as these systems are enacted (Halverson, Kelley, & Kimball, 2004; Kimball, 2002; Kimball & Milanowski, 2009). Halverson and colleagues, for example, found that teacher evaluation activities associated with the implementation of a new standards-aligned system "absorbed as much as 25% of principals' time" (Halverson, Kelley, & Kimball, 2004). Time demands as well as general concerns for teacher motivation may encourage principals to inflate evaluation ratings either to give teachers the benefit of the doubt or to cultivate positive and stronger responses to evaluation ratings (Halverson, Kelley, & Kimball, 2004; Kimball & Milanowski, 2009). Likewise, both time demands and principal skill can impact the overall quality of principal feedback to teachers (Halverson, Kelley, & Kimball, 2004; Kimball, 2002; Sartain, Stoelinga, & Brown, 2011) and evaluation accuracy (Kimball & Milanowski, 2009). These realities, combined with limited training and oversight by school districts, (Kimball, 2002; Kimball & Milanowski, 2009) reduce the potential impact of standards-based teacher evaluation systems.

New teacher evaluation systems, intended to ratchet up the monitoring of teaching and teacher accountability more generally, may also prove challenging for principals to enact due a school's history and culture. Historically, many principals' prior evaluation practices, influenced in part by the number of individuals that principals supervised and by decentralized and loosely connected organizational structures within schools (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Weick, 1976) tended to avoid close inspection of classroom practices (Myung & Martinez, 2013). Such practices are likely to have had important consequences for a school's culture by shaping how faculty members have come to understand issues of instructional autonomy and control

(Halverson, Kelley, & Kimball, 2004). With this in mind, new evaluation systems have potential to challenge existing cultures of teacher autonomy and instructional control, where such cultures have been cultivated, and in these instances threaten the "normative balance" of schools (Hallinger, Heck, & Murphy, 2013). Because teacher expectations have been shown to influence how principals' "work to influence teacher effectiveness" (Donaldson, 2013, p. 871), principals will benefit from guidance to help them navigate such cultural issues within their schools. Otherwise, new evaluation systems are likely to be enacted in a superficial manner as principals seek to "maintain a positive sense of community" (Hallinger, Heck, & Murphy, 2013, p. 37).

Likewise, these new accountability-driven teacher evaluation systems can put pressure on existing principal-teacher relationships that may force changes in the ways in which principals and teachers relate and work. Such systems have potential for introducing greater levels of principal authority that may conflict with leadership orientations emphasizing more collegial and shared leadership approaches (Hallinger, Heck, & Murphy, 2013). Principal-teacher trust is a critical if teacher evaluation systems are to support teacher growth, (Myung & Martinez, 2013; Wermke, 2014) and trusting relationships can easily be undermined if teachers do not receive sufficient information and training on new teacher evaluation systems (Sartain, Stoelinga, & Brown, 2011).

Lastly, research on standards-based evaluation systems suggests that principals are likely to need extensive training and ongoing support to develop the necessary understandings and skills to productively enact new teacher evaluation practices. Kimball and Milanowski (2009) examined the use of standards-based teacher evaluation systems and concluded that it would "take more than specific rubrics and basic training" (p. 65) for principals and other evaluators to productively enact new teacher evaluation systems.

Teacher Evaluation and the Work of Principals: Current Practice

The following section describes the key components of new teacher evaluation systems that are being piloted or enacted throughout the US. Focusing on components of these systems that have particular consequence to principals, their development, and their work, we first detail: a) the examination of teacher practice; b) the establishment and monitoring of teachers' student learning objectives; c) the execution of the yearly evaluation cycle; and d) the management of evaluation evidence. This discussion draws heavily on three states that we have selected as case studies to illustrate key evaluation system components. These case studies also allow us to explore new roles and responsibilities required of principals associated with teacher evaluation, new state-wide approaches for holding principals accountable for teacher evaluation, and the kinds and range of statewide training that has been provided to principal. These states were selected because they illustrate different teacher evaluation designs. They have also been subject to pilot testing and have disseminated reports from initial pilot evaluation studies that are instructive for considering issues of importance when preparing principals to enact these new systems. In addition to pilot implementation study findings from these three states, we also draw on a broader assortment of state-wide and district teacher evaluation pilot implementation findings to highlight new work demands and learning/resource needs likely to emerge as for principals who are charged with enacting these new evaluation systems.

Table 1 (See Appendix A) provides a summary of the key components of each state's teacher evaluation system, principal (and other evaluator) roles in evaluation process and new state-wide approaches for holding principals accountable for teacher evaluation, and state-provided training and support for principals (and other evaluators). Taken collectively, we view new teacher evaluation systems as pressing principals to develop new procedural understandings of the evaluation system, enhance their conceptual understandings of teacher practice and Student Learning Objective (SLO) processes, expand their skills with the collection and management of large volumes of evidence across a broad assortment of data sources, and develop new skills for providing meaningful evidence-informed feedback to teachers.

The Examination of Teacher Practice

As one component of teacher evaluation systems, states use measures of teaching practice, which typically require principals to collect a range of evidence that is assessed using a teacher practice rubric. Teacher practice rubrics are aligned to standards and commonly define teaching across four domains: instructional planning, classroom environment, instructional activities, and professional responsibilities. Domains are further broken down by elements or components that represent teaching competencies. The competencies are typically assessed using a range of data sources, with an emphasis on classroom observations. Other sources include teacher planning documents, examples of student work, and documentation and reflection on professional activities.

The three states we reviewed require principals and other evaluators to take part in training to learn the content of new teacher practice rubrics and how to identify and assess particular teaching practices. Training also includes learning about the types and range of data sources that are informative for documenting teacher practice, processes for collecting/documenting data, and coaching techniques to provide quality feedback to teachers. Nationally, about twenty states have or are planning to provide training resources and some level of evaluator "certification" (Center on Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL), n.d.).

All case study states held in-person training for evaluators prior to the implementation of the new teacher evaluation systems. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) held regional, five-day training sessions to familiarize evaluators with the state's Common Core of Teaching rubric (Donaldson et al., 2014). All evaluators were required to complete these sessions. The CSDE also offered one- and two-day recalibration training sessions for evaluators who needed additional support to pass the state evaluator proficiency exam (CSDE, n.d.). The Tennessee Department of Education (TNDOE) held a required four-day training sessions during the summer of 2011 to prepare evaluators to implement its new Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) rubric and evaluation system (TNDOE, 2012a) and a one-day recertification training for evaluators in the summer of 2012 (TNDOE, 2012b). The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) offered a required two and a half-day training session to familiarize evaluators with the state evaluation system (ODE, 2014). In addition to training, all three states require evaluators to pass an assessment to obtain actual certification prior to conducting teacher evaluations. Teacher evaluation guidebooks and additional online training resources are available on each state's website.

The Establishment and Monitoring of Teachers' Student Learning Objectives

States use different measures of student growth and/or achievement within their teacher evaluation systems. For teachers in tested grades and subjects (those who can be directly linked to the standardized test scores of a particular group of students), states typically either use student growth percentile models or value-added models (Hull, 2013). Value added and student growth percentiles are statistical models that measure student academic growth from one year to the next. They are generally calculated at the state level and provided to districts by the state department of education. In addition to or in place of these student measures, a growing number of new evaluation systems also use Student Learning/Growth Objectives/Goals (typically abbreviated as SLOs, SGOs or SGGs), particularly for teachers in grades and subjects that lack state standardized assessments. In some cases, however, states also require or allow SLOs as an additional measure for teachers in tested grades and subjects.

Although SLOs may represent a key aspect of sound instructional design (i.e., identifying student learning needs, targeting instructional improvement strategies, setting growth targets, and measuring results), the formal use of SLOs in a teacher evaluation system generates additional work and deeper levels of assessment expertise for both teachers and principals. The typical SLO process currently being planned or implemented in over 30 states across the country involves teachers or principals in the review of appropriate student baseline data, selection of assessments or evidence sources that are appropriate for measuring student growth over a designated period of time, setting and then obtaining approval of growth targets for students, and assessing the progress that teachers have made with SLO goals by the end of the designated instructional period.[6] This process engages leaders with SLO planning and monitoring sessions with individual or groups of teachers as facets of yearly evaluation cycle meetings. Equally important, this new stream of work necessitates that principals are good judges of high-quality assessments and growth targets for teacher SLOs across multiple subjects (reading, math, PE, art, etc.). It does not appear that any of the states we reviewed provided separate, in-person training sessions for evaluators on the SLO process; however, all states provide some online guidance to assist educators and evaluators in the development of student growth measures. For example, the Ohio Department of Education website features an SLO guidebook and additional resources on data analysis, writing and reviewing SLOs, assessment literacy, and SLO examples (ODE, n.d.).

The Execution of the Yearly Evaluation Cycle

The typical annual teacher evaluation cycle involves a variety of steps from the beginning to the end of the year, which necessitates that principals hold multiple meetings and conferences with teachers to discuss evaluation system components, review evidence and goals, provide feedback, and discuss results. A common feature of these cycles is a flow of documentation that principals complete as evidence that particular evaluation steps have been completed.

---

[6] For more information on SLOs, please see the Connecticut SLO Handbook at www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/ SLO_Handbook.pdf and the Ohio SLO Handbook at http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/ Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Student-Growth-Measures/Student-Learning-Objective- Examples/071513_SLO_Guidebook_FINAL.docx. aspx

Connecticut, Ohio, and Tennessee, for example, all require teachers and principals to engage in a beginning of year planning and goal setting meeting to set annual teacher practice and student growth goals. All three states also require principals to conduct pre- and post-conferences before and after announced observations, mid-year review conversations to discuss teacher progress, and end-of-year summative evaluation conferences to review and discuss final evaluation results (CSDE, 2013; TNDOE, 2013). Each of these steps requires teachers and evaluators to complete documentation, which creates work flow demands for principals. The following section describes how teacher and principals in these states will manage evaluation documentation.

The Management of Evaluation Evidence

Many states have developed or contracted for online evaluation management systems to help teachers and principals organize evidence sources and documentation reports related to new teacher evaluation components. Ohio, for example, used RTT funding to develop the electronic Teacher and Principal Evaluation System (eTPES) with which evaluators enter observation notes, view uploaded teaching artifacts, and complete forms for evaluation planning and final evaluations. Teachers also have access to the eTPES to upload teaching artifacts and complete evaluation forms. Using the system, principals plan evaluation activities, store and retrieve notes and documents (evaluation evidence), and provide ratings based on the evidence. Outcome data is also uploaded into the eTPES and final score calculations are facilitated through the system (ODE, 2014). These online management systems have great potential to eventually streamline planning, documentation, and assessment processes, but each also requires time to learn new technology and adapt to the new systems. All three states provide in-person and online training and professional development related to these online management systems to help evaluators learn the use of these systems.

Principal Accountability for Quality Implementation of New Teacher Evaluation Systems

In general, new principal evaluation systems, designed and enacted at the same time as new teacher evaluation systems, are placing greater levels of accountability on school principals for the effective evaluation of teachers. These new principal evaluation systems mirror teacher evaluation systems through the use of principal practice rubrics that specify standards-aligned domains of leader practice (e.g., the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). The principal evaluation rubrics in both Connecticut and Ohio, for example, include references to the teacher evaluation process and quality of principal feedback to teachers. The Tennessee principal evaluation rubric is also used to assess principal practice in relation to teacher evaluation. However, the Tennessee rubric also includes a separate domain, worth 15% of a principal's overall evaluation rating, that specifically assesses how well the administrator implements the teacher evaluation process, including the quality of teacher evaluation feedback, the fidelity of implementing the teacher evaluation process, and principal monitoring teacher evaluation results for consistency (i.e., when there are multiple evaluators within schools). By evaluating principals on how well they carry out the teacher evaluation process and provide effective feedback to teachers, these states are signaling the strategic importance of the principal's role in identifying and supporting teaching quality. This alignment can help improve the chances that the teacher evaluation processes will be implemented with fidelity.

New State Teacher Evaluation Pilot and Related Research Findings

External evaluation reports generated about the piloting of new teacher evaluation systems in our case study states of Connecticut, Tennessee, and Ohio found that administrators realized increased work and time demands with the new teacher evaluation systems. In Connecticut, evaluators of teachers reported that they spent more time on evaluation activities than in prior years. Seventy-two percent of administrator survey respondents indicated that they spent considerably more time than in previous years evaluating teachers, conducting post conferences, and completing required documentation (Donaldson et al., 2014). Ohio evaluation participants also expressed concern about the time commitment to carry out evaluation activities using the new model. Even though some principals were testing the system with only one or two teachers, they doubted their capacity to conduct evaluations and provide detailed feedback for all members of their staff given their other roles and responsibilities (ODE, 2012).

Case study pilot evidence also suggests that principals are likely to struggle to complete every element of the system and may opt to refine systems in the face of new time demands generated by these systems. The Connecticut evaluation report, for example, indicated that pilot district administrators were challenged with completing all required observations. Principals reported making adaptations to SEED implementation and often completed fewer observations and post conferences than required. To accommodate the implementation of SEED, principal reported spending less time on non-evaluation tasks and activities, which some felt diminished their instructional leadership activities (Donaldson et al., 2014). Only 17% of teacher respondents felt that their evaluator had the time and resources to implement SEED (Donaldson et al., 2014). These findings are consistent with other reports on the state or district implementation of new teacher evaluation systems that have found principals to initially struggle to meet the time demands of new evaluation systems (Government Accountability Office, 2013). As such, deliberate attention to adapting daily work routines to accommodate time demands brought on by the implementation of new evaluation systems appears to be an important consideration if these systems are to be enacted with quality by principals (acknowledging that such demands should be reduced as leaders deepen their conceptual understanding and process experience). Beyond conducting observations and related observation conferences, the documentation and management of evidence sources appears to be a new challenge that must be negotiated by principals (ODE, 2012; Donaldson et al., 2014; TNDOE, 2012b).

Lessons Learned and Implications from the Purview of School Principals

Teacher evaluation innovations present both opportunities and challenges for improving instructional supervision and teacher quality. The opportunities include more comprehensive teacher evaluation measures; increased instructional effectiveness through regular and specific performance feedback; and the potential for teacher professional growth. Time demands and cognitive challenges will be inevitable as principals and other school leaders learn about and implement new teacher evaluation systems. Simultaneously, other educational changes going to scale, including Common Core State Standards with aligned assessments, and state school accountability systems, will compete for the attention of school leaders and teachers. Negotiating these changes to maximize the positive potential of evaluation reforms requires a commitment by states and districts to resources for training and support as well as policy coherence. We next

provide several policy and practice recommendations that could prove instructive in supporting the successful implementation and sustainability of new teacher evaluation reforms from the purview of school principals. We conclude this brief with recommendations for future research.

Policy Recommendations

Expand the pool of evaluators with particular emphasis on content expertise. Principals can be supported in their teacher evaluation work by identifying and cultivating additional evaluators through an "outsourcing" of aspects of teacher evaluation to the district or regional educational offices. For example, district and regional administrators, particularly those administrators who are content experts (Hill & Grossman, 2013), can be trained to assess teaching videos, artifacts and/or teaching portfolios. These external assessments could represent a part of the teacher's overall score. For credibility, it would still be important for a school leader to be involved with the teacher's evaluation. But the external reviewer could take some of the overall evaluation load from one individual. Further, studies indicate the multiple raters help produce more reliable evaluations (Measures of Effective Teaching Project, 2013) and content-experts can also generate more credible feedback than a principal alone (Hill & Grossman, 2013).

Beyond district and regional administrators, cadres of teachers could also be trained to support teacher evaluation processes. In the Cincinnati Public Schools, for example, teachers have been trained and subsequently released from teaching duties for a certain period to conduct teacher evaluations (Heneman & Milanowski, 2003; Taylor & Tyler, 2011). Such approaches could be supported through state-generated policy recommendations and related resources that target the identification, cultivation, and deployment of additional content-expert teacher evaluators.

Enact more strategic or differentiated evaluation systems. Recognizing the potential burden on evaluators from the high volume of teacher evaluation processes conducted annually for all teachers, a number of states and districts are modifying assessment processes or timelines with an emphasis on the use of more strategic or differentiated evaluation systems (White, 2014). Such modifications reduce yearly evaluation expectations for highly rated and more experienced teachers (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Kennedy, 2010; Kimball, 2002). This allows evaluators to concentrate assessment, support, and feedback on less experienced or struggling educators. It also allows more advanced educators to pursue alternative growth activities, such as action research or National Board Certification. Such approaches could be supported through state-generated policy recommendations.

Ensure assessment of and feedback to principals on implementation of teacher evaluation. Each of the states we reviewed included some measures in the new principal evaluation systems for assessing how well principals are carrying out the teacher evaluation process. Emphasizing teacher evaluation quality in the principal's evaluation creates policy alignment and helps prioritize the organizational imperative for reliable and useful teacher evaluation feedback. Principals also need specific feedback on how well they and their school leaders are doing supporting teaching through the evaluation process. This feedback can lead them to pursue additional training if needed in coaching conversations or with rating calibration.

Practice Recommendations

Address principal learning demands and resource needs/considerations for states, districts, and leadership preparation programs. State training designs that combine both in-person learning experiences led by highly skilled trainers with targeted on-line training and resources (videos, powerpoint presentations, written guidance) emerge from our review of state pilot study findings to offer a range of supports for initial principal training experiences and may produce better results than designs that solely emphasize online learning (Firestone et al., 2013). Ongoing learning experiences provided by both states and districts that focus on the development of principals' conceptual understanding of teacher practice rather than procedural execution of the evaluation system are critical to the overall support of principal development. In addition to deeper learning about teacher practice, principals are also likely to need specific training on how to provide evaluation feedback to teachers in ways that promote both teacher receptivity to the feedback and teacher learning as a result of the feedback (Myund & Martinez, 2013). The utilization of module-based formats as a facet of ongoing training supports have utility because they allow individual principals to select more tailored training experiences that align with their personal learning needs. Both the use of videos for individual observation and scoring of teacher practice and real-time group observation and discussion of teacher practice through classroom walk-throughs or similar district routines have been reported as useful in state pilot study findings and are likely to be key supports for ongoing leader learning (Firestone et al., 2013).

Districts also play an important role in helping principals make sense of new teacher evaluation systems, particularly in relation to prior district evaluation models and other mandated improvement initiatives expected to be implemented in concurrent fashion with the new teacher evaluation system (Halverson, Kelley & Kimball, 2004; State of New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE), 2013). Related to the latter, districts should help principals recognize the relationships that exist between various school-wide improvement initiatives and ways in which these initiatives integrate with one another (NJDOE, 2013). These understandings are critical because they help principals to cultivate such understandings and connections by teachers.

Principal preparation programs can also play an important role in this work by supporting the learning needs of candidates who aspire to the principalship. For this reason, preparation programs would be wise to learn about new state evaluation systems and actively build alignment between instructional leadership courses, principal residency experiences, and these new systems to cultivate the kinds of conceptual understandings that are essential for more robust enactment of teacher evaluation systems. Likewise, principal candidates should become familiar with new principal evaluation systems and how they will be assessed as well as develop an understanding of what proficient and robust levels of principal practice looks like in practice in the area of teacher evaluation.

District action to support principal adoption and use of teacher evaluation systems. Districts can support teacher evaluation more generally and principals' work in this area in several key ways. First, districts should pay close attention to providing timely and transparent communications to schools and teachers as new teacher evaluation systems are introduced and would be wise to provide ongoing learning opportunities for teachers to deepen their understandings of what proficient and robust teaching practice looks like. These actions can lay the foundation for

teachers to develop trust in the teacher evaluation process (NJDOE, 2013). Second, districts should pay attention to the alignment of various district tools and routines to elements of the teacher evaluation process and to the development of teacher facility with these routines and tools. For example, SLO processes are meant to engage teachers in cycles of inquiry and data use as a mechanism to improve teaching and student learning. Helping teachers and principals learn particular data-use routines and gain facility with particular data-use tools that can promote success with SLO work (Cosner, 2012) provides tangible supports for this facet of the teacher evaluation process. Lastly, districts might consider alleviating other management responsibilities from principals' plates as well as work directly with individual principals to help them consider and reallocate some tasks in order to create room for new teacher evaluation demands.

Research Recommendations

Given that new teacher evaluation systems are largely in early stages of implementation, ongoing research is needed to deepen understanding about issues of implementation and impact. For example, are principals able to develop the necessary conceptual understandings to support the enactment of robust evaluation practices and are they also able to develop productive approaches for addressing the new work demands generated by these new systems? Based on comparative case studies, do certain state or district approaches for initial training and ongoing support generate stronger teacher evaluation practices by school leaders and/or stronger teacher effectiveness? More broadly, and drawing on the work of Hallinger and his colleagues (Hallinger, Heck, & Murphy, 2013), there is a need for further empirical studies to determine whether the heavy investment in teacher evaluation by principals, as expected by these new evaluation systems, proves to be a viable and scalable strategy for improving teacher effectiveness and student learning. This assortment of studies would provide critical guidance to policy makers, districts, principal preparation programs and school principals.

Shelby Cosner is an Associate Professor of Educational Organization and Leadership and Academic Program Director of the Doctorate of Urban Educational Leadership at the University of Illinois Chicago.

Steven M. Kimball is an Assistant Scientist with the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) and the Value-Added Research Center (VARC) within the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER) at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Elizabeth Barkowski is a Research Associate with SEDL's Research and Evaluation (R&E) program.

Bradley Carl is Associate Director and Researcher at the Value-Added Research Center (VARC) in the Wisconsin Center for Education Research at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Curtis Jones is a Senior Scientist in the School of Education at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and the evaluator of the state of Wisconsin's Educator Effectiveness system.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to sacosner@uic.edu

References

Center on Great Teachers and Leaders. (n.d.) Database on state teacher and principal evaluation Policies. [Data file]. Available from Center on Great Teachers and Leaders Web site, http://www.gtlcenter.org

Chetty, R., Friedman, J.N., & Rockoff, J.E. (2011). The long-term impacts of teachers: Teacher value-added and student outcomes in adulthood. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Connecticut State Department of Education. (2013). 2013 SEED handbook: Connecticut's system for educator evaluation and development. Retrieved from http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/2013_SEED_Handbook.pdf

Connecticut State Department of Education. (n.d.) Events Page. Retrieved from http://www.connecticutseed.org/?page_id=997

Cosner, S. (2012). Leading the on-going development of collaborative data practices: Advancing a schema for diagnosis and intervention. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 11*(1), 26-65.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Derrington, M.L. (2011). Changes in teacher evaluation: Implications for principals' work. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 77*(3), 51-56.

Donaldson, M.L. (2013). Principal approaches to cultivate teacher effectiveness: Constraints and opportunities in hiring, assigning, evaluating, and developing teachers. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(1), 838-884.

Donaldson, M.L., Cobb, C.D., LeChasseur, K., Gabriel, R., Gonzales, R., Woulfin, S., & Makuch, A. (2014). An evaluation of the pilot implementation of Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development. Retrieved from http://aftct.org/sites/aftct.org/files/neag_seed_report_1_1_14.pdf

Firestone, W.A., Nordin, T., Kirova, D., & Shcherbakov. (2013). Strategies for training on a teacher practice evaluation instrument: Advice from New Jersey's teacher evaluation pilot districts. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Graduate School of Education.

Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2007). Can teacher quality be effectively assessed? National board certification as a signal of effective teaching. *Review of Economics and Statistics, 89*(1), 134.

Government Accountability Office. (2013). Race to the top: States implementing teacher and principal evaluation systems despite challenges GAO-13-777. Washington, DC: Government Accountability Office.

Hallinger, P., Heck, R.H., & Murphy, J. (2013). Teacher evaluation and school improvement: An analysis of the evidence. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Accountability, 26*(1), 5-28. doi: 10.1007/s11092-013-9179-5

Halverson, R., Kelley, C., & Kimball, S. (2004). Implementing teacher evaluation systems: How principals make sense of complex artifacts to shape local instructional practices. In W. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.), *Research and theory in educational administration* (pp. 153-188). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Hanushek, E. (2010). The economic value of higher teacher quality. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Hanushek, E., & Rivkin, S.G. (2010). Generalizations about using value-added   measures of teacher quality. *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings, 100,* 267.

Heneman III, H.G., & Milanowski, A. (2003). Continuing assessment of teacher reactions to a standards-based teacher evaluation system. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 17*(2), 173-195.

Herlihy, C., Karger, E., Pollard, C., Hill, H.C., Kraft, M.A., Williams, M., & Howard, S. (2014). State and local efforts to increase the validity and reliability of scores from teacher evaluation systems. *Teachers College Record, 116*(1), 1-28.

Hill, H.C., & Grossman, P. (2013). Learning from teacher observations: Challenges and opportunities posed by new teacher evaluation systems. *Harvard Educational Review, 83*(2), 371-384.

Horng, E., Klasik, D., & Loeb. S. (2010). Principal's time use and school effectiveness. *American Journal of Education, 116*(4), 491-523.

Horng, E., & Loeb, S. (2010). New thinking about instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan. 92*(3), 66-69.

Hull, J. (2013). Trends in teacher evaluation: How states are measuring teacher performance. Retrieved from www.centerfor publiceducation.org/Main-Menu/Evaluating-performance/Trends-in-Teacher-Evaluation-At-A-Glance/Trends-in-Teacher-Evaluation-Full-Report-PDF.pdf

Kennedy, M.M. (2010). Attribution error and the quest for teacher quality. *Educational Researcher, 39*(8), 591-598

Kimball, S. (2002). Analysis of feedback, enabling conditions, and fairness perceptions of teachers in three school districts with new standards-based evaluation systems. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 16*(4), 241-268.

Kimball, S., & Milanowski, A. (2009). Examining teacher evaluation validity and decision making with a standards-based evaluation system. *Education Administration Quarterly*. *45*(1), 34-70.

Liu, E., & Moore Johnson, S. (2006). New teachers' experiences of hiring: Late, rushed, and information-poor. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42*(3), 324-360.

McGuinn, P. (2012). Stimulating reform: Race to the Top, competitive grants, and the Obama Education Agenda. *Educational Policy. 26*(1), 136.

Measures of Effective Teaching Project. (2013). Ensuring fair and reliable measures of effective teaching: Culminating findings from the MET project's three-year study. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

Medley, D. M., & Coker, H. (1987). The accuracy of principals' judgments of teacher performance. *Journal of Educational Research*, *80*(4), 242–247.

Meyer, J.W. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structures as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology, 83*(2), 340-363.

Myung, J. & Martinez, K. (2013). *Strategies for enhancing post-observation feedback for teachers*. Stanford, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Ohio Department of Education. (2012). Ohio Department of Education Teacher Evaluation System (OTES) Pilot. Retrieved from http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Additional-Information/5150-OTES-Final-Report-Appendices.pdf.aspx

Ohio Department of Education. (2014). Teacher Evaluation. Retrieved from http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System

Ohio Department of Education. (n.d). Local measures. Retrieved from http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Student-Growth-Measures/Student-Learning-Objective-Examples

Peterson, K.D. (2001). The roar of complexity: A principal's day is built on fragments of tasks and decisions. *Journal of Staff Development, 22*(1), 18.

Reardon, S.F. (2011). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor: New evidence and possible explanations. In R. Murnane & G. Duncan (Eds.), *Whither opportunity? Rising inequality and the uncertain life chances of low-income children*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press.

Rich, M. (2013, December 3). American 15-year-olds lag, mainly in math, on international standardized test. *The New York Times*, p. A12.

Rousmaniere, K. (2013). *The principal's office: A social history of the American school principal*. Albany, NY: State University Press.

Sartain, L., Stoelinga, S.R., & Brown, E.R. (2011). Rethinking teacher evaluation in Chicago: Lessons learned from classroom observations, principal-teacher conferences, and district implementation. Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Sawchuck, S. (2013). Teachers' ratings still high despite new measures. *Education Week, 32*(20), 1 & 18-19.

State of New Jersey Department of Education. (2013). Evaluation Pilot Advisory Committee final report. Retrieved from http://www.state.nj.us/education/sboe/meetings/2013/December/public/EPAC%20Report.pdf

Taylor, E.S., & Tyler, J.H. (2011). *The effect of evaluation on performance: Evidence from longitudinal student achievement data of mid-career teachers*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Tennessee Department of Education. (2012a). Teacher evaluation in Tennessee: A report of year 1 implementation. Retrieved from http://tn.gov/education/teaching/evaluation.shtml

Tennessee Department of Education (2012b). TEAM Summer 2012 Training Plan. Retrieved from http://team-tn.org/assets/educatorresources/TEAM_Summer_2012_Training_Plan.pdf

Tennessee Department of Education. (2013). TEAM evaluation timeline. Retrieved from http://team-tn.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/TEAM_Evaluation_Timeline1.pdf

The New Teacher Project. (2007). Hiring assignment, and transfer in Milwaukee public schools. New York: The New Teacher Project.

Weick, K.E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *21*(1), 1-19.

Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness. New York: The New Teacher Project.

Wermke, W. (2014). Teachers' trust in knowledge sources for continuing professional development: Investigating trust and trustworthiness in school systems. In D. Van Maele, P. B. Forsyth, & M. Van Houtte (Eds.), *Trust and school life: The role of trust for learning, teaching, leading and bridging up* (pp. 335-352). New York: Springer.

White, T. (2014). *Evaluating teachers more strategically: Using performance results to streamline evaluation systems*. Stanford, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Appendix A

Table 1
Evaluation System Measures, Principal Roles, and Training/Support for Three States

Evaluation system feature	Tennessee	Connecticut	Ohio[1]
Teacher Evaluation System Overview	Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM)	Connecticut System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED)	Ohio Teacher Performance Evaluation System (OTPES)
	Tested Teachers 50% Teacher Practice 15% Student Achievement 35% Student Growth Non-Tested Teachers 60% Teacher Practice 15% Student Achievement 25% Student Growth	All Teachers 40% Teacher Practice 45% Student Growth and Development 10% Parent or Peer Feedback 5% School-wide Student Learning or Student Feedback	All Teachers 50% Teacher Practice 50% Teacher Growth
Teacher Practice Measures	All teachers evaluated annually using the TEAM rubric.[2] The rubric includes 3 domains and 19 components. 1-4 formal observations per teacher (depending on effectiveness rating) Evaluators collect other evidence, such as instructional plans, student work, and other teaching materials, as part of the evaluation process	All teachers evaluated annually using the Common Core of Teaching rubric.[3] The rubric includes 5 domains and 17 indicators. 3-8 observations per year, both formal (at least 30 minutes) and informal (no fewer than 10 minutes). Number of observations based on teacher's effectiveness rating. Evaluators collect other evidence, such as teaching artifacts, lesson plans, teacher records, and reflections of teaching as part of the evaluation process.	All teachers evaluated annually using state-developed rubric aligned to state teaching standards. High performing teachers may be evaluated bi-annually at district option. The rubric includes 3 domains and 10 components. Districts may also develop their own evaluation models and rubrics aligned to state standards. 2, 30-minute observations required. Scoring is expected after each observation and conference cycle. Evaluators collect other evidence from pre-and –post observation discussions, walkthroughs, student data analysis, and review of professional plan and activities as part of the evaluation process.

(table continues)

1 Information obtained 1-24-14 from Ohio Department of Education website: http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System
2 To view the TEAM rubric, please visit http://team-tn.org/assets/educator-resources/TEAM_Educator_Rubric.pdf
3 To view the Common Core of Teaching rubric, please visit www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/CCT_Instrument_and_Rubric.pdf

Table 1 (*continued*)

Evaluation system feature	Tennessee	Connecticut	Ohio
Student Outcomes	One student growth measure and one student achievement measure per teacher annually Educators and evaluators select and agree upon student growth and achievement measures <u>Tested Teachers</u> • Value-added measure provided by the state (35% of total evaluation) • State-approved student achievement measure (15% of total evaluation)[4] <u>Non-Tested Teachers</u> • Student growth measures selected and approved by educators and evaluators (25% of total evaluation)[5] • State-approved student achievement measure (15% of total evaluation)	All teachers write two Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) annually (45% of total evaluation). The SLO process requires evaluators to approve, monitor, and score SLO results annually for all teachers.[6] Districts decide to use Whole-School Student Learning Indicator or Student Feedback as the additional 5% of teachers' evaluations Whole-School Student Learning Indicators for teachers equal the aggregate of student learning indicators established by the school administrator as part of his or her evaluation rating (typically a school performance index and SLOs) Results from a state recommended student survey instrument comprise the Student Feedback portion of a teacher's evaluation. Teachers and their evaluators should agree upon at least one student feedback goal.[7]	All teachers: 3 assessment types will be used, depending on the availability of test data for specific teachers. These include value-added results, state department approved vendor assessments, or locally determined measures. Districts will decide which measures apply to different teacher situations. <u>Tested teachers</u> • Value-added growth model applied to teachers in tested grades/subjects • Mix of other vendor assessments or LEA assessment measures used for teachers who do not tested grades or who do not teach in tested grades/subjects. The proportion of alternative assessments and growth measures applied ranges from 10-50%. • Student learning Objectives or school or shared attribution measures (e.g., school value-added) may be used for LEA determined measures of teachers who do not have teacher value added or vendor assessments available
Other Evaluation Measures	None	Parent Feedback survey conducted at the whole-school level, 2-3 school goals, agreed upon by principals and teachers. Districts may submit a plan to the state if they wish to use peer feedback in lieu of parent feedback.	None

(*table continues*)

4 To see a list of Tennessee state-approved student achievement measures, please visit http://team-tn.org/assets/misc/15%25%20Achievement%20Measure%20Options_12_13%285%29.pdf

5 To see Tennessee Department of Education guidance on growth measures for non-tested teachers, please visit http://team-tn.org/assets/educator-resources/NTGS_Update_12_20.pdf

6 To learn more about the SEED SLO process, please visit www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/SLO_Handbook.pdf

7 See the SEED Handbook at www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/2013_SEED_Handbook.pdf to learn more about parent feedback, student feedback, and whole-school student learning indicators

Table 1 (*continued*)

Evaluation system feature	Tennessee	Connecticut	Ohio
Evaluation Management System	Comprehensive On-line Data Entry (CODE) system Evaluators use CODE to enter walkthrough and formal observation data, submit and rate student achievement and growth measures, rate teacher performance based on observations and evidence collected, and calculate final teacher evaluation ratings. Evaluators can also generate reports in CODE to track and monitor evaluation results.[8]	My Learning Plan and BloomBoard 2012-13 pilot districts used My Learning Plan to manage evaluation system data. Documentation indicated that during the 2013-14 school year, evaluators use BloomBoard to manage evaluation system data.	State has developed an on-line evaluation management system (eTPES) eTPES is used to upload evidence for observations, artifacts. It includes evaluation planning and final evaluation forms. Outcome data is uploaded into eTPES and final score calculations occur with on-line management system.
Principal/Evaluator Role -Expectations -Accountability	Evaluators complete annual evaluations for all teachers, including: • Beginning of year coaching conversations • Observations • Pre- and post-observation conferences • Mid-year review conversations • End of year summative evaluation conferences Principals oversee evaluations conducted by other evaluators (such as assistant principals and certified school leaders). The Tennessee Administrator Evaluation Rubric holds principals accountable for the quality of teacher evaluations, teacher feedback, and use of teacher evaluation data to reflect on trends.[9]	Evaluators complete annual evaluations for all teachers, including: • Beginning of year goal setting and planning conferences • Observations • Post-observation conferences • Mid-year check-in conferences • End of year summative evaluation conferences The Common Core of Leading Leader Evaluation Rubric is used to assess principals for completing staff evaluations; how well they provide feedback to improve instruction; the extent of teacher reflection, and the provision of quality professional development and resources.[10]	Evaluators engage with teachers on annual evaluation cycle that includes: • Professional development planning & goal setting • Observations • Pre-and-post observation conferences • Walkthroughs • End of year summative evaluation conferences Highly rated teachers may select their evaluator as long as the evaluator is certified. The Ohio Principal Evaluation System rubric includes a reference to principals completing teacher evaluations per district guidelines and the quality of performance feedback provided to teachers. Among suggested observation venues, principal evaluators could include an evaluation conference with a teacher or staff members.

(*table continues*)

8 For more information on the CODE system, please visit www.tn.gov/education/team/videos.shtml
9 Visit http://team-tn.org/assets/misc/Administrator%20Evaluation%20Rubric_13-14.pdf to view the Tennessee Administrator Evaluation Rubric
10 Visit www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/SEED_Administrator_Rubric.pdf to view the Common Core of Leading Rubric

Table 1 (*continued*)

Evaluation system feature	Tennessee	Connecticut	Ohio
Evaluator training	Four-day evaluator training includes training on the TEAM rubric and CODE system. One-day recertification training for evaluators. Additional training online	Five-day training sessions for administrators who evaluate teachers, addressing all four components of the teacher evaluation system. One-day recalibration training for evaluators. Additional regional trainings on coaching, three-hour BloomBoard training.	Evaluators must complete state-developed training. Training is provided at regional educational service centers and spans 2.5 days. It covers: 1) overview of the teacher evaluation system; 2) practice observation techniques (i.e., scripting), analyzing, categorizing and coding; coaching. Completing the training and passing the assessment leads to a required evaluator credential. Half-day training also provided on decision making and data entry for student growth measures. A series of training modules are available on the electronic evaluation management system eTPES on the Ohio Department of Education Website.[11]
Other evaluator support	Not clear	Educators who are evaluator-certified and trained may evaluate teachers.	Districts may elect to train peer teachers to evaluate teachers.

11 eTPES website: education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching?Educator-Evaluation-System/District-educator-Evaluation-Sustems/eTPES-Help