



Wisconsin  
Evaluation  
Collaborative

## **CESA 6 Educator Effectiveness Survey Summary August, 2023**

### **Introduction**

The Department of Public Instruction administered a survey to all Wisconsin public school districts and independent charter schools to assess the implementation of the six required elements of the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness (EE) System, regardless of the evaluation model used. DPI asked that only one respondent from each district complete the required survey. The survey was administered between May 19, 2023 and June 16, 2023. Cooperative Education Service Agency (CESA) staff who support EE implementation in school districts were asked to remind districts in their region to respond.

The survey covers the six requirements of the EE System, including:

1. Orientation and training for educators and evaluators.
2. Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rater agreement.
3. Educators completing a self-review during the EE Cycle
4. Educators completing at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.
5. Evaluators conducting required EE conferences.
6. Evaluators conducting observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.

The following summary presents the response rates for CESA 6 (and statewide for context) along with a summary of survey responses. For each survey question, if the difference between the CESA 6 responses and statewide responses are greater than 10%, those results are bolded. The conclusion addresses findings related to implementation of the six EE requirements in the CESA 6 region.

### **Response rate**

CESA 6 supports 39 school districts and 0 independent and non-instrumentality charter schools. Of the 39 entities, 32 responded to the survey for a **82%** response rate. Statewide the survey response rate is **69%**.

## Survey Summary

### Orientation and training for educators and evaluators

1. Did your agency provide an orientation to the Wisconsin EE System and local EE policies to all new-to-agency teachers and principals?

CESA 6 (n=32)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
32 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (98%)	5 (2%)

2. Did your agency provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support their understanding?

CESA 6 (n=32)		STATE (n=317)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
28 (88%)	4 (12%)	279 (88%)	38 (12%)

3. What, if any, of the following resources did your agency use to provide EE information to staff? [check all that apply]

RESOURCE	CESA 6 RESPONSES (n=32)	STATE RESPONSES (n=317)
Process manuals	13	125
Seminars	12	116
Written materials	22	189
Online resources	22	197
Employee handbook	17	122
CESA training	10	104

Other, specify (n=7):

- Staff meetings (2)
- We have a new educator class for Year 1 and 2 educators that incorporates the EE model
- Individual coaching (2)

- New Teacher Mentor Training and ongoing support (2)  
Statewide, Other, specify (n=72):
- Items mentioned more than once:
  - Trained mentors and coaches (n=28)
  - Locally developed professional development sessions (n=10)
  - Staff meetings (n=7)
  - New staff professional development (n=6)
  - Danielson training or video (n=3)
  - EE coaches (n=3)
  - Personal meetings (n=3)

***Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rate agreement***

4. Have administrators in your agency responsible for evaluating teachers completed training in the observation rubric to certify them as evaluators (i.e., Danielson Framework for Teaching, etc.)?

CESA 6 (n=32)		STATE (n=313)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
32 (100%)	0 (0%)	306 (98%)	7 (2%)

5. Have certified administrators in your agency completed at least one activity during the school year to calibrate observation amongst evaluators of teachers (i.e., a collaborative observation with post observation discussion)?

CESA 6 (n=32)		STATE (n=313)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
30 (94%)	2 (7%)	268 (86%)	45 (14%)

***Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle***

6. All teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle.

CESA 6 (n=32)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
29 (91%)	3 (9%)	300 (96%)	12 (4%)

7. At what point do teachers typically complete a self-review?

TIME	CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=32)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=312)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	7 (22%)	57 (18%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	6 (19%)	47 (15%)
Annually	<b>16 (50%)</b>	<b>201 (64%)</b>

Other, specify (n=3):

- Over the course of the three year cycle
- the self-review is optional
- New educators do this in their first three years. Veteran educators do this every three years.

Statewide, Other, specify (n=7):

- Optional
- We were told by our CESA that it is not required
- Summative year
- Over the course of the three year cycle
- Twice per year
- Beginning of three year cycle or the first two years of employment
- New educators, first three years and veteran educators, every three years

***Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually***

8. Teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 6 (n=32)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
32 (100%)	0 (0%)	310 (99%)	2 (1%)

9. Principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year.

CESA 6 (n=32)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
31 (97%)	1 (3%)	291 (93%)	21 (7%)

10. Teachers and principals completing an evaluation cycle receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle?

CESA 6 (n=32)		STATE (n=312)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
29 (91%)	3 (9%)	294 (94%)	18 (6%)

***Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences***

11. Teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment with the agency?

CESA 6 (n=31)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
30 (97%)	1 (3%)	308 (99%)	1 (1%)

12. Teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment with the agency?

CESA 6 (n=31)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
30 (97%)	1 (3%)	308 (99%)	1 (1%)

13. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following cycles do you use for teachers?

EVALUATION CYCLE	CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=31)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=309)
Annual evaluation	0 (0%)	31 (10%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	3 (1%)
Every third year	16 (52%)	181 (59%)
Combination of the above?	<b>15 (48%)</b>	<b>94 (30%)</b>

Comments (n=8):

- Staff are evaluated annually. Staff are required to complete all standards within a three year cycle
- New Teacher 1 and 2 and Continuing Teacher 3
- new teachers first 3 years then every 3 as needed (2)
- New teachers are supported/evaluated for first three years, then every third year
- Year 1, 2 are annual. Year 3 is option for those new educators based on principal recommendation. All veterans are reviewed every three years or annually when there is a performance issue.
- Every year for probationary teachers, annually for rapid cycles and every third year for on cycle staff who are off probation
- Every third year is the normal cycle for most educators. Educators needing additional support may be placed on annual evaluation.

State Comments (n=35):

- Cycles mentioned more than once:
  - Annually for new teachers in their first three years, then every third year (n=18)
  - First two years in the district, then every third year (n=4)
  - Annually with summary at third year (n=4)
  - Annual SLO and PPG, summative every third year (n=2)

14. When completing an evaluation cycle, which of the following do you use for principals?

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=31)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=309)</b>
Annual evaluation	<b>8 (26%)</b>	<b>123 (40%)</b>
Every other year	3 (10%)	26 (8%)
Every third year	10 (32%)	106 (34%)
Combination of the above?	10 (32%)	54 (17%)

Comments (n=4):

- Staff are evaluated annually. Staff are required to complete all standards within a three year cycle
- New Principals are evaluated in their first year and then every three years. All veterans are reviewed every three years unless there is a position change, which then triggers a review.
- Every third year is the normal cycle for most educators. Educators needing additional support may be placed on annual evaluation.
- Every year for 3 years then every third year

State Comments (n=20):

- Cycles mentioned more than once:
  - Annually for new principals in their first three years, then every third year (n=3)
  - First year and then every third year (n=3)
  - First and second year, then every third year (n=2)
  - Meet annually, summative in third year (n=2)
  - None (n=2)

15. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

<b>EE CONFERENCES</b>	<b>CESA 5 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=31)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=309)</b>
Planning session	26 (84%)	264 (85%)
Mid-year/interval review	24 (77%)	246 (80%)
End-of-cycle conference	31 (100%)	301 (97%)

16. Principals completing an evaluation cycle met with their assigned evaluator for the following required EE conferences. [Select all that apply]

EE CONFERENCES	CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=31)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=309)
Planning session	26 (84%)	232 (75%)
Mid-year/interval review	23 (74%)	205 (66%)
End-of-cycle conference	29 (94%)	293 (95%)

***Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle***

17. Teachers completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

OBSERVATION PROCESS	CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=31)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=308)
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	1 (3%)	14 (5%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	1 (3%)	9 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	5 (16%)	36 (12%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	12 (39%)	90 (29%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	6 (19%)	65 (21%)



A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	1 (3%)	6 (2%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	3 (10%)	52 (17%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	2 (6%)	36 (12%)

18. Principals completing an evaluation cycle this year received one of the following from an evaluator. [Select one]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 6 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=31)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=308)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	3 (10%)	30 (10%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	0 (0%)	2 (1%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	3 (10%)	25 (8%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	3 (10%)	40 (13%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	13 (42%)	107 (35%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	1 (3%)	8 (3%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	3 (10%)	51 (17%)

A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	5 (16%)	45 (15%)
---	---------	----------

19. All teachers received at least one informal, unannounced observation by an evaluator, annually.

CESA 6 (n=31)		STATE (n=308)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
30 (97%)	1 (3%)	277 (90%)	31 (10%)

20. All principals received at least one informal, unannounced visit from an evaluator, annually.

CESA 6 (n=31)		STATE (n=308)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
28 (90%)	3 (10%)	265 (86%)	43 (14%)

## Summary of Results

Based on the CESA 6 survey responses, the following conclusions can be made for each of the six EE requirements. One limitation to consider is that surveys were completed by one individual in each district. Depending on this respondent's role in the district and level of interaction with different schools in the district, their knowledge and understanding of EE practices in each school may vary. Another potential limitation is the possibility that respondents may have "inflated" their responses to appear more in line with DPI requirements, even though the survey was anonymous (other than identifying which CESA the respondent is located in). Finally, another consideration, the wording of questions related to principals (for example, question number 18) uses teacher process language and may have caused confusion for respondents.

### *Orientation and Training for Educators and Evaluators*

Most respondents reported that they provide an orientation (100%) and ongoing training opportunities (88%) for their staff. The most frequently reported resources include: online resources, employee handbook, and written materials.

### *Evaluator training and ongoing monitoring of inter-rate agreement*

All evaluators have been trained (100%) and most (94%) also participate in calibration activities.

*Educators must complete a self-review during the EE Cycle*

Most (91%) teachers and principals complete a self-review during their evaluation cycle and about half of teachers (50%) complete it annually.

*Educators must complete at least one student or school learning objective (SLO) annually.*

All (100%) teachers complete an SLO annually and most principals (97%) complete an SLO annually. Ninety-one (91) percent of teachers and principals receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs at the conclusion of their evaluation cycle.

*Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

Most (97%) teachers and principals are evaluated in their first year of employment and most (97%) teachers and principals are evaluated at least every third year after their first year of employment.

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (52%) or it was reported districts have a combination of approaches to frequency - annually, every other year, every third year (48%). Principals are most frequently evaluated every third year (32%) or annually (32%).

A large percent of teachers met with their evaluators for their planning session (84%), mid-year review (74%), and end-of-cycle conference (100%). Similarly, principals attended conferences with their evaluator: planning session (84%), mid-year review (74%), and end-of-cycle conference (94%).

*Evaluators must conduct observations of professional practice during the EE evaluation cycle.*

Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently receive at least one formal observation including a pre- and post-conference (39%) followed by a number of informal observations equivalent to a full class period (19%).

Regarding principal evaluation, the most frequent was a number of informal mini-observations equivalent to a full class period (42%), followed by informal observation with pre- and post-conferences (16%) and informal observation with post-conferences (10%).

## **Next Steps**

This summary may be used by CESA staff and the DPI to inform and plan EE supports for the 2023-24 school year. The following resources may also help inform planning:

[Six Required Components of EE](#)

[Six Requirements in Practice](#)

[DPI EE Resources and Trainings](#)