



Wisconsin  
Evaluation  
Collaborative

## **CESA 7 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 7 (and statewide for context) along with a summary of survey responses. For each survey question, if the difference between the CESA 7 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 7 region.

### **Response rate**

CESA 7 supports 37 school districts and 2 independent and non-instrumentality charter schools. Of these 39 entities, 25 districts/charters responded to the survey for a **64%** response rate. The statewide 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 7 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
25 (100%)	0 (0%)	312 (98%)	5 (2%)

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

CESA 7 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
22 (88%)	3 (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 7 RESPONSE NUMBER (n=25)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER (n=309)
Process manuals	6	125
Seminars	13	116
Written materials	15	189
Online resources	15	197
Employee handbook	9	122
CESA training	8	104

Other, specify (n=2):

- Educator Effectiveness Coaches
- Monthly Mentor Meetings

***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)?

CESA 7 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
23 (92%)	2 (8%)	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 7 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
18 (72%)	7 (28%)	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 7 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
25 (100%)	0 (0%)	300 (96%)	12 (4%)

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

TIME	CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=25)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=309)
The beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle	4 (20%)	57 (18%)
The beginning of the year of the last year in their evaluation cycle	4 (20%)	47 (15%)
Annually	15 (60%)	201 (64%)

Other, specify (n=0):

***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 7 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
25 (100%)	0 (0%)	310 (99%)	2 (1%)

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

CESA 7 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
23 (92%)	2 (8%)	291 (93%)	21 (7%)

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

CESA 7 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
25 (100%)	0 (0%)	294 (94%)	18 (58%)

**Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences**

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

CESA 7 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
25 (100%)	0 (0%)	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 7 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
25 (100%)	0 (0%)	308 (99%)	1 (1%)

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

EVALUATION CYCLE	CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=25)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=309)
Annual evaluation	3 (12%)	31 (10%)
Every other year	0 (0%)	3 (1%)
Every third year	15 (60%)	181 (59%)
Combination of the above?	7 (28%)	94 (30%)

Comments (n=3):

- Annual with 3rd year summarize rating year
- Every year for the first three years for new teachers, every three years for experienced teachers.
- Annual submission of SLO/PPG with evidence as needed. Summative every 3 years.

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

<b>EVALUATION CYCLE</b>	<b>CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=25)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=309)</b>
Annual evaluation	12 (48%)	123 (40%)
Every other year	2 (8%)	26 (8%)
Every third year	8 (32%)	106 (34%)
Combination of the above?	3 (12%)	54 (17%)

Comments (n=2):

- Same as teachers
- Currently every other year, but transitioning to every third year.

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 7 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=25)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=309)</b>
Planning session	19 (76%)	264 (85%)
Mid-year/interval review	18 (72%)	246 (80%)
End-of-cycle conference	25 (100%)	301 (97%)

16. Principals 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 7 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=25)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=309)</b>
Planning session	19 (76%)	232 (75%)
Mid-year/interval review	15 (60%)	205 (66%)
End-of-cycle conference	25 (100%)	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]

<b>OBSERVATION PROCESS</b>	<b>CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=25)</b>	<b>STATE RESPONSE NUMBER &amp; PERCENT (n=309)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	<b>3 (12%)</b>	<b>14 (5%)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre-conference - of a full class period	0 (0%)	9 (3%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a post-conference - of a full class period	4 (16%)	36 (12%)
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	8 (32%)	90 (29%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	<b>2 (8%)</b>	<b>65 (21%)</b>
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	1 (4%)	6 (2%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	2 (8%)	52 (17%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	5 (20%)	36 (12%)

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

OBSERVATION PROCESS	CESA 7 RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=25)	STATE RESPONSE NUMBER & PERCENT (n=309)
At least one announced, formal observation of a full class period	2 (8%)	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	<b>4 (16%)</b>	<b>25 (8%)</b>
At least one announced, formal observation - including a pre- and post-conference - of a full class period	3 (12%)	40 (13%)
Number of mini-observations (aka informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes) equivalent to a full class period	9 (36%)	107 (35%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre-conference	1 (4%)	8 (3%)
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a post-conference	<b>1 (4%)</b>	<b>51 (17%)</b>
A number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, including a pre- and post-conference	5 (20%)	45 (15%)



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

CESA 7 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
22 (88%)	3 (12%)	277 (90%)	31 (10%)

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

CESA 7 (n=25)		STATE (n=309)	
YES	NO	YES	NO
22 (88%)	3 (12%)	265 (86%)	43 (14%)

## Summary of Results

Based on CESA 7 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 (question number 18) uses teacher process language and may have caused confusion for respondents.

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

All CESA 7 respondents (100%) indicated they provide an EE orientation to all new teachers and principals, and most (88%) respondents provide multiple, ongoing training opportunities to staff to support educators' understanding. The EE resources most utilized by responding districts were written materials (n=15), online resources (n=15), and seminars (n=13).

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

The large majority of (92%) respondents reported that administrators completed the training for the observation rubric to be certified as evaluators, while indicating that most (72%) of these certified administrators completed at least one activity during the school year to calibrate with other evaluators of teachers. These calibration rates are slightly below the statewide rates of 86%.

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

All respondents (100%) indicated that teachers and principals completed a self-review using the relevant rubric for their professional practice at least once in their evaluation cycle. While most (60%) of teachers complete a self-review annually, the remaining teachers either complete theirs at the beginning of a three-year evaluation cycle (20%) or the last year in their evaluation cycle (20%).

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

All responding agencies (100%) indicated that teachers completed at least one SLO during the school year, and the large majority (92%) indicated that principals developed and completed at least one SLO during the school year. Additionally, respondents reported that teachers and principals receive a holistic evaluation of their SLOs across the cycle. CESA 7 rates for SLOs were consistently above the state averages.

### *Evaluators must conduct required EE conferences.*

All teachers and principals (100%) in respondent agencies are evaluated in their first year of employment and at least every third year after their first year of employment.

Teachers are most frequently evaluated every third year (60%) or there is a combination of approaches, including either annual (12%) or annual/every third year combined (12%). Principals are most frequently evaluated annually (48%) or every third year (32%).

End-of-cycle conferences are most frequently utilized for both teachers (100%) and principals (100%), but there was also a prevalence of planning sessions (76% for both teachers and principals) as well as mid-year reviews (teachers = 72% and principals = 60%).

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

Teachers in their evaluation cycle most frequently (32%) receive an announced, formal observation with a pre- and post-conference. The second most utilized strategy (20%) was a number of mini-observations equivalent to a full class period, with a pre- and post-conference

Principals in their evaluation cycle most frequently received a series of informal, unannounced observations lasting at least 10-15 minutes (36%) or mini-observations equivalent to a full class period with a pre- and post-conference (20%).

Of respondent CESA 7 agencies, most (88%) reported that teachers and principals received at least one informal, unannounced annual observation by an evaluator.

## **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](#)