



Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
**EQUIVALENCY REVIEW APPLICATION
 FOR ALTERNATIVE MODELS OF PRACTICE**
 PI-1656 (New 03-13)

INSTRUCTIONS: Submit **original**. Application must be received or postmarked no later than **APRIL 19, 2013**. Late applications will not be accepted. Return to:

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
ATTN: Katharine Rainey
EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS
P.O. BOX 7841
MADISON, WI 53707-7841

For questions regarding this application, contact:

Educator Effectiveness:
Katharine Rainey
katharine.rainey@dpi.wi.gov
608-267-0392

I. GENERAL INFORMATION			
Applicant Agency or Lead if Applying as Consortium		Mailing Address <i>Street, City, State, ZIP</i>	
Contact Person		Title	
Contact Person's E-Mail Address		Fax Area/No.	Phone Area/No.
Program Coordinator <i>If other than contact person</i>		Title	
Program Coordinator's E-Mail Address			Phone Area/No.
Program Coordinator's Mailing Address <i>Street, City, State, ZIP</i>		Approval Period Beginning Date <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>	Ending Date <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
		June 2013	May 2014
Model Title			

II. ABSTRACT

The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness design and work teams recognized that any one model for evaluating professional practice and its rubrics for observation might not suit every district. Therefore, the design team recommended the state develop an application process for districts wishing to use alternative models to measure teacher or principal practice within the statewide system of educator effectiveness. Accordingly, the Wisconsin Legislature included language in Act 166, the legislation setting forth requirements regarding educator evaluations, for the Department of Public Instruction to develop an application and approval process (Equivalency Review) for districts intending to use alternative practice models. The legislation states the following requirements of the Equivalency Process:

- An alternative model must align to the InTASC standards for teachers and the ISLLC standards for principals.
- An alternative model for measuring teacher practice must also align to the following four domains: 1) Planning and preparation, 2) Classroom environment, 3) Instruction, and 4) Professional responsibilities.
- A district intending to use an alternative model must apply for Equivalency from the Department of Public Instruction.

For that purpose, the Department of Public Instruction, in collaboration with a group of education stakeholders familiar with the Educator Effectiveness system, established parameters for the review of models to measure professional practice—otherwise referred to as the Equivalency Review Process. Within the Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness system, only models of educator practice are subject to equivalence; the equivalency review process does not apply to the measures of student outcomes. Applicants must align observation rubrics to the InTASC (teacher) and ISLLC (principal) standards, as well as to the intentions of the statewide system. That is, any approved district's model must include an educator evaluation and support system that continuously improves teacher and principal practice through a fair, valid, and reliable process using multiple measures to improve student and school outcomes.

For additional information and documents to support this application process, refer to the [Educator Effectiveness webpage](#).

	III. ASSURANCES	
--	------------------------	--

As part of the equivalency review process, applicants must agree to do the following:

1. Applicants and their participants shall report teacher-level, school-level, and district-level data required by the department within guidelines established by the department.
2. Applicants shall transfer data electronically to the department according to established technologies as defined by the department, including ability to assign unique identification numbers for entities as part of the data sharing protocols specified by the department.
3. Applicants shall participate in a statewide evaluation conducted by an independent, non-biased external evaluator.
4. Applicants shall implement any corrective actions required by the department if the department determines there is credible evidence indicating that a school, school district, consortium of school districts, or charter school is no longer in compliance with the requirements of this chapter.
5. Administration of the program, activities, and services covered by this application will be in accordance with all applicable state and federal statutes, regulations, and the approved application.

	IV. CERTIFICATION/SIGNATURE	
--	------------------------------------	--

I CERTIFY that the information contained in this application is complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge; that the necessary assurances of compliance with applicable state and federal statutes, rules, and regulations will be met; and, that the indicated agency designated in this application is authorized to administer this grant.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that the assurances listed above have been satisfied and that all facts, figures, and representation in this application are correct to the best of my knowledge.

Signature of Applicant Agency Administrator 	Date Signed <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
--	--------------------------------

V. CONSORTIUM VERIFICATION
Copy as many pages as needed.

(IF APPLICABLE) EACH OF THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFIES that the information contained in this application is complete and accurate, that the local educational agency they represent has authorized them to enter into a consortium agreement, and to provide the necessary assurances of compliance with applicable state and federal statutes, rules, and regulations.

ADMINISTERING AGENCY

Administering Agency	Date Signed <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
Agency Administrator	Signature ➤

CONSORTIUM PARTICIPANTS / LEA / ORGANIZATION

1. LEA/Organization	Date Signed <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
District Administrator	Signature ➤
2. LEA/Organization	Date Signed <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
District Administrator	Signature ➤
3. LEA/Organization	Date Signed <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
District Administrator	Signature ➤
4. LEA/Organization	Date Signed <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
District Administrator	Signature ➤
5. LEA/Organization	Date Signed <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
District Administrator	Signature ➤
6. LEA/Organization	Date Signed <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
District Administrator	Signature ➤
7. LEA/Organization	Date Signed <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
District Administrator	Signature ➤
8. LEA/Organization	Date Signed <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
District Administrator	Signature ➤
9. LEA/Organization	Date Signed <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
District Administrator	Signature ➤
10. LEA/Organization	Date Signed <i>Mo./Day/Yr.</i>
District Administrator	Signature ➤

VI. DEMONSTRATION OF COMPLIANCE
Provide Evidence

Applicants must be able to check to each of the following statements as complete. Additionally, applicants must provide evidence to support these statements in the forms provided (*DPI will accept either electronic or hardcopy materials*).

- 1. The alignment of framework and rubrics to InTASC standards and each of the following four domains: 1) Planning and preparation, 2) Classroom environment, 3) Instruction, and 4) Professional responsibilities. And for principal evaluation, alignment of framework and rubrics to the ISLLC standards.
- 2. The research-base supporting the model and its rubrics has valid and reliable results.
- 3. The rubrics have four performance levels with clearly delineated, observable differences between levels which align to the state model's performance levels.
- 4. The equivalent model includes the same minimum number and type of observations and evaluations as the state model. The equivalent model specifies how formative and summative feedback will inform the educator's professional growth plan.
- 5. The development and implementation of a comprehensive orientation and training program for evaluators that certifies the evaluator's understanding of the evaluation model and processes, as well as inter-rater agreement. The equivalent model specifies how and when recertification will be required.
- 6. The development and implementation of ongoing processes to monitor and improve inter-rater agreement.

VII-A. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY—TEACHER RUBRIC
Provide Evidence

Demonstrate Equivalence of Evaluation Standards and Rubrics with Evidence

Teacher Rubrics. The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System draws upon Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2011), which directly aligns to the InTASC standards (see Appendix A). In order to demonstrate equivalency, an applicant must demonstrate direct alignment between the domains and components within the proposed tool and each of the InTASC standards, as well as the four domains as stated in Act 166.

In the **Teacher Practice Rubric and InTASC Standards Comparison** table below, enter your evidence in response to the InTASC Standard.

Teacher Practice Rubric

InTASC Standards	Alternative Teacher Framework Component(s)
<p>1. Learner Development The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.</p>	
<p>2. Learning Differences The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.</p>	
<p>3. Learning Environments The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</p>	
<p>4. Content Knowledge The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.</p>	
<p>5. Application of Content The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.</p>	
<p>6. Assessment The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.</p>	

VII-A. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY—TEACHER RUBRIC (cont'd)

Provide Evidence

InTASC Standards	Alternative Teacher Framework Component(s)
<p>7. Planning for Instruction The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.</p>	
<p>8. Instructional Strategies The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.</p>	
<p>9. Professional Learning and Ethical Practice The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.</p>	
<p>10. Leadership and Collaboration The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.</p>	

Act 166 requires alternative teacher rubrics to align to the following four domains:

1. Planning and preparation,
2. Classroom environment,
3. Instruction, and
4. Professional responsibilities.

In the table below, show alignment of these domains.

Teacher Practice Rubric and Four Domains	
Domain	Alignment
1. Planning and Preparation	
2. Classroom Environment	
3. Instruction	
4. Professional Responsibilities	

VII-B. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY—PRINCIPAL RUBRIC
Provide Evidence
Demonstrate Equivalence of Evaluation Standards and Rubrics with Evidence

Principal Rubrics. The Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System was also developed to align with the ISLLC standards (see Appendix B). In order to demonstrate equivalency, an applicant must show direct alignment between the domains and elements within the proposed tool and each of the ISLLC standards.

In the **Principal Practice Rubric and the 2008 ISLLC Standards Comparison** table below, enter your evidence in response to the ISLLC Standard.

Demonstration of Principal Rubric Equivalence

ISLLC Standards	Alternative Principal Framework Component(s)
Standard 1 An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.	
Standard 2 An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.	
Standard 3 An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.	
Standard 4 An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.	
Standard 5 An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.	
Standard 6 An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.	

VII-C. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY—MODEL'S RESEARCH BASE

Provide Evidence

Demonstrate the Model's Research Base with Evidence

The Design Team and work teams selected the Danielson Framework and its rubrics due to the research base supporting the correlation between performance ratings on the Danielson Framework and student outcomes. For example, the Gates Foundation's Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study and the Rethinking Teacher Evaluation in Chicago study conducted by the Consortium on Chicago Schools Research (CCSR) confirmed earlier studies by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CRPE) that the Danielson Framework can provide valid, reliable results, as well as a common language for formative feedback regarding educator practice. Although the principal evaluation literature is not as well developed as the teacher evaluation research base, the standards and rubrics of the principal evaluation model derives from the research available on principal and leadership effectiveness.

In order to demonstrate equivalency, an applicant must provide citations from credible research studies, as well as the significant findings, to illustrate the research-base which supports the use of a given tool (similar to the sample provided in Appendix C).

Alternative Teacher Practice Rubrics Research Base

Year of Study	Research Title	Findings

Alternative Principal Practice Rubrics Research Base

Year of Study	Research Title	Findings

**VII-G. DEMONSTRATION OF EQUIVALENCY—
IMPLEMENT ONGOING PROCESSES**
Provide Evidence

Develop and Implement Ongoing Processes to Monitor and Improve Inter-rater Agreement with Evidence

The design team indicated the importance of validity, reliability, and comparability within one of its guiding principles. As such, the design team noted the necessity for processes to ensure rater agreement. Using Teachscape, the online tool associated with the Wisconsin state model, evaluators can complete an online rater certification process and ongoing recalibration to help establish evaluation consistency.

Applicants for equivalency must provide evidence demonstrating a process to ensure and improve rater-agreement beyond the initial orientation and training sessions. Such evidence might include the process guide, a training calendar, facilitation manuals, and training agendas and a description of how evaluations will be monitored for consistency (e.g., simultaneous observations by two raters followed by debriefing sessions).

To demonstrate equivalence of rater processes, applicants must list the processes made available to participants, intended outcomes, and participants involved, as well as identify and attach evidence sources (see sample provided in Appendix G).

Process	Outcomes	Participants	Evidence Sample
			<input type="checkbox"/> Attached to Application
			<input type="checkbox"/> Attached to Application
			<input type="checkbox"/> Attached to Application
			<input type="checkbox"/> Attached to Application
			<input type="checkbox"/> Attached to Application
			<input type="checkbox"/> Attached to Application
			<input type="checkbox"/> Attached to Application