

Authority and Purpose: Evaluation of Licensed Instructional Staff

The Board of Education is committed to an evaluation program for licensed personnel, which complies with Utah state law, USOE Board Rule, Juab School District Policy and measures the implementation of the Utah Effective Teaching Standards and Evaluation Framework.

The Board delegates to district administration responsibility for insuring that the evaluation program is systematic, reasonable, fair and based upon a process which is valid and reliable in measuring educator effectiveness.

Juab School District has adopted the Utah Model Educator Evaluation System, which is aligned to the Utah Effective Teaching Standards in accordance with R277-530, R277-531, and R277-533.

It is the policy of the Board to require all licensed personnel to participate in the evaluation program for the following purposes:

1. To insure student learning as a result of highly effective instruction.
2. To promote professional growth in conjunction with an educator's yearly professional growth plan.
3. To develop, support, and maintain highly effective educators through an ongoing and systematic cycle of goal setting, observation, feedback, collaboration, professional learning and reflection.
4. To promote the use of evidence-based instructional techniques and practices.
5. To promote professional and ethical behavior.
6. To foster a collaborative professional culture that facilitates student learning.
7. To provide a basis for decisions affecting employment and salary.

Definitions for the Purpose of this Policy

1. *Educator* means an individual licensed under Utah Code Section 53A-6-104 who, as a condition of licensure, is required to comply with the standards and requirements of Utah Administrative Rule R277-530, R277-531, and R277-533 (*pending USBE approval*).
2. *Career Educator* means a licensed employee entitled to reasonable expectation of continued employment under the policies of the District. *53A-8a-201*
3. *Provisional Educator* means an educator employed by the District who has not achieved status as a career educator within the District. *53A-8a-404*.
4. *Probationary Educator* means an educator employed by the District who has been advised by the District that the educator's performance is inadequate and is placed on a Plan of Assistance.
5. *Formative Evaluation* is an informal evaluation process designed to provide feedback to educators on how to improve their performance; it is used to promote reflection and professional growth.
6. *Summative Evaluation* is evaluation that is designed to determine an educator's

Teacher Evaluation - DGA

- effectiveness rating based on standards of instructional quality and classroom performance observation data, student growth data, and stakeholder input data. Summative evaluations may inform decisions on salary and employment.
7. *Summative Overall Rating* is the effectiveness rating assigned to an educator (Not Effective, Emerging Effective/Minimally Effective, Effective, or Highly Effective).
 8. *Satisfactory Performance* is defined, as a summative overall rating that is Emerging Effective, Effective, or Highly Effective.
 9. *Unsatisfactory Performance* is defined as a summative overall rating that is Not Effective, or Minimally Effective.
 10. *Student Learning Objectives* (SLOs) are content and grade/course specific measurable learning objectives that can be used to document student learning in a defined time period.
 11. *Attribution* is the process of linking results of student growth and learning to a specific educator or group of educators using the same SLO.
 12. *Student Growth Percentiles* (SGPs) are an analytic approach (statistical method) for transforming student assessment results into an accountability metric.
 13. *Professional Growth Plan* (PGP) is completed by each educator yearly with a minimum of two goals and submitted to the principal via Observer Tab.
 14. *Multiple Lines of Evidence* means additional documentation of an educator's performance and effectiveness submitted during an evaluation cycle.
 15. *Plan of Assistance* (POA) is a written document clearly identifying a career educator's area(s) of unsatisfactory performance and detailing recommendations for improvement that are specific, measurable, and actionable. The POA must also identify a recommended course of action and resources available to support the educator during implementation of the POA.
 16. *Evaluation* is defined as a comprehensive and ongoing cycle of goal setting, observation, feedback, professional learning, and reflection; all district educators will participate in the evaluation process each year, either formatively or summatively.
 17. *Informal Observation* is defined as an unscheduled, informal observation of teacher performance for the purpose of providing feedback.
 18. *Formal Observation* for the purpose of this policy is defined as a pre-conference between the evaluator and the teacher which includes a lesson plan, a scheduled observation of classroom instruction aligned to the lesson plan, and a post-conference for feedback and reflection.

Evaluation Policy and Procedures

1. Each licensed employee shall be evaluated by a *certified* rater who is the principal, principal's designee or immediate supervisor, as determined by the Superintendent and in accordance with the District Rater Reliability plan.
2. All provisional educators shall be assigned a new teacher mentor in accordance with EYE standards and 53A-8a-408.
3. Evaluation frequency:
 - a. *Career* educators shall participate in a summative evaluation every three years. Formative evaluations of career educators will occur annually. A career educator may be subject to additional summative evaluation at any time based on

Teacher Evaluation - DGA

- information obtained during the formative evaluation process. A career educator may make a request to the principal to be summatively evaluated during a formative year.
- b. *Provisional* educators shall be evaluated at least twice each contract year for a minimum of three years and up to five years.
 - c. *Probationary* Educators shall be evaluated formally at least twice each contract year.
 - d. The superintendent, principal, or designee may initiate an evaluation of any educator when deemed necessary.
4. The educator evaluation system for Juab School District will support effective instruction and professional growth utilizing these components:
- a. Educator self-assessment and goal setting
 - b. Regular conferences
 - c. Multiple observations of professional performance at appropriate intervals
 - d. Analysis of student achievement data
 - e. Analysis of and response to stakeholder input data
 - f. Additional lines of evidence
5. Evaluation Cycle and Timeline:
- a. Orientation, notification, and access to the district evaluation instrument shall be given at least fifteen (15) calendar days before the evaluation is scheduled to begin, and will occur by September 1 each year.
 - b. Self-assessment & PGP's shall be submitted to the principal via Observer Tab by the first Friday in September each year.
 - c. A beginning-of-year conference will be conducted by the principal via e-mail or in person by October 1 for all educators, every year.
 - d. Every educator will submit two SLOs to the principal by October 1 each year.
 - i. SLOs shall include the required three components: Learning Goals, Assessments, and Targets.
 - ii. SLOs will be completed on the district-approved two-page template, and will include learning goals linked to the appropriate specific content knowledge and skills from the Utah Core Standards.
 - iii. SLO attribution decisions will be made at the school level between the principal, educators and PLC teams.
 - e. A minimum of one formal observation shall be conducted during each evaluation cycle (September to December and January to April) for *provisional* and *probationary* educators.

Formal observation for the purpose of this policy is defined as including a lesson plan and pre-conference, the classroom observation, and a post-conference. *Career educators* in the summative evaluation year will receive multiple observations of professional performance, one of which shall be formal, conducted as needed and at appropriate intervals to determine progress and insure adequate reliability.

- f. The district evaluation process shall allow multiple opportunities at several intervals throughout the process, for educators to make written response to any

Teacher Evaluation - DGA

part of the evaluation and/or to contribute additional information and artifacts to inform the effectiveness rating.

- g. A year-end conference between the educator and evaluator will be held within 15 days after evaluation is complete, and by May 30 each year. The year-end conference will include a review of the educator's PGP, professional performance, student achievement data documented in SLO's and SAGE, and stakeholder input data with educator response.

Additionally, other lines of evidence may be submitted. An effectiveness rating will be determined at the YEC. The educator may submit a written response to any part of the evaluation; the educator's response will be attached to the evaluation.

- h. The evaluation document shall be finalized in the Observer Tab platform, indicating that the educator and evaluator have signed the document electronically. The educator's signature indicates participation in the YEC but does not signify agreement with the contents of the evaluation or the overall summative rating.
 - i. A copy of the evaluation shall be provided to the educator and a copy shall be retained by the principal in the educator's school personnel file.
 - j. A copy of the final overall summative effectiveness rating and supporting documentation including the summative effectiveness rating document from Observer Tab and SLO's with ratings, shall be submitted to the Human Resource Director at the District Office by June 5 each year to be retained in the employee's district personnel file, and for the purpose of submitting an annual effectiveness rating in CACTUS. Evaluation documents are subject to audit by USOE.
 - k. Evaluation records are classified as "Private Records" and shall be managed according to the guidelines of privacy policy and law.
6. A rating of *Emerging Effective*, *Effective*, or *Highly Effective* shall be considered satisfactory performance for a *provisional* educator.
- a. A mid-year conference shall be conducted with all *provisional* educators by January 15.
 - b. The first evaluation cycle (September-December) for *provisional* educators shall generate a formative mid-year rating based on a minimum of two observations (one must be formal) and other lines of evidence. If the rating from the first evaluation is *Not Effective*:
 - i. The educator shall be notified continued district employment is in question, and
 - ii. Additional resources shall be identified to assist the *provisional* educator.
 - iii. The second evaluation cycle will begin after the mid-year conference.
 - iv. The *provisional* educator will receive a summative overall rating at a conference to be held by March 15.
7. An overall rating of *Effective* or *Highly Effective* shall be considered satisfactory for *career educators*.
8. An overall rating of *Minimally Effective* or *Not Effective* for a *career* educator shall be considered unsatisfactory performance, and the educator will be placed on a Plan of

Teacher Evaluation - DGA

Assistance in accordance with procedures and standards of *Utah Code 53A-8a-501*.

- a. A Plan of Assistance (POA) shall:
 - i. Identify specific, measurable, and actionable deficiencies, and
 - ii. Offer a recommended course of action and available resources intended to improve the educator's performance.
 - b. The period of time for implementing a Plan of Assistance:
 - i. May not exceed 120 school days, except as provided in this policy;
 - ii. May continue into the next school year, and
 - iii. Should be sufficient to successfully complete the POA, and
 - iv. Shall begin when the career educator receives written notice and end when the determination is made that the career educator has successfully remediated the deficiency, or notice of intent to not renew or terminate the career educator's contract is given in accordance with Utah Code Section 53A-8a-502(5).
 - c. An administrator may extend the period of time for implementing a POA beyond 120 school days if:
 - i. A career employee has been approved and qualifies for leave under the Family Medical Leave Act during the time period the POA is scheduled to be implemented, or
 - ii. For other compelling reasons as approved by the Board if leave was scheduled before the employee was placed on a POA.
 - d. Career educators who have been placed on probation for unsatisfactory performance, and are again rated unsatisfactory within a three-year period are subject to nonrenewal or employment termination pursuant to Juab School District Policy DHA.
 - f. An educator is responsible for improving performance, using resources offered by the district, and demonstrating acceptable levels of improvement in any designated area(s) of deficiency.
9. Performance compensation shall begin no later than the 2016-17 school year. If a licensed educator receives an overall rating of Not Effective, he/she shall not advance on the District's wage or salary schedule. If a licensed educator receives an overall rating of Minimally Effective, he/she shall not advance on the District's wage or salary schedule, unless the licensed educator is provisional or in the first year of a new teaching assignment. (Utah Code 53A0-8a-602)
10. Computing the Annual Summative Rating
- a. Component ratings shall be based on actual observations and data gathered, calculated, or observed in alignment with the Utah Effective Teaching and Leadership Standards and rubrics.
 - b. Component ratings shall be combined using the following formula:
 - Professional Performance = 70%
 - Student Growth = 20%
 - Stakeholder Input with teacher response = 10%
 - c. Summative scores shall be reported annually for all educators using the approved terminology for reporting:
 - Not Effective = 0
 - Minimally Effective/Emerging Effective = 1

Teacher Evaluation - DGA

- Effective = 2
 - Highly Effective = 3
- d. Component outcomes will be rounded to the nearest whole number prior to calculating the summative score.
11. Right to Review a Summative Overall Rating
- An educator who is not satisfied with a summative evaluation may request a review of the evaluation within 15 days after receiving the evaluation document. The review of the educator's summative evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with the following USOE standards and *53A-8a-406-3(b)*.
- a. The review shall be conducted by certified raters with experience rating educators in accordance with the Utah Effective Teaching Standards.
 - b. A qualified panel of reviewers shall review:
 - i. District Educator Evaluation policies and procedures.
 - ii. The evaluation process conducted for the educator.
 - iii. The evaluation data from the professional performance, student growth, and stakeholder input components.
 - c. Determine if the initial educator rating was in accordance with district educator evaluation policies, and based on the requirements of the performance standards, *Utah Code 53A-8a, R277-531, and R277-533*.
 - d. The review panel will report recommendations in writing to the superintendent for action.
12. Nothing in this Policy shall prevent the District from taking appropriate disciplinary action for misconduct defined in District policy DHA, the Utah Code, or Utah Administrative Rule.