

NUMBER:	SP 923
EFFECTIVE:	10/08/2008
REVISION:	03/10/2016
PAGES:	6

Statement of.....

## **Policy and Responsibility**

---

SUBJECT: EDUCATOR EVALUATION

---

### GENERAL STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

1. To allow the educator and the District to promote the professional growth of the teacher;
2. To identify and encourage teacher behaviors which contribute to student progress;
3. To assess teachers abilities in order that their capabilities may be enhanced; and
4. To improve the education system and thus the educational opportunities and growth of students.

### DEFINITIONS OF TERMS:

1. EDUCATOR: a classroom teacher employed by the District who is required to hold a professional license issued by the Utah State Board of Education.
2. CAREER EDUCATOR: a classroom teacher who has successfully completed three years of teaching in the District, and is, therefore, entitled to rely upon continued employment under the policies set by the Board.
3. PROVISIONAL EDUCATOR: a classroom teacher who has completed less than three years of classroom teaching in the District.
4. PROBATIONARY EDUCATOR: a classroom teacher whose performance has been formally determined to be less than satisfactory under the policies set by the Board.
5. EVALUATOR: a person who is responsible for an educator's overall evaluation, including:
  - a. professional performance;
  - b. student growth;
  - c. stakeholder input
  - d. other indicators of professional improvement
6. RATER: a person who conducts an observation of an educator related to an educator's evaluation.
7. "STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVE" or "SLO": a content and grade or course specific measurable learning objective that can be used to document student learning over a defined period of time.
8. EMERGING EFFECTIVE RATING: for a provisional educator who holds a Level I license; or a career educator who holds a Level 2 license and has received a new or different teaching or leadership assignment within the last school year; or is developing in that area
9. MINIMALLY EFFECTIVE RATING: for a career educator who holds a Level 2 license; and is teaching or leading in a familiar assignment.

## ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DISTRICT EVALUATION COMMITTEE:

1. The Board shall invite the Community Councils from each school to submit no more than two names, addresses, and telephone numbers of interested parents whose child(ren) attend Murray schools.
2. The Committee shall be comprised of an equal number of classroom teachers, parents, and administrators appointed by the Board.
3. The district shall recommend names to the Board for approval.
4. Names shall be submitted by September 30 to the Director of Personnel prior to the first Board meeting in October for approval by the Board.
5. The Board shall designate the appropriate number of parents consistent with state statute and Board policy, with consideration for geographic, socioeconomic, and ethnic diversity within the district.
5. The Committee may adopt, adapt, or assess an evaluation program for teachers based on a model developed by the State Board of Education; or create its own evaluation program for teachers consistent with state code and administrative rule.
6. Community Councils shall be notified of the opportunity to recommend parents for participation on the Evaluation Committee at least every other year or upon district request.

## ORIENTATION:

The principal of each school shall orient all educators assigned to the school concerning the Board's Educator Evaluation program, including the purpose of the evaluations and the method by which they will be made. Evaluation will not occur prior to this orientation.

## EVALUATION PROCESS:

### SECTION I: EVALUATION COMPONENTS

1. To achieve the previously stated purposes, and to comply with Utah Code 53A-8a and State Board Rule R277-533, educators will be regularly evaluated as prescribed.
  - a. Frequency of evaluations:
    - i. Evaluation is an ongoing process. Using the Utah Effective Teaching Standards, suggestions and constructive criticism shall be given to an educator when needed throughout the school year.
    - ii. Provisional and probationary educators shall be evaluated at least two times each school year:
      1. Two written summative evaluations shall be completed for all provisional educators for the first three years of employment with the district by the school principal or designee once prior to January 15th of each school year, and once no later than sixty (60) working days before the end of the contract year.
      2. Two written summative evaluations shall be completed for all probationary employees, as well as multiple formative assessments, during the designated probationary period.
    - iii. Career educators shall be evaluated annually. A summative evaluation occurs once every three years and formative evaluations occur the other two

years of the three-year cycle. Evaluations can take place more often if deemed necessary by the immediate supervisor or superintendent, or at the request of the educator.

- b. There shall be a reasonable number of formative and summative observation periods during the evaluation process in a variety of settings and situations to ensure adequate data for a fair and complete evaluation.
  - c. At least 30 calendar days prior to the end of the school year, the principal of an educator whose performance has been determined to be unsatisfactory shall complete all written evaluations and recommendations regarding that educator.
  - d. In compliance with State Board Rule, the educator evaluation shall include the use of multiple lines of evidence, such as:
    - i. Self-evaluation;
    - ii. Student and parent input;
    - iii. Peer observations;
    - iv. Supervisor observations;
    - v. Evidence of professional growth;
    - vi. Student achievement data; and
    - vii. Other indicators of instructional improvement.
      1. All educators will complete a self-evaluation and professional growth goals by September 30<sup>th</sup> (annually). The goals will be submitted to and approved by the school principal or designee. A review of progress towards goal achievement shall occur at both the middle and end of the school year by the educator and the school principal or designee.
      2. The educator will be responsible to provide information to the evaluator regarding proficiency in the Utah Effective Teaching Standards at designated goal setting and evaluation conferences. Additionally, the educator may ask to meet with the evaluator at non-designated times to provide information regarding educator proficiency.
  - e. All data gathered will remain confidential and be secured by the rater or evaluator.
  - f. The evaluation will be objective, reliable, valid, and grounded in the principles of effective instructional practices. In compliance with Utah State Board Rule, educator effectiveness shall be based on the Utah Effective Teaching Standards.
  - g. The district evaluation system for all educators will differentiate among the following four levels of performance: Not Effective, Emerging/Minimally Effective, Effective, and Highly Effective.
2. An educator's evaluation shall be conducted by a rater or evaluator who has been certified on the evaluation instrument:
    - a. principal;
    - b. assistant principal;
    - c. principal's designee;
    - d. educator's immediate supervisor;
    - e. district office administrator;
    - f. another person specified in the evaluation program.
  3. The school district will establish a rater reliability plan that shall:
    - a. compare a rater's decisions to standardized ratings established by a committee of expert raters;
    - b. measure a rater's skills and reassess the rater's skills at appropriate intervals to maintain system quality;

- c. designate qualified raters as certified;
  - d. ensure that an educator is rated by a certified rater;
  - e. offer a rater opportunities to improve the rater's skills through instruction and practice; and
  - f. maintain high standards of rater accuracy.
4. Raters and evaluators will be provided with professional development opportunities to:
    - a. improve a rater or evaluator's abilities; and
    - b. give the rater or evaluator an opportunity to demonstrate the rater's ability to rate an educator in accordance with the prescribed teaching or leadership standards.
  5. The educator shall be informed about the evaluation process and shall be given a copy of the evaluation instrument at least 15 calendar days prior to the first evaluation.
  6. An evaluation shall, within 15 calendar days after the completed evaluation process, be put in writing and discussed with the educator by the principal or designee.
  7. Following any revisions made after the discussion, a copy of the evaluation will be filed in the educator's personnel file together with any related reports or documents. A copy of the completed evaluation and any attachments that is are placed in the personnel file will be given to the educator.
 

An educator who is not satisfied with a summative evaluation will be advised that he/she may make a written response to all or any part of the evaluation and the response will be attached to the evaluation and/or they may request a review of the evaluation within 15 days after receiving the written evaluation.

If a review is requested, the school district superintendent or the superintendent's designee shall appoint a person not employed by the school district who has expertise in teacher or personnel evaluation to review the evaluation procedures and make recommendations to the superintendent regarding the educator's summative evaluation. A review of an educator's summative evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with State Board of Education rules R277-533-8 Nothing in this section prevents the teacher and Superintendent or his/her designee from agreeing to another method of review.
  8. An educator's summative rating will be based on the following:
    - a. 70% - observations of instructional quality (based on the Utah Effective Teaching Standards);
    - b. 20% - student learning growth or achievement as measured by a designated SLO(s); and
    - c. 10% - stakeholder input (to include annual input from parents and students).
    - d. \*A final outcome that includes .5 or more will be rounded up.
  9. All educators who are deemed "Highly Effective" overall, including a "Highly Effective" student growth component, will be recognized on an annual basis by a commendation from the Superintendent and the Board.
  10. The number and percent of educators (teachers, and other educators) in each category as stated below will be reported to the State Board of Education annually (on or before June 30) using the following terminology:
    - a. highly effective 3;
    - b. effective 2;
    - c. emerging/minimally effective 1.
  11. Educator effectiveness component data of individuals shall be kept confidential in accordance with Rule R277-487; and state law.

## SECTION II: EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION

1. In compliance with State Law 53A-8a-601 thru 602, beginning in the 2016-2017 school year, any advancement on the adopted salary schedule (“Steps” only) is contingent on receiving a rating of “Effective” or “Highly Effective” on the adopted evaluation system (administrator evaluation, student growth, and stakeholder input). An educator who is deemed “Not Effective” or “Emerging/Minimally Effective” may not advance on the salary schedule unless they are a provisional educator, or a career teacher in the first year of a new assignment (e.g. new subject, grade level, or school).
2. In compliance with State Law 53A-17a-153 and Administrative Rule R277-110, in order for each educator to receive the Legislative Supplemental Salary Adjustment they must have a rating of “Effective” or “Highly Effective” on their most recent evaluation (administrator evaluation only). An educator who is deemed “Not Effective” or “Emerging/Minimally Effective” is not eligible for the Legislative Supplemental Salary Adjustment. This includes: classroom teachers and all other certified educators.
3. Any educator who does not advance on the adopted salary schedule and/or receive the Legislative Supplemental Salary Adjustment due to their evaluation may request one (1) additional re-evaluation within the current school year.

### SECTION III: REMEDIATING UNSATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

1. An educator whose performance is determined to be “Not Effective” and/or “Emerging/Minimally Effective” will be given reasonable assistance to remediate his/her performance and be provided, by the principal or designee, with the following:
  - a. a written document which clearly identifies his/her deficiencies;
  - b. available and appropriate resources (mentoring, coaching, training) to remediate the “Not Effective” and/or “Emerging/Minimally Effective” . areas of performance;
  - c. a recommended course of action which will remediate the educator's performance; and written notice that the employee’s contract is subject to nonrenewal or termination if, upon a reevaluation of the employee’s performance, the employee’s performance is determined to be “Not Effective” and/or “Emerging/Minimally Effective”.
2. The educator is responsible for improving his/her performance by:
  - a. using the resources identified by the principal or designee;
  - b. demonstrating an “Effective” levels of performance in the areas designated as “Not Effective” and/or “Emerging/Minimally Effective”.
3. The period of time for implementing a plan of assistance: may not exceed 120 school days, may continue into the next school year; and should be sufficient to successfully complete the plan of assistance.
  - a. In accordance with local school board policy, the period of time for implementing a plan of assistance may extend beyond 120 school days if a career employee is on leave from work during the time period the plan of assistance is scheduled to be implemented; and the leave was approved and scheduled before the written notice was provided; or the leave is specifically approved by the school board.
  - b. If upon a reevaluation of the career employee's performance, the district determines the career employee's performance is “Effective”, and within a three-year period after the initial documentation of “Not Effective” and/or “Emerging/Minimally Effective” performance for the same deficiency, the career employee's performance is determined to be “Not Effective” and/or “Emerging/Minimally Effective”, the district may elect to not renew or terminate the career employee's contract.
  - c. If the district intends to not renew or terminate a career employee's contract, the district shall: provide written documentation of the career employee's deficiencies in

performance; and give notice of intent to not renew or terminate the career employee's contract in accordance with SP 908: Employee Orderly Termination Policy and Procedure.

- i. The notice of intent shall be in writing and served by personal delivery or by certified mail addressed to the employee's last-known address as shown on the records of the district; the district shall give notice at least 30 days prior to the proposed date of termination; and the notice shall state the date of termination and the detailed reasons for termination.
- d. The district is not required to provide a cause for not offering a contract to a provisional employee. If the district intends to not offer a contract for a subsequent term of employment to a provisional employee, the district shall give notice of that intention to the employee at least 30 days before the end of the provisional employee's contract term.

#### SECTION IV: MENTOR FOR PROVISIONAL EDUCATOR

1. The principal or immediate supervisor shall assign a mentor educator to each provisional educator. The mentor educator, when possible, shall be a career educator who performs substantially the same duties as the provisional educator and has at least three years of successful educational experience. All mentor educators will receive training on mentoring.
2. The mentor educator shall assist the provisional educator to become effective and competent in the teaching profession and school system.
3. The mentor educator shall not evaluate the provisional teacher.
4. The mentor educator will receive compensation for this service through district mentoring funds.