

**District School Board of Pasco County
Race to the Top Evaluation System**

Section I. System Components Referenced both by the RTTT Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Florida Statutes

1. Core Effective Practices

- a. The purpose of the redeveloped evaluation system is to increase student-learning growth by improving the quality of instructional practices. The adoption of the state approved Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model (MCTEM) will achieve this goal.
- b. In order to accomplish this purpose, the MCTEM includes observation instruments to connect specific practices to research and evidence of student learning. The District intends to utilize the observation instruments provided as part of the MCTEM for all teachers to whom the instruments apply.
- c. The MCTEM establishes a clear connection to each of the six Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. These connections are referenced in the state provided crosswalk (Addendum B). The District will refine and/or revise during the next four years, as understanding of the research base for MCTEM becomes known.
- d. The list of related research to support the MCTEM is found in the document entitled *Research Base and Validation Studies on the Marzano Evaluation Model, April 2011* (Addendum A).
- e. The District has contracted with an accomplished educational consulting group, Cambridge Education, to provide training and support, and to ensure inter-rater reliability.

2. Student Growth Measures

- a. In 2011-2012, student growth will be measured using FCAT value added model learning gains in reading and/or mathematics for students in grades 4 -10 (as appropriate by content of instruction). Should the value added model formulas for Algebra I and Geometry become available for the 2011/2012 school year, these learning gains will also be utilized. Teachers of students not assessed by the FCAT will use an average of school-wide reading and mathematics gains. The District will measure student-learning growth using the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the expectations established by the state approved value added model formula(s) approved by the commissioner. The District will implement similar value added student growth measures for statewide and district assessments as they become available. By the 2014-2015 school year, the District will measure student learning growth in all other areas not assessed by statewide assessments, using the value added formulas

provided by the Department of Education. See Florida Statute 1012.34(7)(b).

- b. The District will use the state adopted value added model formula(s) for courses associated with the FCAT for 2011-2012. Should the value added model formulas for Algebra I and Geometry become available for the 2011/2012 school year, these learning gains will also be utilized. These value added model formulas will be utilized to identify the percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations for individual teachers and on a school wide basis over a rolling three year period (to include 2011/2012 school year data for the 2011/2012 evaluation process), as described in item 2a.
- c. For 2011- 2012, the District will measure student-learning growth using the value added formula(s) approved by the commissioner. The District will also implement additional student growth measures for the remainder of the statewide assessments as they become available. By the 2014-2015 school year, the District will measure student learning growth in all other areas not assessed by statewide assessments, using the value added formulas provided by the Department of Education. See Florida Statute 1012.34(7)(b).
- d. For 2011- 2012 the District will be using results from the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (reading and math) as an indicator for student learning growth. Should the value added model formulas for Algebra I and Geometry become available for the 2011/2012 school year, these results will also be utilized. Results will be tied to individual teachers, where appropriate, and on a school-wide basis for all others. Where additional assessments exist and when additional student learning growth formulas are approved and made available to the District, they will be incorporated into the District's calculation of student growth for teacher evaluation purposes.
- e. District Decisions
 - i. Evaluation Criteria for 2011/2012
 - Classroom Teachers – Where three (3) or more years of value added model data are available, the District will use a rolling three year data period (to include 2011/2012 school year data for the 2011/2012 evaluation process) for the 50% student growth portion of the teacher evaluation. Where less than three (3) years of value added model data are available, the District will use data that are available for the 50% student growth portion of the teacher evaluation.
 - Non-Classroom Teachers – The District will use school-wide or district-wide value added model data on the FCAT (Reading and Math) to comprise the required 50% student growth portion of the teacher evaluation. Where three (3) or more years of value added model data are available, the District will use a rolling three year data period (to include 2011/2012 school year data for the 2011/2012 evaluation process) for

the 50% student growth portion of the teacher evaluation. Where less than three (3) years of value added model data are available, the District will use data that is available for the 50% student growth portion of the teacher evaluation. The District will investigate the possibility of incorporating other measureable student outcomes for future years.

ii. Student Learning Growth

- For subjects and grades not assessed by statewide assessments, the District will adopt the state models for student learning growth as they becomes available. The District will review the evaluation system process to incorporate achievement measures for classroom teachers where this measure is more appropriate.
- For subjects and grades for which there are no appropriate statewide assessments and no appropriate District adopted assessments, the school average of FCAT (Reading and Math) value added model learning gains will be applied for these teachers for teacher evaluation purposes. Should the value added model formulas for Algebra I and Geometry become available for the 2011/2012 school year, these learning gains will also be utilized.

3. Evaluation Rating Criteria

- a. The District will use the state identified rating labels of “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Developing/Needs Improvement,” and “Unsatisfactory.”
- b. The District’s adoption of the state approved MCTEM incorporates rubrics, weighting scales, and a scoring system to define and decide an employee’s final evaluation rating. For the 2011/2012 school year (baseline year), the following weighting scales and scoring system will be utilized for all teachers:
 - i. Status Score Component
 - “Highly Effective” – At least 60% of scoreable elements at Level 4 (Innovating) and no scoreable elements at Levels 0 and/or 1 (Beginning and/or Not Using).
 - “Effective” – At least 60% of scoreable elements at Level 3 (Applying) or higher.
 - “Developing/Needs Improvement” – Less than 60% of scoreable elements at Level 3 (Applying) or higher and Less than 50% of scoreable elements at Levels 0 and/or 1 (Beginning and/or Not Using).
 - “Unsatisfactory” – At least 50% of scoreable elements at Levels 0 and/or 1 (Beginning and/or Not Using).
 - ii. Student Growth Component
 - “Highly Effective” – At least 75% of applicable students meet or exceed the expectations established by the state approved

value added model(s) for a rolling three (3) year period to include 2011/2012 data.

- “Effective” – At least 40% but less than 75% of applicable students meet or exceed the expectations established by the state approved value added model(s) for a rolling three (3) year period to include 2011/2012 data.
- “Developing/Needs Improvement” – At least 20% but less than 40% of applicable students meet or exceed the expectations established by the state approved value added model(s) for a rolling three (3) year period to include 2011/2012 data.
- “Unsatisfactory” – Less than 20% of applicable students meet or exceed the expectations established by the state approved value added model(s) for a rolling three (3) year period to include 2011/2012 data.

iii. Final Score Calculation

- Teachers will receive a numeric score ranging from 1 to 4, with 4 representing “highly effective” and 1 representing “unsatisfactory” for both the status score and student growth components.
 - The two numeric scores will be averaged together to provide the final score. Final scores of 3.5 and 4.0 will represent “Highly Effective;” final scores of 2.5 and 3.0 will represent “Effective;” final scores of 1.5 and 2.0 will represent “Developing/Needs Improvement;” and a final score of 1.0 will represent “Unsatisfactory.”
- c. For 2011- 2012, the process of assigning the final evaluation rating will include data collection on the elements of Domain 1 of the MCTEM through observations and conferencing. The final rating will be assigned by a school administrator and will be based on a teacher’s status score (50%) and the teacher’s student growth calculation (50%). For 2012- 2013 and beyond, the District will incorporate Domains 2, 3, and 4 of the MCTEM into the teacher’s status score. In addition, the District will implement a deliberate practice component as an additional metric.
- d. For 2011- 2012, the calculation will be based on an 50% instructional practices status score in Domain 1 of the MCTEM, and a 50% student growth calculation. For 2012- 2013 and beyond, the calculation will be based on 30% instructional practices status score in Domains 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the MCTEM; a 20% deliberate practice score; and a 50% student growth calculation.

Section II. System Components Referenced only by the MOU

4. Teacher and Principal Involvement

- a. The District established a Race to the Top steering committee to oversee the implementation of each project associated with the grant. This

committee is comprised of district and school based administrators, teachers as well as union representatives. The District also established an evaluation subcommittee comprised of district and school based administrators, teachers, and union representatives. A diverse cross section of this subcommittee attended the technical assistance meetings conducted by the state.

- b. The Race to the Top steering committee and the evaluation subcommittee will continue to meet to monitor grant implementation and make recommendations for future implementation.
- c. The memorandum of understanding signed by the District and Union was provided with our original June 1, 2011 checklist submission. (Addendum D). In addition, the amendments and additions to the checklist responses have been agreed to by both the District and the Union.

5. Multiple Evaluations for First Year Teachers

- a. First year teachers to the District will be formally observed a minimum of three (3) times each school year. Formative student performance data will be reviewed throughout the school year, and summative performance data (e.g. FCAT) will be reviewed when it is made available each year.
- b. The types of student performance data will include formative and summative measures (e.g. standardized assessments, attendance and course grades, student behavior strategies, curriculum based assessments, screening and diagnostic assessments, and benchmark assessments).
- c. Observations and data reviews are conducted by school administrators who successfully complete an evaluation certification process.
- d. The focus of the feedback for a newly hired teacher will be specific to improvements and level of progress toward effective instructional practice. Feedback will be provided during pre and post observation conferences and during data reviews.
- e. The same observation instrument and rating system will be utilized for all classroom instructional personnel. Item 11 addresses the District's plan for teachers in fields requiring special procedures.

6. Additional Metric Evaluation Element

- a. The District will incorporate deliberate practice as an additional metric.
- b. This additional metric will be applied to all teachers each year beginning with the 2012-2013 school year.
- c. The deliberate practice score will be 20% of the teacher's 50% instructional practice component.
- d. The deliberate practice score will be implemented during the 2012-2013 school year.

- e. The deliberate practice score will be 20% of the teacher's 50% instructional practice component.

7. Milestone Career Event

Because the District will be implementing a multi-metric evaluation for all teachers each year beginning in 2012- 2013, identification of individual milestone career events is not required.

Section III. System Components Referenced by Florida Statutes

8. Annual Evaluation

- a. All teachers, other than teachers new to the District, will be formally observed two (2) times each school year. Additional formal observations may occur at the request of the school administrator or the teacher, provided the frequency of observation is reasonable. Formative student performance data will be reviewed throughout the school year, and summative performance data (e.g. FCAT) will be reviewed when it is made available each year.
- b. The types of student performance data will include formative and summative measures (e.g. standardized assessments, attendance and course grades, student behavior strategies, curriculum based assessments, screening and diagnostic assessments, and benchmark assessments).
- c. Observations and data reviews are conducted by school administrators who successfully complete an evaluation certification process.
- d. The focus of feedback for all teachers will be specific to improvements and level of progress toward effective instructional practice. Feedback will be provided during pre and post observation conferences and during data reviews.
- e. The same observation instrument and rating system will be utilized for all classroom instructional personnel. Item 11 addresses the District's plan for teachers in fields requiring special procedures.

9. Improvement Plans

- a. Data from the teacher evaluation system will be analyzed at the district and school level to support improvement planning.
- b. Data on instructional practices from the teacher evaluation system will be collected annually and combined with student achievement data to inform school and district improvement plans and teachers' individual professional development plans, which will, in turn, inform the deliberate practice component of the teacher evaluation system.

10. Continuous Professional Improvement

- a. Data on instructional practices collected during conferencing and observations will be provided through verbal and/or written feedback to the teacher throughout the school year. This feedback will be used by administrators and teachers for individual improvement planning.
- b. During the 2011-2012 school year, data collected on individual teacher instructional practices in Domain 1 will be baseline data to inform individual professional development planning for the 2012-2013 school year. This process will be continued in future years as the deliberate practice component.

11. Teaching Fields Requiring Special Procedures

- a. The District has identified teaching fields requiring special procedures, and is in the process of developing specialized observation instruments and rubrics for each of the identified teaching fields that require special procedures. The data collected from these observation instruments will be utilized to generate the status score for teachers identified as requiring special evaluation procedures. (Addendum E) For many of these teaching fields, observations will be conducted by school administrators or district content administrators.

12. Evaluator Training

- a. The District has contracted with an accomplished educational consulting group, Cambridge Education, to develop and deliver training in the proper use of assessment criteria and procedures for all personnel with appraisal responsibilities. This training is being delivered to all school-based administrators during the 2011-2012 school year, and the District anticipates the majority of school-based administrators being certified to evaluate their teaching staff by the end of November of 2011. Administrators who are unable to meet the established certification standards will be provided additional coaching opportunities, but will not be certified until proficiency in the use of the observation instruments is demonstrated.
In addition, the consulting group will deliver training to a core group of District trainers to ensure consistent use of the evaluation system over time.
- b. Sustainability will be ensured, as the core group of certified trainers will be responsible for training new administrators to the District in future years.
- c. The core group will conduct quality assurance reviews annually to monitor evaluator performance and ensure consistency of results.

13. Process of Informing Teachers About the Evaluation Process

- a. Every teacher will be or already has been trained in the common language of instruction (Learning Focused Strategies) that is the basis for the MCTEM. The District is developing awareness podcasts specific to the MCTEM to be utilized by each administrator to orient his/her instructional staff. The August 2011 podcast provided a general overview of the new evaluation system requirements. The September 2011 podcast covers the 9 design questions in Domain 1, as well as the 41 observable strategies and behaviors contained within those design questions. The October 2011 podcast will cover the actual forms that will be used for the evaluation process. The November 2011 podcast will cover the summative evaluation, including calculations and templates. Additional podcasts will be created to cover the value added component of the evaluation system. A sixty (60) in-service credit online course has also been created to navigate teachers through the nine (9) design questions and allows for professional development around Marzano's Art and Sciences of Teaching. Individual training modules will also be made available.
- b. Newly hired teachers will be trained in the common language of instruction that is the basis for the MCTEM. They will also participate in the teacher evaluation system awareness podcasts used annually at each school.

14. Parent Input

- a. Multiple opportunities for parents to provide input into employee performance evaluations may include:
 - a. School/district surveys
 - b. Conferences
 - c. Phone calls
 - d. Electronic communications
 - e. School Advisory Councils
 - f. Parent organizations and clubs

15. Annual Review by the District

- a. The District and Union will annually review the new teacher evaluation system, as well as the results of the annual evaluations, for compliance with applicable statutes and to evaluate the effectiveness of the system itself in improving instruction and student learning.
- b. Starting at the end of the 2011-2012 school year, in order to support improvements in instruction and student learning, the Committee will analyze the distribution of the ratings of teacher effectiveness and the student performance data at each school site.

16. Peer Review Option

- a. The District will not utilize peer evaluation as part of the formal teacher evaluation system. Peer assistance/mentoring will be offered for those teachers operating on an overall “unsatisfactory” evaluation.

17. Evaluation by Supervisor

- a. The administrator responsible for supervising the employee will evaluate the employee’s performance.

18. Input into the Evaluation by Trained Personnel other than the Supervisor

- a. Only trained school or district administrators will be responsible for the evaluation of teachers they supervise.

19. Amending Evaluations

- a. The District and Union collectively reserves the right, as additional applicable data are received, to amend the evaluation process within the guidelines set forth in Florida statute and the applicable collective bargaining agreement.