

Utica Community Schools



Teacher Evaluation System

August 2012



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS BOARD OF EDUCATION

Carol Klenow, Ed.D., President
Gene L. Klida, Vice President
Michele Templeton, Secretary
Robert A. Ross, Ph.D., Treasurer
Jennifer L. Prybys, Trustee
Daniel J. Meyers, Trustee
Ken Krolczyk, Trustee

UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Christine M. Johns, Ed.D., Superintendent of Schools
Robert Monroe, Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning
Stephanie Eagen, Assistant Superintendent for Business and Employee Services
Mark Davey, Assistant Superintendent for Auxiliary Services
Michael Bender, Executive Administrator of Schools
Michele VanDeKerkhove, Executive Administrator of Schools

Table of Contents

Philosophy.....	4
Background.....	4
Teacher Evaluation Timeline and Process.....	6
Tenured Teachers Previously Rated Highly Effective or Effective	6
Teachers Previously Rated Minimally Effective or Ineffective	10
Probationary Teachers	14
Appendix A: Teacher Evaluation Rubric.....	22
Appendix B: Guidance for Establishing SMART Goals.....	46
Appendix C: Macomb County Dashboard	52
Appendix D: Types of Evidence	56
Appendix E: Student Achievement Growth Analysis	60
Appendix F: Individualized Development Plan for Teachers Rated Minimally Effective or Ineffective	64
Appendix G: Individualized Development Plan for First-Year Probationary Teachers and Probationary Teachers Rated Highly Effective or Effective	68
Appendix H: Midyear Progress Report	72
Appendix I: 2012-2013 Teacher Evaluation Form	76
Appendix J: 2013-2014 Teacher Evaluation Form	80
Appendix K: 2014-2015 Teacher Evaluation Form.....	84
Appendix L: 2015-2016 Teacher Evaluation Form	88
Appendix M: Definitions – Teacher Evaluation System.....	92

This page intentionally left blank



Utica Community Schools Teacher Evaluation System

"A commitment to professional learning is important, not because teaching is of poor quality and must be fixed, but because teaching is so hard that we can always improve it. . . Just as in other professions, every teacher has the responsibility to be involved in a career long quest to improve practice."

-Charlotte Danielson, 2010

Philosophy

The Utica Community Schools is committed to recruiting, hiring, training and retaining quality teachers in every classroom. We recognize that caring, committed, effective teachers are our most valuable asset because of their impact on student learning. We honor and acknowledge teaching as a profession and that effective teaching is a complex task that requires reflective practice and continuous professional learning that ultimately translates to the achievement of all students.

The Utica Community Schools teacher evaluation system includes established domains of instructional practice and national, state and local measures of student growth. The domains of instructional practice include Planning and Preparation, The Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities (see Appendix A). The measures of student growth have been identified and developed in conjunction with the Macomb Intermediate School District (MISD), local school districts and the teachers' unions (see Appendix C).

The intent of this new evaluation system is to provide a more detailed review of teacher performance so that targeted feedback and supportive professional development can be provided in a timely manner. The domains of instructional practice will provide a decision-making guide for making a final determination on whether a teacher is highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective.

Background

Public Act 102 of 2011 requires that all certified teachers be evaluated at least **annually** using multiple rating categories which include student growth as a significant factor. To assist in determining professional competence, the performance evaluation system must include multiple direct observations of classroom and professional practices throughout the school year. The results of the evaluation are to inform instructional practice and teacher professional development.

District administrators engaged in a collaborative process with members of the Utica Education Association (UEA) to revise and amend the performance evaluation system. The group began by defining their charge, reviewed the requirements of the law, identified shared values, reviewed the evaluation systems of other school districts, and worked together to develop procedures, timelines, and forms for the teacher evaluation system.

This page intentionally left blank



Teacher Evaluation Timeline and Process

Tenured Teachers Previously Rated Highly Effective or Effective

Timeline

	Process Step	Completion Date or Timeframe
Phase I	Pre-evaluation process	Completed by October 31
	Observations	Conducted September through January
Phase II	Reflection	Completed by January 31
	Observations	Conducted January through April
Phase III	Post-evaluation process	Scheduled during April or May
	Teacher Evaluation Form	Completed by May 31

Process

Phase I

- A. The **Pre-Evaluation** process is to be completed by **October 31** for all teachers. Administrators are to meet with teachers to review the Teacher Evaluation Rubric (Appendix A), the completed Student Achievement Growth Analysis document (Appendix E), and the annual Teacher Evaluation Form (Appendices I-L). Prior to a teacher's individual meeting with his/her administrator, a teacher must review the Teacher Evaluation Rubric and his/her previous year's evaluation.
1. Teachers will identify the specific assessment instruments from the Macomb County Dashboard (Appendix C) that they plan to use with their students to identify needs and monitor progress. Teachers will complete the Student Achievement Growth Analysis document.
 2. At the pre-evaluation conference, the teacher will review the pre-analysis results, present their findings, and describe a course of action as outlined in Phase I of the Student Achievement Growth Analysis document. The guiding questions will provide the basis for this written reflection.
 3. The Student Achievement Growth Analysis must include two desired outcomes, to be reassessed by year's end, as well as student growth measures and strategies that will be utilized to reach the outcomes. The desired outcomes must be derived from the needs assessment, focused on student achievement, and identify student growth measures.
 4. The desired outcomes must be specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented and timely (SMART) (Appendix B). The student growth measures must support district goals and school improvement plans.
 5. The pre-evaluation conference is intended to be a collaborative process between the teacher and administrator. The desired outcomes, growth measures, improvement strategies, and instruments for assessment will be approved by the administrator.
- B. **Observations** are to be conducted during the months of **September, October, November, December, and January.**

1. Tenured teachers previously rated highly effective or effective

- a. Multiple, unscheduled, untimed observations of all teachers. The number of observations, classroom visits, or instructional rounds (walk-throughs) should be regular and consistent within the building.
 - b. Dates and times of observations must be recorded by the administrator on the Teacher Evaluation Form.
2. Tenured teachers where concerns have been identified through observations, classroom visits, or instructional rounds (walk-throughs) during the current year.
 - a. The administrator will identify in writing the area(s) where the teacher is not meeting standards and the teacher will identify in writing specific improvement strategies.
 - b. The administrator will identify and offer supports to assist the teacher.
 - c. The administrator will conduct scheduled observations which will include a pre-observation conference, observation, and a post-observation conference.
 - d. The teacher will provide written reflection on the lesson(s) observed and the administrator will provide written feedback.
 - e. In addition, multiple, unscheduled, untimed observations will be conducted. The number of observations, classroom visits, or instructional rounds (walk-throughs) will be based upon the improvement of the individual teacher.
 - f. Dates and times of observations must be recorded by the administrator on the Teacher Evaluation Form.

Phase II

A. Reflection

1. Engaging in a process of reflection on student growth projected in the desired outcomes established in Phase I with performance measured using the assessment instrument(s) from the Macomb County Dashboard, teachers will complete the Student Achievement Growth Analysis document and submit it to their administrator by **January 31**. The teacher will provide evidence of student achievement growth (Appendix D) identified in the desired outcomes.
2. By Friday of the second full week in February, the administrator will provide the teacher written feedback on their performance based on the Teacher Evaluation Rubric and the Student Achievement Growth Analysis document. The administrator will communicate in writing to the teacher their effectiveness rating to date and the process to be used for the observations, classroom visits, or instructional rounds (walk-throughs) in Phase II.

B. Observations during the months of January, February, March, and April

1. Tenured teachers considered highly effective or effective
 - a. Multiple, unscheduled, untimed observations of all teachers. The number of observations, classroom visits, or instructional rounds (walk-throughs) should be regular and consistent within the building.
 - b. Dates and times of observations must be recorded by the administrator on the Teacher Evaluation Form.

2. Tenured teachers where concerns have been identified through observations, classroom visits, or instructional rounds (walk-throughs) during the current year.
 - a. The administrator will identify in writing the area(s) where the teacher is not meeting standards and the teachers will identify in writing specific improvement strategies.
 - b. The administrator will identify and offer supports to assist the teacher.
 - c. The administrator will conduct scheduled observations which will include a pre-observation conference, observation, and a post-observation conference.
 - d. The teacher will provide a written reflection on the lesson and the administrator will provide written feedback.
 - e. Multiple, unscheduled, untimed observations will be conducted. The number of observations, classroom visits, or instructional rounds (walk-throughs) will be based upon the improvement of the individual teacher.
 - f. The dates and times of observations must be recorded by the administrator on the Teacher Evaluation Form.

Phase III

A. Post-evaluation conducted during the months of **April or May**.

1. The administrator will schedule a conference with each teacher by the end of the school year.
 - a. During the conference the teacher will provide evidence of student achievement growth identified in the desired outcomes established in Phase I and measured by the Macomb County Dashboard assessment(s) and will engage in a reflective conversation encompassing instructional strategies, results, successes, challenges, and areas of future growth.
 - b. After the conference the administrator will provide written feedback on the performance of each teacher using the Teacher Evaluation Form. For ratings of minimally effective or ineffective performance written feedback will be provided.
2. Relevant data from the end of the year assessments will be used during the months of September and October of the next school year.
3. Teachers will receive the completed Teacher Evaluation Form for their signature no later than May 31.
4. If a teacher is rated as highly effective on three consecutive annual year-end evaluations the teacher will be evaluated biennially instead of annually. However, if a teacher is not rated highly effective on one of these biennial evaluations the teacher shall again be provided with annual year-end evaluations.

B. Scoring Guide

1. The overall effectiveness rating is based on the effectiveness rating of each domain and student growth.
2. The effectiveness rating of an individual domain cannot be higher than the lowest component rating within that domain.
3. Student growth will be included in the overall effectiveness rating based on the following:

Highly effective = All students have demonstrated comprehensive growth and 90-100% of the desired outcomes have been achieved.

Effective = All students have demonstrated comprehensive growth and 70-89% of the desired outcomes have been achieved.

Minimally effective = Comprehensive student growth over time is inconsistent and/or random. Fifty to sixty-nine percent of the desired outcomes have been achieved.

Ineffective = Comprehensive student growth over time is not evident. Less than 50% of the desired outcomes have been achieved.

4. Student achievement growth will be included in the overall effectiveness rating based on the following percentages over time:
 - a. During the 2012-13 school year, student achievement growth will be 20% of the overall effectiveness rating. (Appendix I)
 - b. During the 2013-14 school year, student achievement growth will be 25% of the overall effectiveness rating. (Appendix J)
 - c. During the 2014-15 school year, student achievement growth will be 40% of the overall effectiveness rating. (Appendix K)
 - d. During the 2015-16 school year, student achievement growth will be 50% of the overall effectiveness rating. (Appendix L)

Teachers Rated Minimally Effective or Ineffective the Preceding School Year

Timeline

Process Step		Completion Date or Timeframe
Phase I	Pre-evaluation process with a review of the IDP	Completed by October 31
	Observations	Conducted September through January
Phase II	Reflection	Completed by January 31
	Midyear Progress Report	Completed by Friday of the second full week in February
	Observations	Conducted January through April
Phase III	Post-evaluation process	Scheduled during April or May
	Teacher Evaluation Form	Completed by May 31

Process

Phase I

- A. The **Pre-Evaluation** process is to be completed by **October 31** for all teachers. Administrators are to meet with teachers to review the Teacher Evaluation Rubric (Appendix A), the completed Student Achievement Growth Analysis document (Appendix E), the annual Teacher Evaluation Form (Appendices I-L), and the Individualized Development Plan (Appendix F). Prior to a teacher's individual meeting with his or her administrator, a teacher must review the Teacher Evaluation Rubric and his or her previous year's evaluation.
1. Teachers will identify the specific assessment instruments from the Macomb County Dashboard (Appendix C) that they plan to use with their students to identify needs and monitor progress. Teachers will complete the Student Achievement Growth Analysis document.
 2. At the pre-evaluation conference, the teacher will review the pre-analysis results, present their findings, and describe a course of action as outlined in Phase I of the Student Achievement Growth Analysis document. The guiding questions will provide the basis for this written reflection.
 3. The Student Achievement Growth Analysis must include two desired outcomes, to be reassessed by year's end, as well as student growth measures and strategies that will be utilized to reach the outcomes. The desired outcomes must be derived from the needs assessment, focused on student achievement and identify student growth measures.
 4. The desired outcomes must be specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented and timely (SMART). The desired outcomes must support district goals and school improvement plans.
 5. The pre-evaluation conference is intended to be a collaborative process between the teacher and administrator. The desired outcomes, growth measures, improvement strategies, and instruments for assessment will be approved by the administrator.
 6. An Individualized Development Plan (IDP) will be reviewed and finalized during the pre-evaluation conference for all teachers rated minimally effective or ineffective the preceding school year.

B. Observations are to be conducted during the months of **September, October, November, December, and January.**

1. The administrator will conduct scheduled observations which will include a pre-observation conference, observation, and a post-observation conference.
2. For all scheduled observations, the teacher will provide a written reflection on the lesson and the administrator will provide written feedback.
3. The administrator will identify and offer supports to assist the teacher.
4. In addition, multiple, unscheduled, untimed observations will be conducted. The number of observations, classroom visits, or instructional rounds (walk-throughs) will be based upon the improvement of the individual teacher.
5. Dates and times of observations must be recorded by the administrator on the Teacher Evaluation Form

Phase II

A. Reflection

1. Engaging in a process of reflection on student growth projected in the desired outcomes established in Phase I with performance measured using the assessment instrument(s) from the Macomb County Dashboard, teachers complete the Phase II section of the Student Achievement Growth Analysis document and submit it to their administrator by **January 31**. The teacher will provide evidence of student achievement growth (Appendix D) identified in the desired outcomes.
2. By Friday of the second full week in February, the administrator will communicate in writing to the teacher their progress on the desired outcomes established in Phase I, progress on the goal(s) in the IDP, and the plan for professional development using the Midyear Progress Report (Appendix H).

Observations during the months of January, February, March, and April

1. The administrator will conduct scheduled observations which will include a pre-observation conference, observation, and a post-observation conference.
2. For all scheduled observations, the teacher will provide a written reflection on the lesson and the administrator will provide written feedback.
3. The administrator will identify and offer supports to assist the teacher.
4. In addition, multiple, unscheduled, untimed observations will be conducted. The number of observations, classroom visits, or instructional rounds (walk-throughs) will be based upon the improvement of the individual teacher.
5. Dates and times of observations must be recorded by the administrator on the Teacher Evaluation Form.

Phase III

A. Post-evaluation conducted during the months of **April or May**.

1. The administrator will schedule a conference with each teacher by the end of the school year.
 - a. During the conference the teacher will provide evidence of student achievement growth identified in the desired outcomes established in Phase I measured by the Macomb County Dashboard assessment(s) and will engage in a reflective conversation encompassing instructional strategies, results, successes, challenges, and areas of future growth.
 - b. After the conference the administrator will provide written feedback on the performance of each teacher using the Teacher Evaluation Form.
 - c. Any teacher on an IDP will receive written feedback in all areas of the domains of instructional practice as defined in the Teacher Evaluation Rubric.
2. Relevant data from the end of the year assessments will be used during the months of September and October of the next school year.
3. Teachers will receive the completed Teacher Evaluation Form for their signature no later than May 31.
4. If a teacher is rated as highly effective on three consecutive annual year-end evaluations the teacher will be evaluated biennially instead of annually. However, if a teacher is not rated highly effective on one of these biennial evaluations the teacher shall again be provided with annual year-end evaluations.

B. Scoring Guide

1. The overall effectiveness rating is based on the effectiveness rating of each domain and student growth.
2. The effectiveness rating of an individual domain cannot be higher than the lowest component rating within that domain.
3. Student growth will be included in the overall effectiveness rating based on the following:

Highly effective = All students have demonstrated comprehensive growth and 90-100% of the desired outcomes have been achieved.

Effective = All students have demonstrated comprehensive growth and 70-89% of the desired outcomes have been achieved.

Minimally effective = Comprehensive student growth over time is inconsistent and/or random. Fifty to sixty-nine percent of the desired outcomes have been achieved.

Ineffective = Comprehensive student growth over time is not evident. Less than 50% of the desired outcomes have been achieved.

4. Student achievement growth will be included in the overall effectiveness rating based on the following percentages over time:
 - a During the 2012-13 school year, student achievement growth will be 20% of the overall effectiveness rating. (Appendix I)
 - b During the 2013-14 school year, student achievement growth will be 25% of the overall effectiveness rating. (Appendix J)
 - c During the 2014-15 school year, student achievement growth will be 40% of the overall effectiveness rating. (Appendix K)
 - d During the 2015-16 school year, student achievement growth will be 50% of the overall effectiveness rating. (Appendix L)

Probationary Teachers

Timeline

Process Step		Completion Date or Timeframe
Phase I	Pre-evaluation process with a review of the IDP	Completed by October 31
	Observations	Conducted September through January
Phase II	Reflection	Completed by January 31
	Midyear Progress Report for first year teachers and those considered minimally effective or ineffective	Completed by Friday of the second full week in February
	Observations	Conducted January through April
Phase III	Post-evaluation process	Scheduled during April or May
	Teacher Evaluation Form	Completed by May 31

Process

Phase I

A. The **Pre-Evaluation** process is to be completed by **October 31** for all teachers. Administrators are to meet with teachers to review the Teacher Evaluation Rubric (Appendix A), the completed Student Achievement Growth Analysis document (Appendix E), the annual Teacher Evaluation Form (Appendices I-L), and the Individualized Development Plan (Appendix G). Prior to a teacher's individual meeting with his or her administrator, a teacher must review the Teacher Evaluation Rubric. Teachers in their second through fifth year of probation must also review their previous year's evaluation.

1. Teachers will identify the specific assessment instruments from the Macomb County Dashboard (Appendix C) that they plan to use with their students to identify needs and monitor progress. Teachers will complete the Phase I section of the Student Achievement Growth Analysis document.
2. At the pre-evaluation conference, the teacher will review the pre-analysis results, present their findings, and describe a course of action as outlined in Phase I of the Student Achievement Growth Analysis document. The guiding questions will provide the basis for this written reflection.
3. The Student Achievement Growth Analysis must include two desired outcomes, to be reassessed by year's end, as well as student growth measures and strategies that will be utilized to reach the outcomes. The desired outcomes must be derived from the needs assessment, focused on student achievement and identify student growth measures.
4. The desired outcomes must be specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented and timely (SMART). The desired outcomes must support district goals and school improvement plans.
5. The pre-evaluation conference is intended to be a collaborative process between the teacher and administrator. The desired outcomes, growth measures, improvement strategies, and instruments for assessment will be approved by the administrator.
6. An Individualized Development Plan (IDP) will be reviewed and finalized during the pre-evaluation conference for all probationary teachers.

B. Observations are to be conducted during the months of **September, October, November, December, and January.**

1. The administrator will conduct scheduled observations which will include a pre-observation conference, observation, and a post-observation conference.
2. For all scheduled observations, the teacher will provide a written reflection on the lesson and the administrator will provide written feedback.
3. The administrator will identify and offer supports to assist the teacher.
4. In addition, multiple, unscheduled, untimed observations will be conducted. The number of observations, classroom visits, or instructional rounds (walk-throughs) will be based upon the improvement of the individual teacher.
5. Dates and times of observations must be recorded by the administrator on the Teacher Evaluation Form.

Phase II

A. Reflection

1. Engaging in a process of reflection on student growth projected in the desired outcomes established in Phase I with performance measured using the assessment instrument(s) from the Macomb County Dashboard, teachers complete the Phase II section of the Student Achievement Growth Analysis document and submit it to their administrator by **January 31**. The teacher will provide evidence of student achievement growth (Appendix D) identified in the desired outcomes.
2. By Friday of the second full week in February, the administrator will communicate in writing to the teacher their progress on the desired outcomes established in Phase I, progress on the goal(s) in the IDP, and the plan for professional development using the Midyear Progress Report (Appendix H).

B. Observations during the months of **January, February, March, and April**

1. The administrator will conduct scheduled observations which will include a pre-observation conference, observation, and a post-observation conference.
2. For all scheduled observations, the teacher will provide a written reflection on the lesson and the administrator will provide written feedback.
3. The administrator will identify and offer supports to assist the teacher.
4. In addition, multiple, unscheduled, untimed observations will be conducted. The number of observations, classroom visits, or instructional rounds (walk-throughs) will be based upon the improvement of the individual teacher.
5. Dates and times of observations must be recorded by the administrator on the Teacher Evaluation Form.

Phase III

A. **Post-evaluation** conducted during the months of **April or May**.

1. The administrator will schedule a conference with each teacher by the end of the school year.
 - a. During the conference the teacher will provide evidence of student achievement growth identified in the desired outcomes established in Phase I measured by the Macomb County Dashboard assessment(s) and will engage in a reflective conversation encompassing instructional strategies, results, successes, challenges, and areas of future growth.
 - b. After the conference the administrator will provide written feedback on the performance of each teacher using the Teacher Evaluation Form.
 - c. Any teacher on an IDP will receive written feedback in all areas of the domains of instructional practice as defined in the Teacher Evaluation Rubric.
2. Relevant data from the end of the year assessments will be used during the months of September and October of the next school year.
3. Teachers will receive the completed Teacher Evaluation Form for their signature no later than May 31.
4. Teachers hired after July 19, 2011 shall not be considered to have successfully completed the probationary period unless the teacher has been rated as highly effective or effective on his or her 3 most recent annual year-end performance evaluations and has completed at least 5 years of employment in a probationary period.
5. If a teacher hired after July 19, 2011 has been rated as highly effective on 3 consecutive annual year-end performance evaluations and has completed at least 4 full school years of employment in a probationary period, the teacher shall be considered to have successfully completed the probationary period.

B. Scoring Guide

1. The overall effectiveness rating is based on the effectiveness rating of each domain and student growth.
2. The effectiveness rating of an individual domain cannot be higher than the lowest component rating within that domain.
3. Student growth will be included in the overall effectiveness rating based on the following:

Highly effective = All students have demonstrated comprehensive growth and 90-100% of the desired outcomes have been achieved.

Effective = All students have demonstrated comprehensive growth and 70-89% of the desired outcomes have been achieved.

Minimally effective = Comprehensive student growth over time is inconsistent and/or random. Fifty to sixty-nine percent of the desired outcomes have been achieved.

Ineffective = Comprehensive student growth over time is not evident. Less than 50% of the desired outcomes have been achieved.

4. Student achievement growth will be included in the overall effectiveness rating based on the following percentages over time:
 - a. During the 2012-13 school year, student achievement growth will be 20% of the overall effectiveness rating. (Appendix I)
 - b. During the 2013-14 school year, student achievement growth will be 25% of the overall effectiveness rating. (Appendix J)
 - c. During the 2014-15 school year, student achievement growth will be 40% of the overall effectiveness rating. (Appendix K)
 - d. During the 2015-16 school year, student achievement growth will be 50% of the overall effectiveness rating. (Appendix L)

Appendices

Appendix A: Teacher Evaluation Rubric

Appendix B: Guidance for Establishing SMART Goals

Appendix C: Macomb County Dashboard

Appendix D: Types of Evidence

Appendix E: Student Achievement Growth Analysis

Appendix F: Individualized Development Plan for Teachers Rated Minimally Effective or Ineffective

Appendix G: Individualized Development Plan for First-Year Probationary Teachers and Probationary Teachers Rated Highly Effective or Effective

Appendix H: Midyear Progress Report

Appendix I: 2012-2013 Teacher Evaluation Form

Appendix J: 2013-2014 Teacher Evaluation Form

Appendix K: 2014-2015 Teacher Evaluation Form

Appendix L: 2015-2016 Teacher Evaluation Form

Appendix M: Definitions – Teacher Evaluation System

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix A

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

This page intentionally left blank



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

I. Planning and Preparation

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>1a: Knowledge of content and pedagogy</p>	<p>In planning and practice, teacher makes content errors or does not correct errors made by students. Teacher's plans and practice display little understanding of prerequisite relationships important to student's learning of the content. Teacher displays little or no understanding of the range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student's learning of the content.</p>	<p>Teacher is familiar with the important concepts in the discipline but displays lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another. Teacher's plans and practice indicate some awareness of prerequisite relationships, although such knowledge may be inaccurate or incomplete. Teacher's plans and practice reflect a limited range of pedagogical approaches to the discipline or to the students.</p>	<p>Teacher displays solid knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and the ways they relate to one another. Teacher's plans and practice reflect accurate understanding of prerequisite relationships Teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline.</p>	<p>Teacher displays extensive knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and the ways they relate both to one another and to other disciplines. Teacher's plans and practice reflect understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts and provide a link to necessary cognitive structures needed by students to ensure understanding. Teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline, anticipating student misconceptions.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

I. Planning and Preparation (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
1b: Demonstrating knowledge of students.	Teacher demonstrates little or no understanding of how students learn and little knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs and does not seek such understanding.	Teacher indicates the importance of understanding how students learn and the students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge about the class as a whole.	Teacher understands the active nature of student learning and attains information about levels of development for groups of students. The teacher also purposefully seeks knowledge from several sources of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs and attains this knowledge about groups of students.	Teacher actively seeks knowledge of students' levels of development and their backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs from a variety of sources. This information is acquired for individual students.

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

I. Planning and Preparation (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>1c: Setting instructional outcomes</p>	<p>Outcomes represent low expectations for students and lack of rigor, and not all of them reflect important learning in the discipline.</p> <p>Outcomes are stated as activities rather than as student learning.</p> <p>Outcomes reflect only one type of learning and only one discipline or strand and are suitable for only some students.</p>	<p>Outcomes represent moderately high expectations and rigor.</p> <p>Some reflect important learning in the discipline and consist of a combination of outcomes and activities.</p> <p>Outcomes reflect several types of learning, but teacher has made no attempt at coordination or integration.</p> <p>Most of the outcomes are suitable for most of the students in the class in accordance with global assessments of student learning.</p>	<p>Most outcomes represent rigorous and important learning in the discipline.</p> <p>All the instructional outcomes are clear, are written in the form of student learning, and suggest viable methods of assessment.</p> <p>Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and opportunities for coordination.</p> <p>Outcomes take into account the varying needs of groups of students.</p>	<p>All outcomes represent rigorous and important learning in the discipline.</p> <p>The outcomes are clear, are written in the form of student learning, and permit viable methods of assessment.</p> <p>Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and, where appropriate, represent opportunities for both coordination and integration.</p> <p>Outcomes take into account the varying needs of individual students.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

I. Planning and Preparation (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
1d. Demonstrating knowledge of resources	Teacher is unaware of school or district resources for classroom use, for the expansion of his or her own knowledge, or for students.	Teacher displays basic awareness of school or district resources available for classroom use, for the expansion of his or her own knowledge, and for students, but no knowledge of resources available more broadly.	Teacher displays awareness of resources—not only through the school and district but also through sources external to the school and on the Internet—available for classroom use, for the expansion of his or her own knowledge, and for students.	Teacher displays extensive knowledge of resources—not only through the school and district but also in the community, through professional organizations and universities, and on the Internet—for classroom use, for the expansion of his or her own knowledge, and for students.

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

I. Planning and Preparation (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>1e. Designing coherent instruction</p>	<p>The series of learning experiences is poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes and does not represent a coherent structure.</p> <p>The activities are not designed to engage students in active intellectual activity and have unrealistic time allocations. Instructional groups do not support the instructional outcomes and offer no variety.</p>	<p>Some of the learning activities and materials are suitable to the instructional outcomes and represent a moderate cognitive challenge but with no differentiation for different students.</p> <p>Instructional groups partially support the instructional outcomes, with an effort by the teacher at providing some variety.</p> <p>The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure; the progression of activities is uneven, with most time allocations reasonable.</p>	<p>Teacher coordinates knowledge of content, of students, and of resources, to design a series of learning experiences aligned to instructional outcomes and suitable to groups of students.</p> <p>The learning activities have reasonable time allocations; they represent significant cognitive challenge, with some differentiation for different groups of students.</p> <p>The lesson or unit has a clear structure, with appropriate and varied use of instructional groups.</p>	<p>Plans represent the coordination of in-depth content knowledge, understanding of different students' needs, and available resources (including technology), resulting in a series of learning activities designed to engage students in high-level cognitive activity.</p> <p>Learning activities are differentiated appropriately for individual learners. Instructional groups are varied appropriately with some opportunity for student choice.</p> <p>The lesson's or unit's structure is clear and allows for different pathways according to diverse student needs.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

I. Planning and Preparation (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
1f. Designing student assessments	<p>Assessment procedures are not congruent with instructional outcomes; the proposed approach contains no criteria or standards.</p> <p>Teacher has no plan to incorporate formative assessment in the lesson or unit nor any plan to use assessment results in designing future instruction.</p>	<p>Some of the instructional outcomes are assessed through the proposed approach, but others are not.</p> <p>Assessment criteria and standards have been developed, but they are not clear.</p> <p>Approach to the use of formative assessment is rudimentary, including only some of the instructional outcomes.</p> <p>Teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for the class as a whole.</p>	<p>Teacher's plan for student assessment is aligned with the instructional outcomes, assessment methodologies may have been adapted for groups of students.</p> <p>Assessment criteria and standards are clear. Teacher has a well-developed strategy for using formative assessment and has designed particular approaches to be used.</p> <p>Teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for groups of students.</p>	<p>Teacher's plan for student assessment is fully aligned with the instructional outcomes and has clear criteria and standards that show evidence of student contribution to their development.</p> <p>Assessment methodologies have been adapted for individual students, as needed.</p> <p>The approach to using formative assessment is well designed and includes student as well as teacher use of the assessment information.</p> <p>Teacher intends to use assessment results to plan future instruction for individual students.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

II. The Classroom Environment

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
2a. Creating an environment of respect and rapport	<p>Patterns of classroom interactions, both between teacher and students and among students, are mostly negative, inappropriate, or insensitive to students' ages, cultural backgrounds, and developmental levels.</p> <p>Interactions are characterized by sarcasm, put-downs, or conflict.</p> <p>Teacher does not deal with disrespectful behavior.</p>	<p>Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the teacher and students and among students, are generally appropriate but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, and disregard for students' ages, cultures, and developmental levels.</p> <p>Students rarely demonstrate disrespect for one another.</p> <p>Teacher attempts to respond to disrespectful behavior, with uneven results. The net result of the interactions is neutral, conveying neither warmth nor conflict.</p>	<p>Teacher-student interactions are friendly and demonstrate general caring and respect. Such interactions are appropriate to the ages of the students.</p> <p>Students exhibit respect for the teacher. Interactions among students are generally polite and respectful.</p> <p>Teacher responds successfully to disrespectful behavior among students. The net result of the interactions is polite and respectful, but impersonal.</p>	<p>Classroom interactions among the teacher and individual students are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring and sensitivity to students as individuals.</p> <p>Students exhibit respect for the teacher and contribute to high levels of civil interaction between all members of the class. The net result of interactions is that of connections with students as individuals.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

II. The Classroom Environment (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>2b. Establishing a culture for learning</p>	<p>The classroom culture is characterized by a lack of teacher or student commitment to learning and/or little or no investment of student energy into the task at hand. Hard work is not expected or valued.</p> <p>Medium or low expectations for student achievement are the norm, with high expectations for learning reserved for only one or two students.</p>	<p>The classroom culture is characterized by little commitment to learning by teacher or students.</p> <p>The teacher appears to be only going through the motions, and students indicate that they are interested in completion of a task, rather than quality.</p> <p>The teacher conveys that student success is the result of natural ability rather than hard work; high expectations for learning are reserved for those students thought to have a natural aptitude for the subject.</p>	<p>The classroom culture is a cognitively busy place where learning is valued by all, with high expectations for learning being the norm for most students.</p> <p>The teacher conveys that with hard work students can be successful.</p> <p>Students understand their role as learners and consistently expend effort to learn.</p> <p>Classroom interactions support learning and hard work.</p>	<p>The classroom culture is a cognitively vibrant place, characterized by a shared belief in the importance of learning.</p> <p>The teacher conveys high expectations for learning by all students and insists on hard work.</p> <p>Students assume responsibility for high quality by initiating improvements, making revisions, adding detail, and/or helping peers.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

II. The Classroom Environment (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
2c. Managing classroom procedures	<p>Much instructional time is lost through inefficient classroom routines and procedures.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that the teacher is managing instructional groups, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies effectively.</p> <p>There is little evidence that students know or follow established routines.</p>	<p>Some instructional time is lost through only partially effective classroom routines and procedures.</p> <p>The teacher's management of instructional groups, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies is inconsistent, the result being some disruption of learning.</p> <p>With regular guidance and prompting, students follow established routines.</p>	<p>There is little loss of instructional time because of effective classroom routines and procedures.</p> <p>The teacher's management of instructional groups and the handling of materials and supplies are consistently successful.</p> <p>With minimal guidance and prompting, students follow established classroom routines.</p>	<p>Instructional time is maximized because of efficient classroom routines and procedures.</p> <p>Students contribute to the management of instructional groups, transitions, and the handling of materials and supplies.</p> <p>Routines are well understood and may be initiated by students.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

II. The Classroom Environment (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
2d. Managing student behavior	<p>There appear to be no established standards of conduct and little or no teacher monitoring of student behavior.</p> <p>Students challenge the standards of conduct.</p> <p>Response to students' misbehavior is repressive or disrespectful of student dignity.</p>	<p>Standards of conduct appear to have been established, but their implementation is inconsistent.</p> <p>Teacher tries, with uneven results, to monitor student behavior and respond to student misbehavior.</p> <p>There is inconsistent implementation of the standards of conduct.</p>	<p>Student behavior is generally appropriate.</p> <p>The teacher monitors student behavior against established standards of conduct.</p> <p>Teacher response to student misbehavior is consistent, proportionate, respectful to students, and effective.</p>	<p>Student behavior is entirely appropriate.</p> <p>Students take an active role in monitoring their own behavior and that of other students against standards of conduct.</p> <p>Teachers' monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventative.</p> <p>Teacher's response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs and respects students' dignity.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

II. The Classroom Environment (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
2e. Organizing physical space	<p>The physical environment is unsafe, or many students don't have access to learning resources.</p> <p>There is poor coordination between the lesson activities and the arrangement of furniture and resources, including computer technology.</p>	<p>The classroom is safe, and essential learning is accessible to most students.</p> <p>The teacher's use of physical resources, including computer technology, is moderately effective.</p> <p>Teacher makes some attempt to modify the physical arrangement to suit learning activities, with partial success.</p>	<p>The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; teacher ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities.</p> <p>Teacher makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology.</p>	<p>The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students, including those with special needs.</p> <p>Teacher makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology. The teacher ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities.</p> <p>Students contribute to the use or adaptation of the physical environment to advance learning.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

III. Instruction

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
3a. Communicating with students	<p>The instructional purpose of the lesson is unclear to students, and the directions and procedures are confusing.</p> <p>The teacher's explanation of the content contains major errors.</p> <p>The teacher's spoken or written language contains errors of grammar or syntax.</p> <p>The teacher's vocabulary is inappropriate, vague, or used incorrectly, leaving students confused.</p>	<p>The teacher's attempt to explain the instructional purpose has only limited success, and/or directions and procedures must be clarified after initial student confusion.</p> <p>The teacher's explanation of the content may contain minor errors; some portions are clear; other portions are difficult to follow.</p> <p>The teacher's explanation consists of a monologue, with no invitation to the students for intellectual engagement.</p> <p>Teacher's spoken language is correct; however, his or her vocabulary is limited, or not fully appropriate to the students' ages or backgrounds.</p>	<p>The teacher clearly communicates instructional purpose of the lesson, including where it is situated within broader learning, and explains procedures and directions clearly.</p> <p>Teacher's explanation of content is well scaffolded, clear and accurate, and connects with students' knowledge and experience.</p> <p>During the explanation of content, the teacher invites student intellectual engagement.</p> <p>Teacher's spoken and written language is clear and correct and uses vocabulary appropriate to the students' ages and interests.</p>	<p>The teacher links the instructional purpose of the lesson to student interests; the directions and procedures are clear and anticipate possible student misunderstanding.</p> <p>The teacher's explanation of content is thorough and clear, developing conceptual understanding through artful scaffolding and connecting with students' interests.</p> <p>Students contribute to extending the content and help explain concepts to their classmates.</p> <p>The teacher's spoken and written language is expressive, and the teacher finds opportunities to extend students' vocabularies.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

III. Instruction (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
3b. Questioning and discussion techniques	<p>Teacher's questions are of low cognitive challenge, require single correct responses, and are asked in rapid succession.</p> <p>Interaction between teacher and students is predominantly recitation style, with the teacher mediating all questions and answers.</p> <p>A few students dominate the discussion.</p>	<p>Teacher's questions lead students through a single path of inquiry, with answers seemingly determined in advance.</p> <p>Alternatively, the teacher attempts to frame some questions designed to promote student thinking and understanding, but only a few students are involved.</p> <p>Teacher attempts to engage all students in the discussion and to encourage them to respond to one another, but with uneven results.</p>	<p>Although the teacher may use some low-level questions, he or she asks the students questions designed to promote thinking and understanding.</p> <p>Teacher creates a genuine discussion among students, providing adequate time for students to respond and stepping aside when appropriate.</p> <p>Teacher successfully engages most students in the discussion, employing a range of strategies to ensure that most students are heard.</p>	<p>Teacher uses a variety or series of questions or prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high-level thinking and discourse, and promote metacognition.</p> <p>Students formulate many questions, initiate topics, and make unsolicited contributions.</p> <p>Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discussion.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS
Teacher Evaluation Rubric

III. Instruction (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>3c. Engaging students in learning.</p>	<p>The learning tasks and activities, materials, resources, instructional groups and technology are poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes or require only rote responses.</p> <p>The pace of the lesson is too slow or too rushed.</p> <p>Few students are intellectually engaged or interested.</p>	<p>The learning tasks and activities are partially aligned with the instructional outcomes but require only minimal thinking by students, allowing most to be passive or merely compliant.</p> <p>The pacing of the lesson may not provide students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.</p>	<p>The learning tasks and activities are aligned with the instructional outcomes and designed to challenge student thinking, the result being that most students display active intellectual engagement with important and challenging content and are supported in that engagement by teacher scaffolding.</p> <p>The pacing of the lesson is appropriate, providing most students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.</p>	<p>Virtually all students are intellectually engaged in challenging content through well-designed learning tasks and suitable scaffolding by the teacher and fully aligned with the instructional outcomes.</p> <p>In addition, there is evidence of some student initiation of inquiry and of student contribution to the exploration of important content.</p> <p>The pacing of the lesson provides students the time needed to intellectually engage with and reflect upon their learning and to consolidate their understanding.</p> <p>Students may have some choice in how they complete tasks and may serve as resources for one another.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS
Teacher Evaluation Rubric

III. Instruction (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
3d. Using assessment in instruction	<p>There is little or no assessment or monitoring of student learning; feedback is absent or of poor quality.</p> <p>Students do not appear to be aware of the assessment criteria and do not engage in self-assessment.</p>	<p>Assessment is used sporadically by teacher and/or students to support instruction through some monitoring of progress in learning.</p> <p>Feedback to students is general, students appear to be only partially aware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work, and few assess their own work.</p> <p>Questions, prompts, and assessments are rarely used to diagnose evidence of learning.</p>	<p>Assessment is used regularly by teacher and/or students during the lesson through monitoring of learning progress and results in accurate, specific feedback that advances learning.</p> <p>Students appear to be aware of the assessment criteria; some of them engage in self-assessment.</p> <p>Questions, prompts, assessments are used to diagnose evidence of learning.</p>	<p>Assessment is fully integrated into instruction through extensive use of formative assessment.</p> <p>Students appear to be aware of, and there is some evidence that they have contributed to, the assessment criteria.</p> <p>Students self-assess and monitor their progress.</p> <p>A variety of feedback, from both their teacher and their peers, is accurate, specific, and advances learning.</p> <p>Questions, prompts, assessments are used regularly to diagnose evidence of learning by individual students.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

III. Instruction (Continued)				
Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
3e. Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness	<p>Teacher adheres to the instruction plan in spite of evidence of poor student understanding or lack of interest.</p> <p>Teacher ignores student questions; when students experience difficulty, the teacher blames the students or their home environment.</p>	<p>Teacher attempts to modify the lesson when needed and to respond to student questions and interests, with moderate success.</p> <p>Teacher accepts responsibility for student success but has only a limited repertoire of strategies to draw upon.</p>	<p>Teacher promotes the successful learning of all students, making minor adjustments as needed to instruction plans and accommodating student questions, needs, and interests.</p> <p>Drawing on a broad repertoire of strategies, the teacher persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning.</p>	<p>Teacher seizes an opportunity to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous event or student interests, or successfully adjusts and differentiates instruction to address individual student misunderstandings.</p> <p>Teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help, using an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies and soliciting additional resources from the school or community.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

IV. Professional Responsibilities

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
4a. Reflecting on teaching	<p>Teacher does not know whether a lesson was effective or achieved its instructional outcomes, or he/she profoundly misjudges the success of a lesson.</p> <p>Teacher has no suggestions for how a lesson could be improved.</p>	<p>Teacher has a generally accurate impression of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which instructional outcomes were met.</p> <p>Teacher makes general suggestions about how a lesson could be improved.</p>	<p>Teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes and can cite general references to support the judgment.</p> <p>Teacher makes a few specific suggestions of what could be tried another time the lesson is taught.</p>	<p>Teacher makes a thoughtful and accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes, citing many specific examples from the lesson and weighing the relative strengths of each.</p> <p>Drawing on an extensive repertoire of skills, teacher offers specific alternative actions, complete with the probable success of different courses of action.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

IV. Professional Responsibilities (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
4b. Maintaining accurate records	<p>Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments and student progress in learning is nonexistent or in disarray.</p> <p>Teacher's records for noninstructional activities are in disarray, resulting in errors and confusion.</p>	<p>Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments and student progress in learning is rudimentary and only partially effective.</p> <p>Teacher's records for noninstructional activities are adequate but require frequent monitoring to avoid errors.</p>	<p>Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and noninstructional records is fully effective.</p>	<p>Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and noninstructional records is fully effective.</p> <p>Students contribute information and participate in maintaining the records.</p>
4c. Communicating with families	<p>Teacher communication with families—about the instructional program, about individual students—is sporadic or culturally inappropriate.</p> <p>Teacher makes no attempt to engage families in the instructional program.</p>	<p>Teacher makes sporadic attempts to communicate with families about the instructional program and about the progress of individual students but does not attempt to engage families in the instructional program.</p> <p>Communications are one-way and not always appropriate to the cultural norms of those families.</p>	<p>Teacher communicates frequently with families about the instructional program and conveys information about individual student progress.</p> <p>Teacher makes some attempts to engage families in the instructional program.</p> <p>Information to families is conveyed in a culturally appropriate manner.</p>	<p>Teacher's communication with families is frequent and sensitive to cultural traditions, with students contributing to the communication.</p> <p>Response to family concerns is handled with professional and cultural sensitivity.</p> <p>Teacher's efforts to engage families in the instructional program are frequent and successful.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Rubric

IV. Professional Responsibilities (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
4d. Participating in a professional community	<p>Teacher's relationships with colleagues are negative or self-serving.</p> <p>Teacher avoids participation in a professional culture of inquiry, resisting opportunities to become involved.</p> <p>Teacher avoids becoming involved in school events or school and district projects.</p>	<p>Teacher maintains cordial relationships with colleagues to fulfill duties that the school or district requires.</p> <p>Teacher becomes involved in the school's culture of professional inquiry when invited to do so.</p> <p>Teacher participates in school events and school and district projects when specifically asked to do so.</p>	<p>Teacher's relationships with colleagues are characterized by mutual support and cooperation; teacher actively participates in a culture of professional inquiry.</p> <p>Teacher volunteers to participate in school events and in school and district projects, making a substantial contribution.</p>	<p>Teacher's relationships with colleagues are characterized by mutual support and cooperation, with the teacher taking initiative in assuming leadership among the faculty.</p> <p>Teacher takes a leadership role in promoting a culture of professional inquiry.</p> <p>Teacher volunteers to participate in school events and district projects making a substantial contribution, and assuming a leadership role in at least one aspect of school or district life.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS
Teacher Evaluation Rubric

IV. Professional Responsibilities (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>4e. Growing and developing professionally</p>	<p>Teacher engages in no professional development activities to enhance knowledge or skill.</p> <p>Teacher resists feedback on teaching performance from either supervisors or more experienced colleagues.</p> <p>Teacher makes no effort to share knowledge with others or to assume professional responsibilities.</p>	<p>Teacher participates in professional activities to a limited extent when they are convenient.</p> <p>Teacher accepts, with some reluctance, feedback on teaching performance from both supervisors and colleagues.</p> <p>Teacher finds limited ways to contribute to the profession.</p>	<p>Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill.</p> <p>Teacher welcomes feedback from colleagues—either when made by supervisors or when opportunities arise through professional collaboration.</p> <p>Teacher participates actively in assisting other educators.</p>	<p>Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development and makes a systematic effort to conduct action research.</p> <p>Teacher seeks out feedback on teaching from both supervisors and colleagues.</p> <p>Teacher initiates important activities to contribute to the profession.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS
Teacher Evaluation Rubric

IV. Professional Responsibilities (Continued)

Component	Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>4f. Showing professionalism</p>	<p>Teacher displays dishonesty in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public.</p> <p>Teacher is not alert to students' needs and contributes to school practices that result in some students' being ill served by the school.</p> <p>Teacher makes decisions and recommendations based on self-serving interests. Teacher does not comply with school and district regulations.</p>	<p>Teacher is honest in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public.</p> <p>Teacher attempts, though inconsistently, to serve students. Teacher does not knowingly contribute to some students' being ill served by the school.</p> <p>Teacher's decisions and recommendations are based on limited but genuinely professional considerations.</p> <p>Teacher complies minimally with school and district regulations, doing just enough to get by.</p>	<p>Teacher displays high standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public.</p> <p>Teacher is active in serving students, working to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to succeed.</p> <p>Teacher maintains an open mind in team or departmental decision making.</p> <p>Teacher complies fully with school and district regulations.</p>	<p>Teacher takes a leadership role with colleagues and can be counted on to hold to the highest standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality.</p> <p>Teacher is highly proactive in serving students, seeking out resources when needed.</p> <p>Teacher makes a concerted effort to challenge negative attitudes or practices to ensure that all students, particularly those traditionally underserved, are honored in the school.</p> <p>Teacher takes a leadership role in team or departmental decision making and helps ensure that such decisions are based on the highest professional standards.</p> <p>Teacher complies fully with school and district regulations, taking a leadership role with colleagues.</p>

Adopted from the work of Charlotte Danielson, *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument* (2011).

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix B

Guidance for Establishing SMART Goals

This page intentionally left blank

Guidance for Establishing SMART Goals

Teachers are to create desired outcomes as part of Phase I of the Student Achievement Growth Analysis document using the SMART goal format. **SMART** Goals are specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound.

Specific

A goal should be simplistically written and clearly define what is going to be achieved. The goal should focus on student growth in a specific subject area, course, grade level, or student population.

Examples of how students may be grouped:

Subject area (English Language Arts), course (U.S. History 1900-present), Health and Wellness, grade level (Grade 3), learning needs of students (students with an Individual Education Plan)

Measurable

A goal should be measurable so tangible evidence exists that the goal has been accomplished. The goal should name the amount of growth the students will attain.

Examples of phrases that reflect a measure of growth:

Increase writing skill by 25%, demonstrate a gain of 10 percentage points, improve by one full letter grade, one year's growth

Attainable

A goal should be achievable; it should stretch the students so they feel challenged, but defined well enough so the goal can be achieved. The amount of growth should be realistic.

Results-oriented

A goal should measure outcomes, not activities. The result of the goal should be clear. The goal should be consistent with district and school improvement goals.

Examples of words that support results:

Increase, improve, decrease, reduce, change, demonstrate achievement gains

Time-bound

A timeframe should be identified to accomplish the goal. A goal should be linked to a timeframe that creates a practical sense of urgency.

Examples of phrases that specify a timeframe:

By the end of each quarter, by the end of the semester, by May 1, by the end of the school year

Adapted from the work of Richard DuFour, *Learning by Doing* (2010)

This page intentionally left blank

Suggested Format for establishing SMART goals

Percentage of _____ (student group) _____ scoring at proficiency or higher in _____ (content area) _____ will increase from _____% to _____% by the end of _____ school year as measured by _____ (assessment tool) _____ administered in _____ (month, time of year) _____ .

Examples of SMART goals:

Elementary School

The students in my grade 3 classroom will demonstrate one year's growth in reading by May 1 as measured by the QRI.

The percentage of kindergarten students scoring at an 80% or higher on the end-of-year math assessment will increase from 88% to 93% as compared to the spring mathematics assessment from the previous school year.

Junior High School

The percentage of 7th grade students scoring a four or higher on the building writing assessment will increase from 78% to 84% as measured on the UCS 6 point writing rubric administered in September and May.

All students enrolled in Math 8 will score at proficiency or higher on the UCS Math 8 Semester 2 Exam.

By the end of each semester, the Health and Wellness students will improve their performance on the pre/post test by 50 percentage points.

High School

By the end of the school year, all English 11 students will improve their writing skills, as measured by the ACT Writing rubric, by 25%. Students with a beginning score of 6 will maintain that score through the end of the year.

The students with IEP's in my U.S. History 1900-Present course will increase their performance on the pre/post-test by one full letter grade by the end of the semester.

The percentage of 10th grade students scoring at an 80% or higher will increase from 82% to 88% as measured on the end of course English 10 assessment administered in June. (The 82% would be taken from the end of course results from the previous school year.)

Music

Using a 20 point scale, all 6th grade students will achieve 17 or more points on the scale to play a song on their instrument at the end of the semester performance.

Using a 4 point rubric, all 4th grade students will be able to perform four measures of level appropriate rhythms while keeping a steady beat.

Physical Education

All 9th grade students will improve their fitness level by 10% in muscle strength endurance, cardio-respiratory endurance, speed, agility, and flexibility on the end of course Presidential Challenge fitness test.

Visual Arts

All students will recognize, apply, and understand the Elements of Art and Principles of Design within a work of art by the end of the school year through quizzes, project reflections, rubrics, and critiques.

All students will demonstrate their understanding of artistic concepts on the end of the semester sculpture project by achieving 80% proficiency or higher on levels 5 or 6 on the six-point rubric.

All students in Advanced Placement Art will achieve a 5 or 6 on a six-point rubric demonstrating advanced techniques with a variety of mediums by combining two art elements of their choice to produce a sculpted representation of a masterpiece from a medium.

Appendix C

Macomb County Dashboard

This page intentionally left blank

Macomb County Dashboard

Student Growth Measures

Elementary (Grades K-5/6)	Secondary (Grades 6/7-8/9)	Secondary (Grades 9/10-12)
MEAP Scale Scores (Grades 2-5/6)	MEAP Scale Scores (Grades 6 &7)	MME Scale Scores (Grades 9/10-11)
MLPP (Grades K-3)	Department Common Assessments (Pre & Post) (Grades 6/7-8/9)	Department Common Assessments (Pre & Post) (Grades 9/10-12)
DIBELS (Grades K-3)	# of Students Pass/Fail Rate (Grades 6/7-8/9)	# of Students-Credit Earned (Grades 9/10-12)
Common Assessment/Content Area (Grades K-5/6)	Standardized Test Results (NWEA; Iowa) (Grades 6/7-8/9)	AP Test Scores (Grades 10-12)
Standardized Test Results (Grades K-5/6)	Student Performance Project Based (Grades K-6/7-8/9)	Graduation Rates (Grades 9/10-12)
Student Performance Project Based (Grades K-5/6)	Explore/Plan (Grades 8/9/10)	ACT Work Keys (Grades 9/10-11)
<u>Special Education:</u> IEP Goals MI-Access Brigance Inventory Woodcock Johnson	<u>Special Education:</u> IEP Goals MI-Access Brigance Inventory Woodcock Johnson	Student Performance Project Based (Grades 9/10-12)
Other	Other	Explore/Plan (Grades 9/10)
		<u>Special Education:</u> IEP Goals MI-Access Brigance Inventory Woodcock Johnson
		Other

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix D

Types of Evidence

This page intentionally left blank

Types of Evidence

The purpose of this list is to provide ideas regarding the types of evidence that teachers and students may produce to highlight effective instructional practice and growth in student learning. By no means is this list exhaustive or required.

- National, state, and district data reports
- Performance assessments that include scoring rubrics
- Project-based learning activity
- Student feedback reports on learning activities
- Data/feedback collected by a peer, colleague, or administrator
- Observation data collected by the teacher
- Artifacts collected from professional development
- Student writing samples (scored using a rubric)
- Teaching units
- Video tapes of lessons/student performances
- Computer and software programs used by the teacher to personalize instruction
- Charts, tables, or graphs that demonstrate and effectively display student progress on curricular goals
- Parent contact and conference logs

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix E

Student Achievement Growth Analysis

This page intentionally left blank



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Student Achievement Growth Analysis

Teacher Name: _____ Building/Assignment: _____

Hire Date: _____ Employee Number: _____

Evaluator: _____ School Year: _____

PHASE I

<p>Pre-Analysis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What have I learned about my students and their needs as a class, as sub-groups, and as individuals? 2. What data/assessments/evidence was used to obtain this information?
<p>Desired Outcome #1</p>
<p>Student Growth Measures and Strategies #1</p>
<p>Desired Outcome #2</p>
<p>Student Growth Measures and Strategies #2</p>

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Administrator: _____ Date: _____

PHASE I TO BE COMPLETED BY OCTOBER 31

PHASE II

Evidence of student achievement growth from progress monitoring for outcome #1:

Evidence of student achievement growth from progress monitoring for outcome #2:

Guiding Questions:

1. Based on the data, explain what impact the change in your instructional practice (s) had on student achievement growth as a class, as subgroups, and as individuals.
2. Based on the response to question #1, what will you do differently to address the needs of the class, subgroups, and individuals?

PHASE II TO BE COMPLETED BY JANUARY 31-TEACHER

Feedback from Administrator:

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Administrator: _____ Date: _____

PHASE II TO BE COMPLETED BY THE FRIDAY OF THE 2nd FULL WEEK IN FEBRUARY-ADMINISTRATION

Appendix F

Individualized Development Plan for Teachers Rated Minimally Effective or Ineffective

This page intentionally left blank

UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Guide to Developing an Individualized Development Plan for a Tenured Teacher Rated Minimally Effective or Ineffective on an Annual Year-End Performance Evaluation

If the teacher has received a rating of minimally effective or ineffective on an annual year-end performance evaluation, the district shall provide the teacher with an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) developed by appropriate administrative personnel in consultation with the individual teacher. The IDP shall require the teacher to make progress toward individual development goals within a specified time period, not to exceed 180 days. The annual year-end performance evaluation shall include an assessment of the teacher's progress in meeting the goals of his or her IDP.

The purpose of the IDP is to assist the tenured teacher in improving and is not intended to be punitive. When concerns emerge, the administrator will provide the teacher with feedback.

Similar to an IDP for a probationary teacher, the teacher's input is sought when developing the specifics of the improvement plan. However, if a teacher is non-compliant mutual agreement is not necessary to implement the plan.

An IDP for a tenured teacher must address the specific area(s) on the year-end evaluation where a minimally effective or ineffective rating has been earned. The IDP represents a guide for the teacher to improve his or her performance and will include the appropriate level of detail.

The IDP framework includes:

- Identification of the areas rated minimally effective or ineffective with clear expectations for the measurable final outcome.
- Identification of the measures of performance that will be used to document improvement, no improvement, and/or a decline in performance.
- Identification of the strategies, techniques, and related details which may assist the teacher in reaching a future highly effective or effective performance rating.
- Any other assistance the administration will provide which may assist the teacher in reaching a future highly effective or effective performance rating.
- Timeline for monitoring progress of goal(s), not to exceed 180 days from implementation to improvement.

At the conclusion of the IDP, not to exceed 180 days from implementation, the administrator shall provide a written report of progress relating to the IDP to the teacher.

If a teacher is rated as ineffective on three consecutive annual year-end evaluations, the district shall dismiss the teacher from his or her employment.



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Individualized Development Plan for a Teacher Rated Minimally Effective or Ineffective on an Annual Year-End Performance Evaluation

Teacher Name: _____ **Building/Assignment:** _____

Hire Date: _____ **Employee Number:** _____

Evaluator: _____ **School Year:** _____

An IDP must address the specific area(s) on the year-end evaluation where an ineffective or minimally effective rating has been earned. The IDP represents a guide for the teacher to improve his or her performance and will include the appropriate level of detail.

The IDP framework includes:

- Identification of the areas rated ineffective or minimally effective with clear expectations for the measurable final outcome.
- Identification of the measures of performance that will be used to document improvement, no improvement, or a decline in performance.
- Identification of the strategies, techniques, and related details which may assist the teacher in reaching a future highly effective or effective performance rating.
- Any other assistance the administration will provide which may assist the teacher in reaching a future highly effective or effective performance rating.
- Timeline for monitoring progress of goal(s), not to exceed 180 days from implementation to improvement.

Individualized Development Plan:

(Box expands as needed)

Teacher: _____ **Date:** _____

Administrator: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix G

Individualized Development Plan for First-Year Probationary Teachers and Probationary Teachers

Rated Highly Effective or Effective

This page intentionally left blank

UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Guide to Developing an Individualized Development Plan for First Year Probationary Teachers and Probationary Teachers Rated Highly Effective or Effective on an Annual Year-End Performance Evaluation

The district shall provide a probationary teacher with an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) developed by appropriate administrative personnel in consultation with the individual teacher. The IDP shall require the teacher to make progress toward individual development goals throughout the school year.

The purpose of the IDP is to assist the probationary teacher in developing effective instructional practices. If concerns emerge during the school year, the administrator will provide the teacher with feedback.

The teacher's input is sought when developing the specifics of the improvement plan. The IDP represents a guide for the teacher to develop his or her performance and will include the appropriate level of detail.

The IDP framework includes:

- Identification of the areas of focus with clear expectations for the measurable final outcome.
- Identification of the measures that will be used to document performance.
- Identification of the strategies, techniques, and related details which may assist the teacher in reaching a highly effective or effective performance rating.
- Any other assistance the administration will provide which may assist the teacher in reaching a highly effective or effective performance rating.
- Timeline for monitoring progress of goal(s) from implementation to effective performance.

The annual year-end performance evaluation shall include an assessment of the teacher's progress in meeting the goals of his or her IDP.



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Individualized Development Plan for First Year Probationary Teachers and Probationary Teachers Rated Highly Effective or Effective on an Annual Year-End Performance Evaluation

Teacher Name: _____ Building/Assignment: _____

Hire Date: _____ Employee Number: _____

Evaluator: _____ School Year: _____

Year of Probation: 1 2 3 4 5

The IDP represents a guide for the teacher to develop his or her performance and will include the appropriate level of detail.

The IDP framework includes:

- Identification of the areas of focus with clear expectations for the measurable final outcome.
- Identification of the measures that will be used to document performance.
- Identification of the strategies, techniques, and related details which may assist the teacher in reaching a highly effective or effective performance rating.
- Any other assistance the administration will provide which may assist the teacher in reaching a highly effective or effective performance rating.
- Timeline for monitoring progress of goal(s) from implementation to effective performance.

Individualized Development Plan:

(Box expands as needed)

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Administrator: _____ Date: _____

Appendix H

Midyear Progress Report

This page intentionally left blank



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Midyear Progress Report

Teacher Name: _____ Building/Assignment: _____

Hire Date: _____ Employee Number: _____

Evaluator: _____ School Year: _____

Progress on Goal #1

Professional Development Plan

Progress on Goal #2

Professional Development Plan

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Administrator: _____ Date: _____

Used for:

- 1st year Probationary Teachers
- Probationary Teachers rated "Minimally Effective" or "Ineffective" in his or her most recent year-end evaluation
- Tenured teachers rated "Minimally Effective" or "Ineffective" in his or her most recent year-end evaluation

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix I

2012-2013 Teacher Evaluation Form

This page intentionally left blank



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Form (2012-13)

Name: _____ Assignment: _____ Building(s): _____ Tenure YES _____ NO _____
 Employee Number: _____ Evaluator: _____ School Year: 2012-13

Date:	<u>Pre-Evaluation Meeting</u>		<u>Date of Observations</u>	
	Date:	Subject:	Date/Time:	Subject:
<input type="checkbox"/> Year 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Year 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Year 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Year 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Year 5 *hired after 7/19/2011				
	Highly Effective 3	Effectively 2	Minimally Effective 1	Ineffective 0
I. Planning and Preparation (Knowledge of content and pedagogy; demonstrating knowledge of students; setting instructional outcomes; demonstrating knowledge of resources; designing coherent instruction; designing student assessments)				
II. The Classroom Environment (Creating an environment of respect and rapport; establishing a culture for learning; managing classroom procedures; managing student behavior; organizing physical space)				
III. Instruction (Communicating with students; questioning and discussion techniques; engages students in learning; using assessment in instruction; demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness)				
IV. Professional Responsibilities (Reflecting on teaching; maintaining accurate records; communicating with families; participating in a professional community; growing and developing professionally; showing professionalism)				
Demonstration of Student Learning (20% of overall effectiveness rating)				
Overall Rating <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Minimally Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Ineffective				

Comments:

Administrator's Signature

*Teacher's Signature

*(The teacher's signature only indicates receipt of this document)

Date:

Date:

The teacher may submit a written response to this evaluation with a copy to be attached to this document and placed in his/her personnel file.

Adopted:

Appendix J

2013-2014 Teacher Evaluation Form

This page intentionally left blank



**UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS
Teacher Evaluation Form (2013-14)**

Name: _____ Assignment: _____ Building(s): _____ Tenure YES _____ NO _____

Employee Number: _____ Evaluator: _____ School Year: 2013-14

Non Tenure Year <input type="checkbox"/> Year 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Year 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Year 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Year 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Year 5 *hired after 7/19/2011	Pre-Evaluation Meeting		Date of Observations		
	Date:	Subject:	Date/Time:	Subject:	
Post Evaluation Meeting		Date/Time:	Subject:	Date/Time:	Subject:
Highly Effective 3	Effective 2	Minimally Effective 1	Ineffective 0		
I. Planning and Preparation (Knowledge of content and pedagogy; demonstrating knowledge of students; setting instructional outcomes; demonstrating knowledge of resources; designing coherent instruction; designing student assessments)					
II. The Classroom Environment (Creating an environment of respect and rapport; establishing a culture for learning; managing classroom procedures; managing student behavior; organizing physical space)					
III. Instruction (Communicating with students; questioning and discussion techniques; engages students in learning; using assessment in instruction; demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness)					
IV. Professional Responsibilities (Reflecting on teaching; maintaining accurate records; communicating with families; participating in a professional community; growing and developing professionally; showing professionalism)					
Demonstration of Student Learning (25% of overall effectiveness rating)					
Overall Rating <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Minimally Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Ineffective					

Comments:

[Empty rectangular box for comments]

Administrator's Signature

*Teacher's Signature

*(The teacher's signature only indicates receipt of this document)

Date:

Date:

The teacher may submit a written response to this evaluation with a copy to be attached to this document and placed in his/her personnel file.

Adopted:

Appendix K

2014-2015 Teacher Evaluation Form

This page intentionally left blank



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Form (2014-15)

Name: _____ Assignment: _____ Building(s): _____ Tenure YES _____ NO _____

Employee Number: _____ Evaluator: _____ School Year: 2014-15

<input type="checkbox"/> Non Tenure Year <input type="checkbox"/> Year 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Year 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Year 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Year 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Year 5 *hired after 7/19/2011	<u>Pre-Evaluation Meeting</u> Date: _____ Subject: _____		<u>Date of Observations</u> Date/Time: _____ Subject: _____	
	<u>Post Evaluation Meeting</u> Date: _____ Subject: _____		Date/Time: _____ Subject: _____	
Highly Effective 3	Effective 2	Minimally Effective 1	Ineffective 0	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Minimally Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Ineffective
I. Planning and Preparation (Knowledge of content and pedagogy; demonstrating knowledge of students; setting instructional outcomes; demonstrating knowledge of resources; designing coherent instruction; designing student assessments)				
II. The Classroom Environment (Creating an environment of respect and rapport; establishing a culture for learning; managing classroom procedures; managing student behavior; organizing physical space)				
III. Instruction (Communicating with students; questioning and discussion techniques; engages students in learning; using assessment in instruction; demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness)				
IV. Professional Responsibilities (Reflecting on teaching; maintaining accurate records; communicating with families; participating in a professional community; growing and developing professionally; showing professionalism)				
Demonstration of Student Learning (40% of overall effectiveness rating)				
Overall Rating <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Minimally Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Ineffective				

Comments:

Administrator's Signature

*Teacher's Signature

*(The teacher's signature only indicates receipt of this document)

Date:

Date:

The teacher may submit a written response to this evaluation with a copy to be attached to this document and placed in his/her personnel file.

Adopted:

Appendix L

2015-2016 Teacher Evaluation Form

This page intentionally left blank



UTICA COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

Teacher Evaluation Form (2015-16)

Name: _____ Assignment: _____ Building(s): _____ Tenure YES _____ NO _____

Employee Number: _____ Evaluator: _____ School Year: 2015-16

Non Tenure Year () Year 1 () Year 2 () Year 3 () Year 4 () Year 5 *hired after 7/19/2011	Pre-Evaluation Meeting		Date of Observations	
	Date:	Subject:	Date/Time:	Subject:
Highly Effective 3	Effective 2	Minimally Effective 1	Ineffective 0	() Highly Effective () Effective () Minimally Effective () Ineffective
I. Planning and Preparation (Knowledge of content and pedagogy; demonstrating knowledge of students; setting instructional outcomes; demonstrating knowledge of resources; designing coherent instruction; designing student assessments)				
II. The Classroom Environment (Creating an environment of respect and rapport; establishing a culture for learning; managing classroom procedures; managing student behavior; organizing physical space)				
III. Instruction (Communicating with students; questioning and discussion techniques; engages students in learning; using assessment in instruction; demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness)				
IV. Professional Responsibilities (Reflecting on teaching; maintaining accurate records; communicating with families; participating in a professional community; growing and developing professionally; showing professionalism)				
Demonstration of Student Learning (50% of overall effectiveness rating)				
Overall Rating () Highly Effective () Effective () Minimally Effective () Ineffective				

Comments:

Administrator's Signature

*Teacher's Signature

*(The teacher's signature only indicates receipt of this document)

Date:

Date:

The teacher may submit a written response to this evaluation with a copy to be attached to this document and placed in his/her personnel file.

Adopted:

Appendix M

Definitions-Teacher Evaluation System

This page intentionally left blank

Definitions - Teacher Performance Evaluation

Annual Evaluation – A yearly performance evaluation of a teacher based on the Utica Community Schools Teacher Evaluation Rubric and student growth.

Desired Outcomes – Once the needs of the students are identified, the teacher creates goals using the SMART goal format in Phase I of the Student Achievement Growth Analysis process. The teacher reflects on the progress made in reaching the desired outcomes at mid-year and as part of the final evaluation at the end of the year.

Goal-setting Process – The process by which the district utilizes data, both qualitative and quantitative, for determining a teacher's level of performance (effectiveness rating) and targeted professional development.

Guiding Questions – The questions used as a basis for teacher reflection in Phase II of the Student Achievement Growth Analysis process.

Individual Development Plan (IDP) – A plan developed by the teacher and administrator designed to strengthen the skills of the teacher. The plan includes specific goals, actions, and support to assist in the development of a probationary teacher and to help a tenured teacher improve.

Macomb County Dashboard – The list of multiple measures approved by the Macomb Intermediate School District, Utica Community Schools (UCS), and the Utica Education Association (UEA) that measure student growth (see Appendix C for sample measures).

Mid-Year Progress Report – A written report completed by the administrator that includes specific performance goals and training designed to assist the first year probationary teacher and the tenured teacher rated minimally effective or ineffective the previous year to improve his or her overall effectiveness rating.

Observations of Teaching – The process by which an administrator (evaluator) has observed the qualitative measures of teaching for each teacher being evaluated. This may include instructional rounds (walk-throughs), classroom visits, and/or observations.

Other evidence – Qualitative data collection tools (evidence) in the classroom and school that produce sufficient data from which a teacher may be evaluated on all or part of the domains of the teacher evaluation rubric (see Appendix C for types of evidence).

Overall Teacher Effectiveness Rating – The determination of a teacher's effectiveness using the ratings of highly effective, effective, minimally effective, and ineffective.

Qualitative Measures – Observable measures of evidence which must include the following domains: planning and preparation, the classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities.

Quantitative Measures – Data specific measures which result from students' performance on national, state, and district measures of student performance.

SMART Goals – Clearly defined student achievement goals that are specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, and time-bound (see Appendix B for examples).

State Assessments – State assessments required by state or federal laws.

Student Achievement Growth Analysis – The process used by teachers to document the needs of the students at the beginning of the school year, develop desired outcomes, identify instructional strategies, identify the student growth measures, document progress monitoring, and reflect on their performance. The administrator also uses the process to provide feedback to teachers on their performance at the mid-year point.

Student Growth Measures – Multiple measures of student academic performance listed on the Macomb County Dashboard directly related to the performance of the teacher. These measures account for 20% of a teacher's evaluation during the 2012-13 school year, 25% in 2013-14, 40% in 2014-15, and 50% in 2015-16.

Teacher Evaluation Form – The summary instrument that includes the teacher effectiveness ratings on the instructional domains and demonstration of student learning (see Appendices F-I).

Teacher Evaluation Rubric – Instructional practices grouped by the domains of planning and preparation, the classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities and organized by levels of effectiveness. The rubric is based on the work of Charlotte Danielson (2011).