

Raymond School District

SAU 33



RAYMOND SCHOOL DISTRICT

Raymond Educator Effectiveness Plan

Table of Contents	Page
Educator Effectiveness Committee	3
Plan Development	3
Frequency of Observations & Evaluations	6
Transition Between Tracks	6
Frequency of Observations	6
Summative Evaluation Timeline	6
Observation/Evaluation Procedures	6
Timeline for Completion of Documents	7
Professional Practice Rating	8
Educator Effectiveness Rating	8
Educator Effectiveness Rating Chart	8
Student Learning Goals	9
Progressive Improvement Plan	9
Concern Form	12
Progressive Improvement Plan Form	13
Paraeducator Observation/Evaluation Process	14
Building Level Administrator Evaluation	
Procedures	15
Timeline	17
Evaluation of Professional Staff Policy - GCO	18
Building Principal(s) Evaluation Policy - CFB	19
References	20

Appendix:

01. Classroom Teacher Documents*
 02. Special Education Teacher Documents*
 03. Counselor Documents*
 04. Instructional Specialist Documents*
 05. Library/Media Specialist Documents*
 06. Nurse Documents*
- *Each Folder Contains;
- a. Focus Components
 - b. Walkthrough Observation Form
 - c. Pre-observation Form
 - d. Scheduled Observation Form
 - e. Post-observation Form
 - f. Summative Evaluation Form
07. Paraeducator Documents
 - a. Feedback Form
 - b. Formative/Summative Evaluation Form
 08. Improvement Plan Documents
 - a. Notification of Concern
 - b. Verification of Concern
 - c. Improvement Plan
 09. Building Level Administrator Documents
 - a. Evaluation Frameworks
 - b. Evaluation Form

Educator Effectiveness Committee

The purpose of the Educator Effectiveness Committee is to redesign and assess the implementation of an evaluation plan that is focused on measuring teaching effectiveness.

The committee is made up of three educators, a paraeducator and one administrator from each of the three schools along with the Superintendent, District Curriculum Coordinator, and the Raymond Education Association President. The 2020-2021 committee included:

Lamprey Elementary School

Jessica Jortberg
Nicole Hauswirth
Andrea Elliott
David Smith
Laura Yacek

Raymond High School

Chrissy Pauli
Kim Moyer
Bill Hayes
Bob Lemoine
Steve Woodward

Iber Holmes Gove Middle School

Katie Bronson
Coleen Bridle
Felicia Formisano
Abby Nieves
Bob Bickford

SAU #33

Mike Hatfield
David DeRuosi

The committee was recently charged to gather feedback and review the implementation of the current educator effectiveness plan. The committee continues to retain the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching as the evaluation tool. The Framework For Teaching Evaluation Instrument, 2013 Edition, by Charlotte Danielson is the rubric that is used for classroom teachers and the non-instructional rubrics by Charlotte Danielson are used for the majority of the other positions in this plan.

The faculty and paraeducators of the three schools were encouraged to share their comments, questions, and/or concerns about the work of the Educator Effectiveness Committee with any member of the committee during the plan's development. Committee members brought the feedback to the committee for review and discussion. The committee responded to all inquiries as a committee.

The timeline for the initial implementation of the plan is as follows:

- Developed plan during the 2013-2014 school year.
- Implement and revise as needed during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years.
- The plan was finalized for the 2016-2017 school year.
- The plan was reviewed and revised during the 2020-2021 school year

Plan Development

The committee met for eight full days from October, 2013 through May, 2014, and another four full days during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years. The committee accomplished the following:

- Reviewed and discussed the NH Department of Education (NHDOE) recommendations and requirements related to the state waiver of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA) and its impact on the district's supervision and evaluation plan.
- Reviewed and discussed the approaches several other NH school districts of various sizes have taken to address these same recommendations and requirements.

- Addressed the following requirements:
 - At the end of each school year each building principal must report to the NHDOE the number of effective and ineffective educators in their schools using a four level scale. The levels include Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, and Ineffective. Only the numbers of educators in each of the four effectiveness levels are reported to the NHDOE, not individual educator ratings.
 - Initially, the educator effectiveness rating had to include student performance data directly related to the educator as well as state standardized testing data, where appropriate. This requirement was dropped when congress passed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015 and has been removed from this plan for implementation in the 2016-2017 school year.
- The committee decided on a matrix, or panel approach, to incorporate data from our current four domains in our evaluation plan and from the educator's student performance data. We adopted the following four domains from Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching: Planning & Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibilities.
- The committee developed a process to identify a Professional Practice Rating. In doing so, the committee has identified two components in each of the four domains of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching. The focus components will be used to determine the Professional Practice rating and will allow educators to move from one level of the plan to the next. The focus components for classroom teachers are (the focus components for other professional positions are listed elsewhere in this plan):
 - Domain 1: Planning & Preparation
 - 1.c. Setting Instructional Outcomes
 - 1.e. Designing Coherent Instruction
 - Domain 2: The Classroom Environment
 - 2.a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
 - 2.b. Establishing a Culture for Learning
 - Domain 3: Instruction
 - 3.c. Engaging Students in Learning
 - 3.d. Using Assessment in Instruction
 - Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities
 - 4.c. Communicating with Families
 - 4.f. Showing Professionalism
- At each of the meetings, the committee reviewed the feedback and questions from all three schools. The work of the committee and the responses to the faculty inquiries were published throughout the district after each meeting in the form of talking points.
- The committee spent significant time reviewing the state requirements for the inclusion of student performance data in the educator evaluation process. It developed a set of recommendations based on those requirements. Student Learning Objectives was selected as the format that will be used to include student performance data into each educator's effectiveness rating. The requirement to include student performance data as part of an educator's effectiveness rating was removed with the passing of ESSA. The committee decided to keep a version of SLO's to replace an earlier requirement of annual professional goals. This revised process is referred to as Student Learning Goals (SLG) and will fall within Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities.

- The committee decided that there will be two tracks in the plan as required by the state waiver of NCLBA: track I, and track II. This component of the plan stayed in effect with the passing of ESSA that replaced NCLBA.
- The committee discussed who can provide data that will be used as part of an educator's summative evaluation. The following was decided:
 - Informal, walk-through observations can be completed by any district administrator who holds a principal, special education director, or superintendent's certification.
 - Formal observations are to be completed by the building principal or assistant principal. Other district administrators that hold a principal, special education director or superintendent's certification and are agreed to by the educator who is being observed can complete formal observations.
 - Educators can provide other data and evidence to support their Professional Practice Rating.
 - The concept of having educators being able to provide feedback on their supervisor's performance as a data point for the supervisor's summative evaluation was discussed. The committee agrees conceptually that student feedback on educators' performance and educator feedback on supervisors' performance has merit. However, committee believes that there are going to be enough changes in the new plan that it would not be effective to add student and educator feedback at this time. The concept will be revisited in the future as the plan is finalized and implemented.
 - Initially there were to be two data points that would be used to determine an educator's effectiveness rating; a Professional Practice Rating and Student Performance Rating. With the removal of the requirement of student performance data in ESSA only the Professional Practice Rating will be used to determine an educator's effectiveness rating.
 - The Professional Practice Rating will be based on evidence of professional practice in the four domains of Charlotte Danielson's Framework of Teaching:
 - § Planning and Preparation
 - § The Classroom Environment
 - § Instruction
 - § Professional Responsibilities
- The ratings will be: Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, Ineffective
- Educator Effectiveness Rating will be based on the Professional Practice Rating.
- During the 2014/15 and 2015/16 school years the committee collected feedback from educators and supervisors alike and made adjustments to the plan so it better reflected the needs of the district and the intent of the committee in measuring educator effectiveness.
- During the 2015/16 school year paraeducator representatives from each of the schools were invited to join the committee and the development of a paraeducator evaluation system was developed for implementation in 2016/17.
- During the 2015/16 school year the committee decided to change all observation forms to a rubric format based on the critical attributes as identified in the Charlotte Danielson Frameworks for Teaching rubrics. The committee also developed and implemented a paraeducator observation and evaluation forms that reflected the educator's process and forms.
- During the 2020-2021 school year, the committee met three times to review feedback from staff across the district and decided to eliminate the tracks, change the frequency of walkthroughs, observations,

and summatives required, and edited the timeline for evaluations and summatives.

Frequency of Observations and Evaluations: ([RSA 189:14-a](#))

- First year teachers new to the RSD will be required to have one scheduled observation prior to December 1
- First year teachers new to the RSD will have at least one walk-through within 60 calendar days of the start of the school year.
- Two walk-throughs will be completed on all certified staff prior to winter break
- A total of 5 walkthroughs will be completed on all certified staff
- Educators, or supervisors, can request additional scheduled observations or walkthroughs prior to the second Friday in March

For the purpose of an additional scheduled observation only, an educator may request an alternative district administrator. All scheduled observations are part of the educator's permanent personnel file.

Summative Evaluation Timeline:

- **Certified educators new to the RSD will receive a summative evaluation at the end of their first year. Certified educators with more than one year in the RSD will receive a summative evaluation aligned with their recertification year.**
 - An educator's evidence of their effectiveness for Domain 1 & 4 components is due to the supervisor no later than the Friday before February Break.
 - Summative evaluations returned to educators by the last Friday in March.

Observation / Evaluation Procedures:

Walk-through Observations

Walk-through observations are unannounced classroom visitations that help provide a supervisor with supplemental information about an educator's performance. Walk-through observations are usually shorter in duration than a scheduled observation. A written summary of a walk-through observation will be provided. A follow-up conference may be scheduled at either the educator's or the supervisor's request. Walk-through observation forms will become part of the educator's personnel file.

Scheduled Observations

Scheduled classroom observations will be conducted by a supervisor and will consist of a pre-observation conference, a classroom visitation and a post-observation conference. The educator will complete the pre-observation form prior to the pre-observation conference. The educator will complete the post observation form prior to the post observation conference. Scheduled observation forms will become part of the educator's personnel file.

Summative Evaluations

Summative evaluations will be completed in accordance with the summative evaluation timeline. The ratings of the components on the summative evaluation will be based on formal observations, walkthroughs, and other evidence and artifacts that the educator and/or supervisor provides. Educators

are required to provide evidence of the components in Domains 1 & 4 as part of the summative evaluation process. A template will be provided to staff [RSD Template](#). Educators may also provide evidence for the components in domains 2 & 3. The walkthrough & observation process will provide evidence of performance level in domains 2 & 3.

One piece of evidence should be provided for each component. Individual pieces of evidence can be used in consecutive portfolios as long as they accurately reflect current practices.

Performance levels of components within a summative evaluation will be scored based on the preponderance of evidence collected through observations and evidence provided by the educator and the supervisor. Educators will be provided with the opportunity to meet with their supervisor to review the portfolio evidence.

Staff will be notified by September 1 if they are scheduled to have their summative evaluation in the current school year.

Only documents that are signed by both the educator and the supervisor will be placed in the educator's personnel file.

Instructional Specialists:

The instructional specialist will meet with building administration at the beginning of each school year to identify whether the classroom teacher or instructional specialist criteria will be used during the school year. Criteria will remain the same for the duration of the school year. The three year summative evaluation form chosen will be based on the criteria with the majority of the feedback.

Library/Media Specialists:

The library/media specialist will meet with building administration at the beginning of each school year to identify whether the classroom teacher or library/media specialist criteria will be used during the school year. Criteria will remain the same for the duration of the school year. The three year summative evaluation form chosen will be based on the criteria with the majority of the feedback.

- Special education staff evaluations and summatives will be conducted collaboratively by building administrators and district administration

Timeline for Completion of Documents

- Administrators must make the completed observation form available to the educator within 5 school days of the date of the observation..
- If requested, the administrator must meet with the educator within 10 school days of the date of the observation.
- The educator must submit any comments, sign, and return the observation form within 15 school days of the date of the observation. It is the responsibility of the administrator to print the final document and submit it to the educator for signature.

Professional Practice Ratings

An educator's Professional Practice Rating will be determined at the time of the summative evaluation. It will be based upon the following four domains of Charlotte Danielson's Framework of Teaching:

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

Domain 3: Instruction
Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

There is an expectation that all educators will demonstrate proficient performance in each of the following focus components.

Component Scores Rating

One or more component rating of 1 in any area	1
No 1's, one or more of the focus(*) components is a 2.	2
No 1's; all focus components(*) are 3 or better	3
All focus components(*) are 3's or better, two or more 4's in any component	4

	Score
Domain 1 & 4 Combined	_____
Domain 2 & 3 Combined	_____

Effectiveness Rating: Highly Effective Effective Needs Improvement Ineffective

Track recommendation for next evaluation cycle: Track I Track II

* - Focus components are identified for each building level position that is covered in this plan.

The scores determined in the above will be used in the panel chart below to determine each educator's effectiveness rating.

Educator Effectiveness Rating

From the Summative Evaluation Form the score for Domains 1 & 4 and for Domains 2 & 3 are entered into the chart below to determine an educator's Effectiveness Rating.

Educator Effectiveness Rating Chart:

Educator Effectiveness Rating Chart:

	Distinguished (4)	Automatic Review	Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation &	Proficient (3)	Needs Improvement	Needs Improvement	Effective	Highly Effective
Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities	Basic (2)	Ineffective	Needs Improvement	Effective	Effective
	Unsatisfactory (1)	Ineffective	Ineffective	Needs Improvement	Automatic Review
		Unsatisfactory (1)	Basic (2)	Proficient (3)	Distinguished (4)

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment & Domain 3: Instruction

Determining Effectiveness Ratings for State Reporting

Educator performance ratings for components in Domains 2 and 3 will be based on data collected during documented observations. Educators can also provide evidence to their supervisor to demonstrate their level of performance in these components.

Educator performance ratings for components in Domains 1 and 4 will be based on evidence presented by the educator to their supervisor and may include other evidence provided by the supervisor.

The district Educator Effectiveness Committee has placed more emphasis on the performance in Domains 2 & 3 when determining each educator's effectiveness rating.

Student Learning Goals

As established by the [Raymond School District Professional Development Plan](#)

PROGRESSIVE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Just as students sometimes need special, personalized attention to meet performance standards, educators may require extra support and resources within a particular area(s) of professional performance. The Raymond School District Educator Effectiveness Plan has established a process of professional intervention so that targeted resources and support can be directed to educators who need them.

An administrative supervisor may have concerns about an educator's unsatisfactory performance based on information from any number of sources:

1. An administrative supervisor may notice through administrative supervisory observations or other interactions that an educator has demonstrated unsatisfactory performance as outlined in the Raymond Educator Effectiveness Plan Performance Rubrics, or;
2. A concern may arise when an administrative supervisor notices an educator's failure to move toward meeting a Professional Learning Goal that supports the educator's Student Learning Goal, or;
3. Finally, the administrative supervisor may investigate a concern based on information received from another source (i.e. a parent, student, educator, support staff, administrator, and/or school board member).

At any point in this process, either party can request representation and/or witnesses to participate in a meeting, given no fewer than three school days' notice to the other party.

NOTIFICATION

When a concern has been identified, the administrative supervisor will notify the educator within seven (7) school days in writing. The administrative supervisor will use the Concern Form. The Concern Form includes:

- Statement of concern with the specific area of Raymond Educator Effectiveness Plan Performance Rubrics identified;
- The source of the concern;
- An invitation to have the administrative supervisor and educator meet to hear the educator's perspective and/or add informational details; and
- Notification and/or verification that the administrative supervisor will be monitoring/investigating the situation.

INVESTIGATION

Once an educator has been notified of a concern, an investigation by the administrative supervisor will ensue. The investigation shall be thorough and include as many people as necessary to ensure the acquisition of the facts surrounding the concern. After a concern has been identified and investigated, the educator will be made aware of the outcome of the investigation as soon as possible, but no longer than twenty (20) school days. The administrative supervisor will use the Concern Form to notify the educator. It is possible for the concern to be immediately addressed and resolved, determined to not be a concern, or determined to be a concern. In the case that the concern is substantiated by the administrative supervisor's investigation, the administrative supervisor will schedule a Concerns Conference with the educator within seven (7) school days of the verification. At any point after the Concern Form has been presented to the educator, the educator has the option to formulate a written response to that concern. This written response will then become a part of the investigative documentation.

CONCERNS CONFERENCE

During the conference between the faculty member and administrative supervisor, the administrative supervisor will outline the evidence for the concern. Based on the nature of the concern and evidence collected during the investigation process, the administrative supervisor will determine whether the concern will require an Improvement Plan.

IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The Improvement Plan must include the following:

1. Identification of the area of concern within the Raymond Educator Effectiveness Plan Performance Rubrics;
2. Documentation of a Scheduled Observation following the concerns verification, that supported the construction of the Improvement Plan;
3. Plan for progress monitoring, including plans for additional administrative supervisory observations, announced and unannounced. These should include pre and post conference(s), and what the administrative supervisor will be focusing on during the observation(s). (Note that the educator may identify and request an additional administrator to conduct Scheduled Observations);
4. Timeline of the Improvement Plan with beginning and ending dates;
5. Criteria for successful completion of the Improvement Plan; and
6. Notification of potential recommendation for non-renewal.

The administrative supervisor will use the "Progressive Improvement Form". If an educator is in the

process of completing an Improvement Plan and additional unrelated concerns arise, those concerns will be addressed through a separate investigative process and will not be included in the existing Improvement Plan.

DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The educator will meet with the administrative supervisor to develop the improvement plan. Some suggestions for improvement that may be included are:

- Peer observations with a reflection written by the educator
- Meetings with same grade level or subject matter
- Workshops
- Conferences
- Self-filming a classroom (for educators use only with written approval of all parents of students in the classroom and the adults also present)
- Having a peer observe the educators class

DISMISSAL OF EDUCATORS

An educator who has two years of an ineffective rating will be dismissed from employment under RSA 189.

Educators may also be dismissed in accordance with other applicable RSAs. Any educator who does not successfully complete an Improvement Plan will be dismissed from employment in accordance with applicable RSAs.

“For reference, under RSA 189:14d, employees of a school administrative unit or school district in this state who have been convicted of homicide, child pornography, aggravated felonious sexual assault, felonious sexual assault, or kidnapping, in this state or under any statute prohibiting the same conduct in another state, territory or possession of the United States, shall have their employment terminated by the school administrative unit or school district after it receives notice of the conviction. Additionally, under RSA 189:13, the school board may dismiss any teacher found by them to be immoral, or who has not satisfactorily maintained the competency standards established by the school district, or one who does not conform to regulations prescribed; provided, that no teacher shall be so dismissed before the expiration of the period for which said teacher was engaged without having previously been notified of the cause of such dismissal, nor without having previously been granted a full and fair hearing.”

Concern Form

NAME: _____ SCHOOL: _____

GRADE LEVEL: _____ SUBJECT(S): _____ CURRENT TRACK: _____

SUPERVISOR: _____ DATE: _____

PROPOSED CONCERNS CONFERENCE DATE AND TIME (if applicable): _____

As per the Raymond School District Educator Effectiveness Plan, this document is (*check all that apply*):

- ☐ Notifying you that a concern has been raised regarding your job performance.
- ☐ Notifying you that a concern regarding your job performance has been both investigated and verified by your administrative supervisor.

The outcome of that investigation is that the issue has been:

- ☐ determined to NOT be a concern ☐ determined to be a concern

If the issue HAS been determined to be a concern, the administrative supervisor will schedule a Concerns Conference with the educator within seven (7) school days of the educator receiving the Concern Form. At any point after the Concern Form has been presented to the educator, the faculty member has the option to formulate a written response to that concern for inclusion in the file.

Area(s) of Concern/Domain Component(s):

Source(s) of Concern(s):

Educator Signature

Date

Administrator Signature

Date

The signature of the educator does not signify agreement or disagreement with the content of this Concern Form, but only that he/she has seen it and it has been reviewed with the administrator.

**** As per the Raymond School District Educator Effectiveness Plan, the employee may request representation and/or witnesses to participate in a meeting, given at least one school days' notice to the administrative supervisor.***

Progressive Improvement Plan Form

NAME: _____ SCHOOL: _____

GRADE LEVEL: _____ SUBJECT(S): _____ CURRENT TRACK: _____

SUPERVISOR: _____ DATE: _____

ORIGINAL CONCERN NOTIFICATION DATE: _____

CONCERN CONFERENCE DATE: _____

As per the Raymond School District Educator Effectiveness Plan, this document is notifying you that a concern regarding your job performance has been investigated by your administrative supervisor, with the resulting determination that the concern will be addressed with an Improvement Plan.

The following plan is to be developed by the administrative supervisor in collaboration with the educator.

Time Period of Plan: _____ Final Evaluation Conference Date: _____

INTERIM SUPERVISION CONFERENCE DATES: _____

DOMAIN OF CONCERN (including a list of attached documentation):

CORRECTIVE ACTION STEPS (including a plan for progress monitoring):

Educator Signature Date

Administrator Signature Date

The signature of the educator does not signify agreement or disagreement with the content of this Progressive Improvement Plan, but only that he/she has seen it and it has been reviewed with the administrator.

- This improvement plan has been developed by the administrative supervisor in collaboration with the educator: _____ (educator's initials) _____ (administrator's initials)
- If observations result in the identification of additional concerns, the administrative supervisor will discuss them in the post-observation conference and document further steps in the Improvement Plan. Educator initials: _____
- For an Improvement Plan, the educator should consider this document to be notification of potential recommendation for non-renewal. Educator initials: _____

Improvement Plan Completion:

- ☐ This plan was completed successfully on or before the designated completion date.
- ☐ This plan was not completed successfully by the designated completion date. The component(s) that continue to be of concern are:

Educator Signature Date

Administrator Signature Date

The signature of the educator does not signify agreement or disagreement with the content of this Progressive Improvement Plan, but only that he/she has seen it and it has been reviewed with the administrator.

Paraeducator Evaluation Process

- Professional staff that the paraeducator works with will be given the opportunity to provide input into the paraeducators' Summative evaluations through the Paraeducator Feedback Form. The observations and evaluation will be based on at least two Paraeducator Feedback Forms completed by teachers, case managers, and/or administrators that observed the paraeducator performing their job responsibilities.
- The case manager will also have input into the paraeducator's formative (observation and feedback) and summative evaluations.
- The district special education administrator will consider all feedback and input of the professional staff and administrators (if applicable) in developing the summative evaluation of the paraeducator.
- All paraeducators starting at the beginning of the school year will have an unannounced walkthrough formative observation completed prior to the December vacation by the district special education administrator.
 - For paraeducators hired after the school year begins they will have an unannounced formative observation completed during their probationary period of employment.
- Paraeducators will be supervised by the case manager that they are assigned to.
- Professional staff that the paraeducator works with will be given the opportunity to provide input into the paraeducator's evaluation through the Paraeducator Feedback Form. All paraeducator observations and evaluations will be based on at least two Paraeducator Feedback Forms completed by teachers, case managers, and/or administrators that observed the paraeducator performing their job responsibilities
- The case manager will also have input into the paraeducator's evaluation.
- The district special education administrator will consider all feedback and input of the professional staff and administrators (if applicable) in developing the evaluation of the paraeducator.
- Comments will be constructive in nature and will be edited by the district special education administrator as needed.
- **Process:**
 - All paraeducators starting at the beginning of the school year will have an unannounced formative observation completed during the second quarter of the school year but prior to the December vacation by the district special education administrator.
 - For paraeducators hired after the school year begins they will have an unannounced formative observation completed during their probationary period of employment.
 - A post-observation conference is optional with the district special education administrator.
 - All paraeducators will have a summative evaluation prior to the end of the school year. A summative evaluation conference is required with the district special education administrator.

EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Educational leaders should promote the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

An effective educational leader promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Educational leaders promote the success of all students by collaborating with all families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

The Definition of an Effective Educational Leader:

1. Mission, Vision, and Core Values

Effective Educational Leaders:

- Develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education and academic success and well-being of each student.

2. Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

Effective Educational Leaders:

- Develop and support intellectually rigorous and coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

3. Community of Care and Support for Students

Effective Educational Leaders:

- Cultivate a positive inclusive, caring, safe, and supportive school community that promotes the academic success and well-being of each student.

4. Professional Capacity of School Personnel

Effective Educational Leaders:

- Develop the professional capacity and practice of school personnel to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

5. Operations and Management

Effective Educational Leaders:

- Manage school operations and resources to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

6. Professional Community for Teachers and Staff

Effective Educational Leaders:

- Foster a professional community of teachers and other professional staff to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

7. Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community

Effective Educational Leaders:

- Engage families and the community in meaningful, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial ways to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

8. Ethics and Professional Norms

Effective Educational Leaders:

- Act ethically and according to professional norms to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

9. Equity and Cultural Responsiveness

Effective Educational Leaders:

- Strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

10. School Improvement

Effective Educational Leaders:

- Act as agents of continuous growth to promote each student's academic success and the school's improvement.

PROCEDURES

A well-constructed assessment process serves to evaluate the performances and actions of an educational leader through focusing on specific behaviors that are associated with student learning. Supervisors will be able to evaluate an educational leader's capabilities and improve teacher and student performance (Wallace Foundation, 2009). The evaluation process be completed by an immediate supervisor who is knowledgeable of the procedures, standards, and indicators.

Use of Specific Data/Development of Portfolios:

The evaluation of an educational leader should reference specific data gleaned from a variety of sources to validate performance in conjunction with the standards. Information collected during formal and informal interactions should be considered. Such data should be considered during formative discussions and utilized in making a determination about the educational leader's performance.

It is recommended that educational leaders collect artifacts (newsletters, schedules, reports, letters etc.) that demonstrate their competencies in a portfolio over a three-year period (certification cycle). **Each year, the educational leader should be evaluated on no more than 1/3rd (16) of the indicators (48) as mutually agreed upon by the evaluator and the educational leader.** Where possible, the portfolio should be organized in such a way that artifacts/products/information are aligned with the standards and indicators that are being evaluated for that year. Information from the portfolio should be shared and discussed with the supervisor on a regular basis. These artifacts can be used during both formative and summative assessments. This information will be especially important in addressing the specific goals that are correlated with the standards. The supervisor should meet with the educational leader to establish a priority order of the standards.

IMPORTANT NOTE: All of the 48 indicators may not apply to every educational leadership role.

Standards Rubrics:

A set of educational leader evaluation rubrics with indicators, based on the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015), Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015, Reston, VA: Author, has been developed. Supervisors should use the **New Hampshire Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2018** when evaluating an educational leader (see attachment).

Interactions/Meetings/Timelines:

For all educational leaders, frequent interaction with their supervisor(s) is necessary. Interactions should be both formative and summative. Formative interactions and assessments can be used to guide an educational leader's future actions. Summative interactions and assessments provide the educational leader with an assessment about competence (Condon & Clifford, 2010). It is recommended that an educational leader have an opportunity to meet with their evaluator periodically for formative discussions prior to any summative assessment. Accurate documentation shall be maintained. This should be in the form of shared notes or minutes

taken during meetings. Discussions should reference the standards, indicators, and the SMART goals that have been established in alignment with them.

Evaluating Novice Educational Leaders: Novice educational leaders (those with three or fewer years serving in a new educational leader role) should maintain a close, reflective relationship with their supervisor. As a minimum, they should meet quarterly, with the educational leader receiving formative assessments of performance.

Evaluating Experienced Educational Leader: Experienced educational leaders should meet at least three times per year with their supervisor. The initial and mid-year meetings should be reflective in nature. The final meeting shall be summative in nature.

Timeline(s)

August/September: Goal setting consultation between educational leader and supervisor

- Establish SMART goals (*Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Timely*)
- Determine which standards are to be addressed
- Set specific timelines
- Determine responsibilities
- Discuss resources and supports

January/February: Mid-year progress consultation/update

- Review SMART goals
- Modify goals as needed
- Review performance status
- Supervisor provides a brief written summary (within 15 days)

May/June: Summative conference

- Educational leader shares portfolio information/artifacts with supervisor
- Educational leader reflects on goals
- Supervisor provides a rubric-based assessment (with written response within 15 days)

Raymond School District Policy - GCO

EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF

The School Board will adopt and the Superintendent will implement a teacher performance and evaluation system. The performance and evaluation system will include procedures, evaluation criteria and other components necessary to evaluate certified teaching personnel. Such procedures, criteria and components may be included as an appendix to this policy.

The School Board will involve teachers and principals in the development of this policy and its corresponding appendix by providing such teachers with notice and an opportunity to comment on their provisions. However, all final decisions relative to evaluation procedures, criteria and components will remain with the School Board.

Legal References:

RSA 189:1-a, Duty to Provide Education

RSA 189:14-a, Failure to be Renominated or Reelected

N.H. Code of Administrative Rules, Section Ed. 302.02(n), Substantive Duties of Superintendents

N.H. Code of Administrative Rules, Section Ed. 304.01(b), Substantive Duties of School Principals

Adopted: April 21, 1988

Revised: August 1, 2002

Revised: November 6, 2013

Raymond School District Policy - CFB

BUILDING PRINCIPAL(S) EVALUATION

The Superintendent shall conduct an ongoing process of evaluating the principal(s) on his/her skills, abilities, and competence. Annually, the Superintendent or his/her designee will formally evaluate the principal(s) (using school board approved evaluation forms). See appendix for form administrators.

The goal of the formal evaluation process is to ensure the education program for the students is carried, out, promote growth in effective administrative leadership for the school district, clarify the building principal's role as the board and the superintendent see it, ascertain areas in need of improvement, and focus the immediate priorities of the principal(s) responsibilities.

The formal evaluation shall include written criteria related to the job duties. The principal may make comments responding to the formal evaluation.

The formal evaluation shall also include an opportunity for the principal and the superintendent to discuss the written criteria, the past year's performance and the future areas of growth. The evaluation shall be completed by the Superintendent, signed by the building principal and filed in the principal's personnel file. The evaluation will also provide the opportunity to review and update the principal's job description.

This policy supports and does not preclude the ongoing informal evaluation of the principal's skills, abilities and competence.

New principals will be evaluated at least twice in writing for each of the first three years of their employment.

Statutory and Regulatory Reference:

RSA 189:14-a & b

Littkey v. Winchester School District, 219 NH 626 (1987)

NH Code of Administrative Rules Part 302 Superintendents

NH Code of Administrative Rules Part 304 School Principals

Adopted: April 18, 2002

Revised: February 21, 2007

References:

Charlotte Danielson's The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument, 2013 Edition

Assessing the effectiveness of school leaders: New directions and new processes. Perspective. (2009). New York: Wallace Foundation.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED504428)

Condon, C., & Clifford, M. (2010). *Measuring principal performance: How rigorous are commonly used principal performance assessment instruments?* Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED509964)

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved May 18, 2011 from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2008/Educational_Leadership_Policy_Standards_2008.pdf

Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid Continent Research for Education and Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED481972)

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015), Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015, Reston, VA: Author

New Hampshire Association of School Principals Principals Evaluation Task Force Report - MAY, 2018

The New Hampshire Task Force on Effective Teaching: Phase II Report

Pittsfield Professional Growth & Evaluation Plan, Pittsfield, NH School District

SAU 64 Professional Growth Plan, SAU 64, Milton, NH

Berlin Educational Assistant Evaluation Rubric, Berlin Public Schools, 183 Hillside Avenue, Berlin, NH 03570