

Raymond School District

SAU 33



RAYMOND SCHOOL DISTRICT

Raymond Educator Effectiveness Plan

Table of Contents	Page
Educator Effectiveness Committee	3
Plan Development	3
Educator Tracks	6
Transition Between Tracks	6
Frequency of Observations	6
Summative Evaluation Timeline	7
Observation/Evaluation Procedures	7
Timeline for Completion of Documents	8
Professional Practice Rating	8
Educator Effectiveness Rating	9
Educator Effectiveness Rating Chart	9
Student Learning Goals	10
SLG Development Worksheets	12
SLG Approval Form	16
SLG Data Collection Template	18
SLG Mid-Year & End of Year Reflection Form	19
Helpful Hints for Collecting and Compiling a “Manageable” Evidence Collection	20
Progressive Improvement Plan	21
Notification of Concern Form	23
Verification of Concern Form	24
Progressive Improvement Plan Form	25
Paraeducator Observation/Evaluation Process	27
Building Level Administrator Evaluation Procedures	28
Timeline	30
Evaluation of Professional Staff Policy - GCO	31
Building Principal(s) Evaluation Policy - CFB	32
References	33

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. Student Learning Goals Documents
 - a. Student Learning Goal Worksheet
 - b. Learning Goal
 - c. Assessment and Scoring
 - d. Growth Targets
 - e. Approval Form
 - f. Activities Plan
 - g. Data Collection Template
 - h. Reflection Form
09. Improvement Plan Documents
 - a. Notification of Concern
 - b. Verification of Concern
 - c. Improvement Plan
10. 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. During the 2015-16 school year paraeducators from each of the buildings were added to the committee as well as the president of the Raymond Education Support Staff association. The committee included:

Lamprey Elementary School

Deb Wood
Marlene Jones
Suzanne Ives
Bryan Belanger
Mary-Jo Holmes
Sandy Ellis

Iber Holmes Gove Middle School

Katie Bronson
Katie Wilcott
Jim White
Wendy Buckingham
Bob Bickford

Raymond High School

Georgine Williams
Kim Moyer
Bill Hayes
Holly Rosendahl
Steve Woodward

SAU #33

Ellen Small
Walter Anacki
Melissa Lefebvre

The committee was charged to redesign and assess the implementation of an evaluation plan that is focused on measuring teaching effectiveness. The committee decided to retain the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching as the basis of the redesigned plan. 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 implementation of the plan is as follows:

- Develop plan during the 2013-2014 school year.
- Implement and revise as needed during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years.
- The plan will be finalized for the 2016-2017 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 ResponsibilitiesThe 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.

Educator Tracks:

Track I:

- Anyone with a Beginning Educator certificate (first three years as a certified educator as determined by the NH DOE)
- Anyone new to the Raymond School District regardless of years of teaching experience
- Anyone below the Effective rating

Track II:

- Anyone with an Experienced Educator certificate that has been in the district at least one year, and that has earned an Effective rating.

An educator's effectiveness rating will remain in effect until the next summative evaluation.

Transitioning Between Tracks:

Track I to Track II

- For those with Beginning Educator certificates: Upon attaining an Experienced Educator certificate and earning an Effective rating
 - In order to obtain an Experienced Educator Certificate, according to the NH DOE, an educator has to have been evaluated as effective or above according to the local evaluation system, for two consecutive years, and the educator has been employed full-time, for three years under an educator credential (teacher, administrator or specialist)
- For those with Experienced Educator certificates: Completing at least one year of service in the Raymond School District and earning an Effective rating.

Track II to Track I

- Regardless of years of experience or previous effectiveness ratings, any educator earning less than an Effective rating will be placed back on Track I.

Frequency of Observations and Evaluations:

Track I

Educators on Track I will have two scheduled observations and have a summative evaluation yearly.

- All educators in their first year in the Raymond School District will have at least one scheduled observation within sixty calendar days of the beginning of the school year, to be preceded by a minimum of one walk-through.
- The second scheduled observation will be completed by the first week in March.
- Additional walk-through observations will be at the discretion of the administrator and/or the request of the educator.
- Educators on track I will have a summative evaluation each school year.

Track II

Educators on track two will be given a scheduled observation once per year, preceded by a walkthrough observation.

- Walk through observations will be at the discretion of the administrator and/or the request of the educator.
- The observation process will be completed by the third Friday in April. It is recommended that the scheduled observations be completed by the last Friday in March.
- Educators on track II will have a summative evaluation every three school years.

Educators on either Track I or Track II may request an additional scheduled observation. For the purpose of an additional scheduled observation only, an educator may request an alternative district administrator. The alternative administrator will be selected by the Superintendent. All scheduled observations are part of the educator's permanent personnel file.

Summative Evaluation Timeline:

- **Track I Educators:**

- An educator's evidence of their effectiveness for Domain 1 & 4 components is due to supervisor no later than 2nd Friday in March. Summative evaluations returned to educators by the last Friday in March.

- **Track II Educators:**

- An educator's evidence of their effectiveness for Domain 1 & 4 components due to supervisor no later than third Friday in April. Summative evaluations returned to educators by the second Friday in May.

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, and should be considered formative. 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 building administrator 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.

Observations are not given a score as they are not an evaluation. Observations are a tool to provide feedback as to what indicators of performance were observed during the observation.

Summative Evaluations

Summative evaluations will be completed in accordance to the track that the educator is currently on; annually for educators on track I and once every three years for those on track II. The ratings of the components on the summative evaluation will be based on formal observations as well as 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. Educators may also provide evidence for the components in domains 2 & 3. The observation process will provide evidence of performance level in domains 2 & 3. Educators may do a self assessment prior to the summative evaluation meeting.

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.

Staff will be notified by June 1 if they are scheduled to have their summative evaluation the following school year. This list will be submitted to the SAU office.

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.

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:

	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

Introduction to Student Learning Goals

Student Learning Goals are targets of individual growth that educators set at the start of the course and strive to achieve by the end. These goals provide the opportunity for all educators to be able to set meaningful goals, collaborate with other educators around shared goals, monitor student and educator progress toward goals, and evaluate the extent to which goals were achieved. These goals encourage and support good teaching and learning.

The Student Learning Goal cycle consists of four steps:

1. **Developing the SLG.** The educator collaborates with colleagues and administrators to create an SLG.
2. **Approving the SLG.** A district-designated administrator or administrator team reviews the goal to ensure that it meets criteria in terms of student learning.
3. **Monitoring progress.** The educator delivers high-quality instruction and monitors student progress throughout the course. As needed, the educator adjusts his or her approach to ensure that all students are making progress. This step must include midcourse conversation between the educator and administrator to discuss progress thus far.
4. **Reviewing the SLG.** The educator meets with a district-designated administrator or administrator team at the end of the year to review data and determine whether students met their growth targets. Educators should use this information to form goals for the following year. The Educator Effectiveness Committee suggests that data from these goals are included as evidence in the Professional Responsibilities Domain.

SLG Timeline & Important Deadlines

Guidelines

Student Learning Goals comprises three key components.

These three components consist of:

1. **The Learning Goal:** a description of what students will be able to do at the end of the course or grade;
2. **The Assessment(s):** measurement of students' understanding of the learning goal;
3. **The Targets:** the expected student outcome by the end of the instructional period.

Student Learning Goals Must Be:

- **Specific:** The learning goal is focused, for example, by content standards; by learners' needs.
- **Measurable:** An appropriate instrument/measure is selected to assess the learning goal .
- **Appropriate:** The learning goal is within the educator's control to effect change and is a worthwhile focus for the students' academic year.
- **Realistic:** The learning goal is feasible for the educator.
- **Time limited:** The learning goal is contained within a single school year or appropriate unit of time.

Professional Growth Plan Process

Each educator needs to include a Student Learning Goal in his/her Annual Growth Plan. The Student Learning Goal should be:

- Developed by the end of September
- Developed based upon an analysis of the State assessment scores and relevant district, school, and classroom assessments (i.e. NWEA, pre-test/post-test data, mid-term/final exam data, common assessments, Smarter Balanced Assessment)
- Differentiated for appropriate subgroups of students

- Representative of the courses/subjects you teach
- Linked to high priority standards, critical learning outcomes, and enduring understandings/skills derived from the NH Curriculum Frameworks, NH Common Core, and local curriculum competencies.
- Aligned to school and district improvement goals
- Be measurable (growth-based or achievement status-based)
- Ambitious and realistic

Growth Plan Development Process

Step 1 Examination of Relevant Student Data

- Examine State assessment results to identify students' learning needs
- Examine district and classroom assessments to gain a more specific understanding of the learning needs

Step 2 Identification of Desired Student Learning Goals

- Utilize the NH Curriculum Frameworks & Common Core
- Utilize the District Curriculum & Competencies
- Discuss with other educators at your grade level or within your common planning team to and where appropriate, identify common outcomes

Step 3 Develop Student Learning Goals

- Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time Bound
- Differentiate as appropriate for subgroups of students
- Establish performance levels and identify assessments to be used

Step 4 Development of Planned Strategies for Goal Completion

- Select from the learning activities to support Learning Goal
- Identify evidence to be collected to document activity completion
- Organize strategies

Step 5 Administrative Review

- Meet with administrator to review plan and obtain approval

Step 6 Implementation of Plan

- Implement the plan
- Meet with administrator to review progress: beginning, middle and end of year
- Assemble evidence materials in professional portfolio
- Review plan as needed

Step 7 Compilation and Review of Portfolio

- Compile materials in portfolio in Domain 4:Professional Responsibilities- Component 1:Reflecting on Teaching
- Complete reflection on professional learning and student results
- Meet with administrator to review portfolio

Individual SLG Development Worksheets

Student Learning Goal Template: SLGs are content and grade/course specific learning objectives that can be validly measured to assess student learning over a defined and significant period of time e.g., semester or year.

GOAL OF THE SLG TEMPLATE

The SLG Template is designed to assist educators in creating a relevant and rigorous SLG that is aligned to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and will ultimately improve student learning. Completely fill-in each of the following worksheets and use them to create your SLG approval form. Provide any additional information that you feel is necessary to accomplish this goal.

Student Population

What students will be included in this SLG?

Additional information:

- Identifies the class or subgroup covered by the SLG
 - Educator states number of students, number of classes, information of IEPs, gifted, ESOL, or any other subgroup
- If an educator does not reference any subgroup(s) whoever is monitoring the SLG may ask the educator to address the subgroups or lack of them

Individual SLG Development Worksheets

Learning goal

What is the big idea, deep understanding or essential concept represented by the learning goal? How does it relate to the CCSS? Which specific content standard(s) is the SLG aligned?

Additional information:

- Specifies how the SLG will address applicable standards from CCSS
- Educators need to state specific content, however for an entire course; the content should reflect the entire year's learning
- Represents the big ideas, domains, or competencies of the content taught during the interval of instruction
 - It would not be enough for the educator to simply list the overall standards-more specific topics within must be stated
- Identifies core knowledge and skills students are expected to attain as required by the applicable standards
- Provides a consistent, clear understanding of what students are expected to learn and why they need to learn this for future academic, career and adult success
- Explains how this is a critical goal for students in this course/grade
- Demonstrates students' understanding of the content standard within the time span indicated. *Fill in SCAFFOLD ACTIVITIES SECTION*

Individual SLG Development Worksheets

Assessment and Scoring

Why did you choose this SLG? Cite the evidence/ assessment data that supports your choice.

Additional information:

- Identifies assessments to effectively measure progress toward the SLG
 - Have the rubrics and assessments been validated?
- Identifies supplemental assessments used to include all abilities levels in course / grade?
- Follow guidelines for appropriate assessments:
 - Are assessments valid? Do the assessments test the knowledge and skills that the standards address?
 - Based on the assessment data what patterns or trends do you see?
 - What formative and summative assessments did you use to collect student data?
 - Provide a copy of your scoring rubric.

Individual SLG Development Worksheets

Growth Targets

Considering all available data and content requirements, what is the expected outcome of the whole class as well as the subgroups? Explain how data will change your instructional practices in order to obtain the growth targets?

Additional information:

- Collects baseline data of where every student is now, where we want them to be (growth data), and where they actually end up (post assessment)
- All students in the class should have a growth target
 - Educators should create a chart listing various achievement levels on the pre-assessment, projected growth target and the post-assessment
- Uses baseline or pre-test data to determine appropriate growth
- Explains rigorous expectations for each subgroup
- Creates “tiered” targets when appropriate so all students may demonstrate growth.
- Explains how data will change your instructional practices e.g. lesson plans, instructional strategies, interventions, collegial collaboration, student and parental communication, etc.

List your Professional Growth Goal (s). What are you doing professionally to support the success of the stated SLG?

SLG Approval Form*

General Information:
School Name:
Teacher Name:
Content area:
Grade Level(s):
Beginning date of SLG:

Student Learning (SLG):
After completing the worksheets that follow, write a summary in this box of your SLG.

Educator's Signature _____

Principal's Signature _____

Dates of SLG review _____

~~* Changes may be made to your SLG with administrative approval.~~

SLG Approval Form*

Teacher Name:		
School Name:		
Content area:		
Grade Level(s):		
Certification Period: July 1, 20 ___ to June 30, 20 ___		
SLG Yr. 1:	SLG Yr. 2:	SLG Yr. 3:

Student Learning Goal (Yr. 1):
After completing the worksheets that follow, write a summary in this box of your SLG.

Educator's Signature _____

Principal's Signature _____

Dates of SLG review _____

*** Changes may be made to your SLG with administrative approval.**

Student Learning Goal (Yr. 2):

After completing the worksheets that follow, write a summary in this box of your SLG.

Educator's Signature _____

Principal's Signature _____

Dates of SLG review _____

*** Changes may be made to your SLG with administrative approval.**

Student Learning Goal (Yr. 3):

After completing the worksheets that follow, write a summary in this box of your SLG.

Educator's Signature _____

Principal's Signature _____

Dates of SLG review _____

*** Changes may be made to your SLG with administrative approval.**

Mid-Year Reflection Sheet

Based on the results of your SLG data, complete a self reflection that considering the following:

Things I will stop doing:

Things I will continue doing:

Things I will start doing:

End of Year Reflection Sheet

Based on the results of your SLG data, complete a self reflection that considering the following:

Things I will stop doing:

Things I will continue doing:

Things I will start doing:

End of Year Review:

Review student learning data, including the results of summative assessments, and determine scores for Student Learning Goals.

Prior to end-of-year review conference:

<p>The educator should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Collect all end-of-course assessment data used for the Class and Targeted Student Learning Goal and record this data on the SLG Data Collection Template.● Submit any additional information to help evaluators judge the Targeted Goal. This might consist of additional graded student assessments, classwork, or student work products.● Submit the SLG Data Collection Template hours before the end-of-year review conference.	<p>The evaluator should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Schedule the end-of-year review conference.● Review the educator’s SLG Data Collections Template.● Determine the overall Targeted Student Learning.
--	---

During end-of-year review conference:

1. Review and discuss the student learning data and attainment of goals.
2. Evaluator has a chance to ask any outstanding questions about student learning data, and provide any feedback.

Upon completion of Student Learning Goal and end-of-year review conference:

1. Compile Data Collection Templates, student work samples and assessments to represent work completed throughout the school year to represent work toward the Student Learning Goal
2. Place this evidence in Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities- Component 1: Reflecting on Teaching

Helpful Hints for Collecting and Compiling a “Manageable” Evidence Collection

When creating an evidence collection:

- It’s not just about what you did; it’s about what you learned
- It’s about working to “improve” rather than trying to “prove”
- Less is more – make a concise collection of carefully selected evidence
- Pick illustrative examples rather than including everything
- Avoid creating a “scrapbook” (a collection of personally meaningful mementos)
- Avoid creating a “steamer trunk” (a container stuffed with materials)
- Use technology – put the evidence on your computer, a CD or a USB memory stick; use a digital camera, capture pictures of students’ projects, students working, etc.

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**. ~~“Notification of Concern” form.~~ The **Concern Form** notification 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 as indicated on the Concern Form.** ~~receive verification of the outcome.~~ The administrative supervisor will notify the educator within thirty (30) school days of the outcome of the administrative supervisor's investigation. The administrative supervisor will use the ~~Verification of~~ **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,** ~~verification of the concern,~~ the faculty member 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 verification** 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.***

Notification of Concern Form

NAME: _____ SCHOOL: _____

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

SUPERVISOR: _____ DATE: _____

As per the Raymond School District Educator Effectiveness Plan, this document is notifying you that a concern has been raised regarding your job performance. It is also notifying you that the administrative supervisor will be monitoring/investigating the situation.

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 Notification of 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 day's notice to the administrative supervisor.***

Verification of Concern Form

NAME: _____ SCHOOL: _____

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

SUPERVISOR: _____ DATE: _____

ORIGINAL CONCERN NOTIFICATION DATE: _____

PROPOSED CONCERN CONFERENCE DATE: _____ AND TIME: _____

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. 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 verification. At any point after the verification of the concern, 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 Verification of 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

- 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 developed by the committee. 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 building special education coordinator 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 special education coordinator 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 special education coordinator.
 - 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 building special education coordinator.
 - All paraeducators will have a summative evaluation prior to the end of the school year. A summative evaluation conference is required with the building special education coordinator.

BUILDING LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Building level administrators 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 building level administrator 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. Building level administrators are educational leaders who 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 Building Level Administrator:

Educational Leadership

Effective Building Level Administrators:

- 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.

School Culture and Instructional Programs

Effective Building Level Administrators:

- Promote the success of all students by advocating, nurturing and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

School Management

Effective Building Level Administrators:

- Promote the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources to support a safe, efficient, effective and positive learning environment.

School and Community

Effective Building Level Administrators:

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

Integrity and Ethics

Effective Building Level Administrators:

- Promote the success of all students by acting with integrity and fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Social and Cultural Contexts

Effective Building Level Administrators:

- Promote the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger social, economic, legal and cultural context.

Local District Goals

Effective Building Level Administrators:

- Promote and implement the district goals, collaboratively develops and implements building level goals, and develops professional goals which are in concert with and support district and school level goals.

Student Growth

Effective Building Level Administrators:

- Promote student growth using multiple sources of evidence.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The process serves to evaluate the performances and actions of a building level administrator through focusing on specific behaviors that are associated with students learning. Supervisors will be able to evaluate a building level administrators leadership capabilities and improve educator and student performance (Wallace Foundation, 2009). The evaluation process must be completed by an immediate supervisor who is knowledgeable of the frameworks.

Use of Specific Data/Development of Portfolios

The evaluation of a building level administrator should reference specific data gleaned from a variety of sources to validate performance in conjunction with the frameworks. 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 building level administrator's performance.

It is recommended that a building level administrator collect artifacts (newsletters, schedules, reports, letters etc.) that demonstrate their competencies in a portfolio. Where possible, the portfolio should be organized in such a way that artifacts/products/information are aligned with the frameworks. 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 frameworks.

Standards Rubrics:

An evaluation rubric, based on the frameworks of the ISLLC standards, will be used by the supervisor.

Interactions/Meetings/Timelines:

For all building level administrators, frequent interaction with their supervisor(s) is necessary. Interactions will be both formative and summative. Formative interactions and assessments will be used to guide a building level administrators future actions. Summative interactions and assessments provide the building level administrator with an assessment about competence (Condon & Clifford, 2009). Building level administrators will meet with their supervisor periodically for formative discussions prior to the summative assessment. Accurate documentation will be maintained. This will be in the form of shared notes or minutes taken during meetings. Discussions will reference the frameworks and the goals that have been established in alignment with them.

Evaluating Novice Building Level Administrators

Novice building level administrators (those with three or fewer years) should maintain a close, reflective relationship with their supervisor. The supervisor will meet quarterly with the building level administrator receiving formative assessments of performance.

Evaluating Experienced Building Level Administrators

Experienced building level administrators will meet at least three times per year with a supervisor. The initial and mid-year meetings will be reflective in nature. The final meeting will be summative in nature. Experienced building level administrators will be evaluated at least once every three years.

The supervisor will meet with the building level administrator to establish a priority order of the standards. The building level administrator and supervisor will try to adjust the evaluation period so that it coincides with the normal three year recertification cycle.

Timeline(s)

August/September: Goal setting consultation between building level administrator 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

- Building level administrator shares portfolio information/artifacts with supervisor
- Building level administrator reflects on goals
- Supervisor provides a rubric-based assessment (with written response within 15 days)
- Building level administrators will be able to review and **respond to the summative evaluation.**

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)

NH Principal Evaluation Task Force Report April, 2012

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