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Thompson School District believes that, through an effective Educator Evaluation Cycle, teachers and administrators can work collaboratively to provide high quality education to each TSD student. The Education Evaluation process will:

- Provide meaningful and actionable feedback to educators that translates into effective professional growth
- Encourage a collaborative approach for growth and development of licensed personnel
- Focus on instructional practices that will directly improve the learning for all students
- Maintain a focus on using data to help improve learning
- Uphold a system that is uniform, consistent, fair and achievable
- Serve as the mechanism for making administrative recommendations regarding the retention of quality staff who meet the expectations set by the District and its educators
- Meet the requirements set forth by the State of Colorado and the Colorado Department of Education
## Educator Effectiveness

**Timeline and Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION COMPONENT</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Training & Orientation | Prior to completing self-assessment | • Training video for all Staff (District Administration)  
• Notification of Evaluator (Principal)  
• Orientation video to the evaluation process (Principal)  |
| Self-Assessment | October 15th, 2022 | • Self-Assessment Rubric (Teacher)  |
| Review of Annual Goals & Performance Plan Including Educators for Whom SLOs are Required (see page 5), *face-to-face meeting* | November 30th, 2022 | • Review Prior Year Final Rating  
• Completed Self-Assessment (Teacher)  
• Professional Growth Plan with PPS Goals (Teacher)  
• MSL Goals (Principal & Teacher)  
• Formal Conference (Principal & Teacher)  |
| Mid-Year Review *face-to-face meeting* | February 24th, 2023 | • Mid-Year Review Form (Principal)  
• PPS Rubric to Date (Principal)  
• Formal Mid-Year Review Conference to review Rubric, PPS & MSL Goals (Principal & Teacher)  |
| Required Artifact for Professional Practice Rating | Ongoing--completed by March 31st, 2023 | • See page 5 for artifact guidance  
• Gather and complete all supporting documents for chosen measure  
• Complete reflection for chosen measure  
• Upload to RANDA  |
| Submission of Final SLO Data | April 17th, 2023 | • Turn in to evaluator for scoring  |
| Evaluator Assessment | Ongoing--completed by May 1st, 2023 | • Rubric Ratings (Principal)  
• Collect additional artifacts if necessary  |
| End of Year Review *face-to-face meeting* **If educator and evaluator agree on the final effectiveness rating, this step may be combined with the final effectiveness rating step.** | On or before May 5th, 2023 for teacher evaluation | • Self-Assessment Rubric (Teacher)  
• Professional Growth Plan for current and subsequent year (Teacher)  
• End of Year Review Meeting (Principal & Teacher)  |
| End of Year Review | June 5th, 2023 for principal evaluation | • Evaluator Assessment Rubric Worksheet (Principal)  
• End of Year Review Meeting (Principal & Teacher)  |
| Final Effectiveness Ratings | May 5th, 2023 for teacher evaluation | • Preliminary Written Evaluation Report  
*no meetings required*  |
| Final Effectiveness Ratings | June 5th, 2023 for principal evaluation | • Final PPS Rating Submitted (Principal)  
• PPS Evaluation Worksheet (Principal)  
*no meetings required*  |
| Goal setting & Performance Planning *optional in RANDA* | Prior to next evaluation cycle | • Professional Growth Plan (projected PPS Goals)  
*No meetings required*  |
| Final Effectiveness Rating | Due by May 22nd, 2023 | • Final MSL Composite Score & Score Sheets (Principal)  
• Final Combined Summative Rating submitted to Human Resources (Principal)  
• Final Combined Summative Rating uploaded to On-line management system  |
**Educator Effectiveness**

**Professional Practice Standards**

**CDE Model Educator Evaluation System for Teachers as it Pertains to TSD**

**Observations based on the Four Quality Standards that measure professional practice and student learning over time.**

- All standards are weighted equally
  - Standard 1 - Know Content
  - Standard 2 - Establish Environment
  - Standard 3 - Facilitate learning
  - Standard 4 - Reflect on Practice & Leadership

**One Required Artifact**

Used to inform the rubric

See Timeline and Requirements

- Artifact and supporting documents
- Reflection that explicitly links the measure to elements within the Teacher Quality Standard Rubric

**Two Basic Requirements**

1. Individual Attribution
2. Collective Attribution

**TSD Model**

1. Collective Attribution - 1%
2. Individual Attribution - 49%

**Collective Attribution - 1%**

For high school, district graduation rates will be used. For middle and elementary levels the school average i-Ready growth scores will be used. For early childhood, Teaching Strategies Gold program averages will be used.

**Models for Individual Attribution - 49%**

All licensed staff will choose from either the default assessment for their level, approved district/curriculum-based or an SLO. (See page 7 for more details)
Additional Evidence / Artifacts

EXHIBIT: (Teacher Examples from CDE User’s Guide)
Artifacts listed below are examples of items that may be used to provide evidence of proficiency on any given standard. The list of artifacts is not exhaustive, rather it is suggestive to teachers and principals regarding the types of artifacts that may be useful for discussion in the evaluation process. Identifying these artifacts is not required by either the evaluator or the teacher nor does collection of these artifacts signify mastery of a standard. The teacher being evaluated may use these or additional artifacts to address specific issues that need further explanation or illustration during the end-of-year performance discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Evidence/Artifacts:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of professional practice may include additional measures such as those listed below. These are provided as examples of evidence the evaluator and/or educator being evaluated may share with each other to provide evidence of performance in addition to observations and evaluator ratings collected on the rubric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Anecdotal Records
- Assessment Plans
- Data Analysis Record
- Documentation of service on teams, task forces and committees
- Feedback from Walkthroughs
- Formative and Summative Assessment of Student Work
- Instructional Activities Schedules
- Lesson Plans/Units of Study
- Notes from parent and community meetings
- Parent Feedback
- Records of Advocacy Activities Responses to Feedback
- Self-Reflection
- Student Achievement Data
- Student Feedback
- Student Journals/Learning Logs
- Student Portfolios
- Student Work
Thompson Observation Protocol in accordance with S.B. 10-191:

Probationary teachers - At least three observations that total 60 minutes or more, when combined with feedback regarding the observation, shall be provided promptly and in a face-to-face manner when possible. RANDA will be updated by the evaluator.

Non-Probationary teachers - At least one observation of 20 minutes or more, when combined with feedback regarding the observation, shall be provided promptly and in a face-to-face manner when possible. RANDA will be updated by the evaluator.

Implications for earning or losing non-probationary status by performance evaluation rating:

Ineffective/Partially Effective - Non-probationary status will be lost after two consecutive years of a partially effective or ineffective rating.

Effective/Highly Effective - Non-probationary status will be earned on the first day of the fourth year after receiving a rating of effective or highly effective for three consecutive years.
CDE Model Educator Evaluation System for Principals and Assistant Principals as it Pertains to TSD

**Professional Practices - 50%**
Observations based on the Four Quality Standards that measure professional practice and student learning over time
- All standards are weighted equally
  - Standard 1 - Strategic Leadership
  - Standard 2 - Inclusive Leadership
  - Standard 3 - Instruction Leadership
  - Standard 4 - Professionalism

**Recommended Artifacts (at least one artifact required)**
Used to inform the rubric
- Artifact and supporting documents
- Reflection that explicitly links the measure to elements within the Principal Quality Standard Rubric
- Percentage and number of teacher ratings
- Percentage and number of teacher improvement
- Student perceptions
- Parent/guardian perceptions
- Other administrators’ perceptions

**Measures of Student Learning - 50%**

**Collective Attribution - 1%**
Either Gold Strategies (if EC), school i-Ready average (if K-8), or district graduation rates (if HS).

**Individual Attribution - 49%**
At least one measure of student academic growth or achievement must be used. Examples:
- targets in the SUIP
- is consistent with the measures of student academic growth or achievement used for the evaluation of teachers in the principal’s school
- individualized school or program based measure
Thompson Observation Protocol in accordance with S.B. 10-191:

Principals shall receive at least one evaluation that results in a written evaluation report each academic year. The written evaluation report, informed by a body of evidence collected systematically in the months prior, shall rate a Principal as highly effective, effective, partially effective, or ineffective.

Other measures (additional evidence/artifacts) of a principal’s performance may include direct observations.
## Educator Effectiveness

### Measures of Student Learning

#### Collective Attribution = 1%
- High School: District graduation rates
- Elementary and Middle School: School i-Ready average growth
- Early Childhood: Teaching Strategies Gold program average growth

#### Individual Attribution = 49% (see below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Collective 1%</th>
<th>Individual (49%) Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Early Childhood  | Program average Teaching Strategies Gold           | 1. Default: Teaching Strategies Gold OR  
2. District Assessments OR  
3. SLO                                                                 |
| Elementary       | i-Ready school average growth                      | 1. Default: i-Ready (growth or achievement):  
1. Math OR  
2. Reading OR  
2. District Assessments OR  
3. SLO                                                                 |
| Middle School    | i-Ready school average growth                      | 1. Default: i-Ready (growth or achievement):  
1. Math for math teachers OR  
2. Reading for ELA & SS teacher OR  
3. Math/Reading (equally weighted) for other educators OR  
2. District Assessments OR  
3. SLO                                                                 |
| High School      | District Graduation Rates                          | 1. PSAT/SAT (added into Illuminate):  
1. PSAT grades 9, 10, & 11 OR  
2. District Assessments OR  
3. SLO                                                                 |
| SSPs or any other licensed staff specialist | Select most relevant collective attribution from above groups | Select most relevant individual attribution choice from above groups |
| Principal        | Either school i-Ready average (if K-8), or district graduation rates (if HS) | At least one measure of student academic growth or achievement must be used. See examples on page 7. |
Educator Effectiveness

**Student Learning Objective (SLO)**

In general, the following teachers and educators are encouraged to complete an SLO:
- SSP’s: Audiologist, OT/PT, Nurse, Counselor, SLP, Social Worker, Psych., Orientation and Mobility Specialist
- All ILC, Affective Needs, and ESS teachers with less than 50% of students rostered to them that do not have district assessment data
- Some education programs: TOL, SOARs, ATLAS, HOPE, Community Connections, and THRIVE
- Any Unique Role educator (e.g. TOSA, Instructional Coach, Program Coordinator)

Guidance from CDE:
[http://www.cde.state.co.us/educatoreffectiveness/implementationguidance](http://www.cde.state.co.us/educatoreffectiveness/implementationguidance)

TSD SLO Template:
[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QtCOAGh8FV7zHbnXnzMQnCMZd6ks0Cl5Y17TLS5jZIc/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QtCOAGh8FV7zHbnXnzMQnCMZd6ks0Cl5Y17TLS5jZIc/edit?usp=sharing)

TSD SLO Approval Rubric:
[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uOfNW_fdvxqhcenx9HWR5xP4IlcRp0fZ/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=10599632560000292152&trpof=true&sd=true](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1uOfNW_fdvxqhcenx9HWR5xP4IlcRp0fZ/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=10599632560000292152&trpof=true&sd=true)

An SLO is:
A specific, long term goal for student learning, customized to an educator’s particular students.
- A **teacher SLO** must be directly tied to student achievement or growth. This includes anyone evaluated on the teacher rubric.
- An **SSP SLO** may be associated with indicators of student well-being and/or academic progress.

**SLO Process:**
**Step 1 - Data Gathering:** Educators review data about their students, including statewide and prior assessments.
**Step 2 - Draft and Submit SLO:** Individual educators draft and submit their SLO.
**Step 3 - SLO Approval (Due Nov. 30, 2022):** Evaluators review and approve proposed SLOs or request revisions and meet with educator. Evaluators also progress monitor educators throughout the SLO process.
**Step 4 - SLO Scoring:** Educators submit SLO results including data, analysis, and results to evaluators.
**Step 5 - Reflection:** Educators and evaluators discuss progress and implications for the next year’s SLO and Measures of Student Learning/Outcomes.

**SLO Helpful Hints:**
- Utilize assessments or measures that you value and inform your practice
- Collaborate with evaluator


Educator Effectiveness

Final Effectiveness Rating Templates

**Early Childhood**
- Professional Practice Standard: 50.0%
- Default: Teaching Strategies Gold
  - OR -
  - District Assessments
  - OR -
  - SLO
- Program Average Teaching Strategies Gold: 49.0%

**Elementary**
- Professional Practice Standard: 50.0%
- Default: i-Ready Growth:
  - OR -
  - a. Math
  - OR -
  - b. Reading
- i-Ready School Average Growth: 49.0%
- OR -
- District Assessments
- OR -
- SLO
**Educator Effectiveness**

**Final Effectiveness Rating Templates**

**Middle School**
- Professional Practice Standard: 50.0%
- i-Ready School Average Growth: 49.0%
- Default: i-Ready Growth
  - a. Math for math teachers
  - b. Reading for ELA & SS teachers
- OR-
  - District Assessments
- OR-
  - SLO

**High School**
- Professional Practice Standard: 50.0%
- District Graduation Rates: 49.0%
- PSAT/SAT added into Illuminate
  - PSAT grades 9, 10, & 11
- OR-
  - District Assessments
- OR-
  - SLO
SSPs
or any other Licensed Staff Specialist

Professional Practice Standard
50.0%
Select most relevant individual attribution choice from above groups
49.0%
Select most relevant collective attribution from above groups

Principals

Professional Practice Standard
50.0%
At least 1 qualifying measure of student academic growth
49.0%
Either school i-Ready average (if K-8), or school graduation rates (if HS)

Questions?
General: Keely Garren, Director of Professional Development, ext. 5659
MSL-Specific: Brigitte Mutter, Director of Assessment and Evaluation, ext. 6173
RANDA: Amanda Goetz, Human Resources Technician, ext. 5771