

Book

BOARD POLICIES

Section

Personnel Policies

Title

Effective Teaching Standards and Educator Evaluation

Number

Status

Pending Board Approval

Adopted

Effective Teaching Standards and Educator Evaluations

Utah Code Ann. §53A-8a-301 et seq., Employee Evaluations

Utah Code Ann. §53A-8a-401 et seq., Educator Evaluations

Utah Code Ann. §53A-8a-501 et seq., Orderly School Termination Procedures Utah Code Ann. §53A-8a-601 et seq., Performance Compensation

Utah Admin. Code R277-531, Public Educator Evaluation Requirements

Utah Admin. Code R277-532, Local Board Policies for Evaluation of Non-Licensed Public Education Employees (Classified Employees)

1. Purpose:

The purpose of the formal educator evaluation system of Bonneville Academy is to insure that the best possible instruction and learning are accomplished and to provide feedback to the educator in order to promote professional growth in conjunction with the educator's plan for professional development. The evaluation process is also intended to establish behaviors that contribute to student progress.

2. Policy

The Bonneville Academy Board of Directors (Board) understands the importance of guaranteeing that every child has an effective educator. Research shows that educator quality

affects student achievement greater than any other school based variable. It is the policy of the Board to focus on preparing, recruiting, and retaining quality educators as primary strategies to boost academic achievement. By linking educator evaluation with academic standards for students and professional standards for educators, the Board will ensure that educator evaluation is effective tool for improving instructional practice and raising student achievement.

3. Procedure for Educator Evaluation:

3.1 Definitions

"Educator" means an individual licensed under Utah Code Section 53A-6-104 who, as a condition of licensure, is required to comply with the standards and requirements of Utah Administrative Rule R277-530 and R277-531. For the purpose of this policy an educator does not include individuals who work less than three hours per day or who are hired for less than half of a school year.

"Effectiveness Standards" means the Utah Effective Teaching and Educational Leadership Standards found in Utah Administrative Code R277-530 located on-line at:
<http://www.rules.utah.gov/publicat/code/r277/r277-530.htm>

"Formative Evaluation" means evaluations that provide Educators with feedback on how to improve their performance. The Administrator conducting a Formative Evaluation may review applicable and available Educator Evaluation Multiple Lines of Evidence to include, but not limited to observations, evidence, Educator effectiveness, stakeholder input, student growth and information obtained from at least two Walk-through Evaluations. This information may be used to "re-validate" the most recent Summative Evaluation or as a basis to conduct a formal Summative Evaluation. Formative Educator Evaluation is based on the Effectiveness Standards.

"Misconduct" means conduct that is designated as a cause for termination or disciplinary action under Section [53A-8a-501](#), a violation of Academy Policy or a reason for license discipline by the State Board of Education or as a basis for action recommended by the Utah Professional Practices Advisory Commission. Misconduct also includes, but is not limited to, a violation of work rules; a violation of Board policies, State Board of Education rules, directives issued by an administrator or supervisor, or law; a violation of standards of ethical, moral, or professional conduct; or insubordination.

"Summative Evaluation" means evaluations that are used to make annual decisions or ratings of Educator performance and may inform decisions on salary, continued employment, personnel assignments, or dismissals.

"Unsatisfactory performance" means a deficiency in performing work tasks which may be due to insufficient or undeveloped skills, lack of knowledge or aptitude, poor attitude, or insufficient

effort; and remediated through training, study, mentoring, practice, or greater effort. Unsatisfactory performance does not include Misconduct.

“Utah Effective Teaching Standards” identified in Utah Administrative Rule R277-530.

Utah Code governing Educator Evaluations is contained in Utah Code 53A-8a-401 et seq.

3.2. Educator Evaluation Training and Notification

3.2.1. The Academy will explain the evaluation process and provide comprehensive training with follow-up training as needed. The Director will monitor and enforce compliance and intervene as necessary.

3.2.2. The Academy will notify educators of the evaluation process, provide a copy of the instrument, and conduct a group meeting to explain the purpose of, procedure, and the methods used to evaluate educators at least 15 days before an educator's first evaluation. Evaluations may not occur prior to the orientation.

3.3. Educator Evaluation Process

3.3.1. The Academy’s Evaluation Instrument shall be based on the Utah Effectiveness Standards:

3.3.2. Educator Evaluation Multiple Lines of Evidence:

3.3.2.1. Self Evaluation: Each Educator shall engage in a self-assessment and develop a professional growth plan using the Effectiveness Standards no later than 15 days following the principal’s group meeting to explain the purpose of and the methods used to evaluate Educators.

3.3.2.2. Instruction: The Academy will measure effective, consistent, and meaningful instruction using the principles and guidelines outlined in the Effectiveness Standards. This is primarily accomplished and documented using the Academy Evaluation Instrument through a reasonable number of observations and other indicators of instructional knowledge, skill, and ability.

3.3.2.3. Student Achievement: The Academy will measure student growth using assessment data as required by Administrative Rule and State Code.

3.3.2.4. Parent and Student Input: Parents and students will be given the opportunity to provide input using available tools and web-based surveys. Data will be recorded and measured to provide feedback on Academy climate and educator effectiveness.

3.3.2.5. PLC Effectiveness: The Academy will also use as part of an educator's overall performance score, Team Effectiveness measured through: PLC participation, ensuring the expected effective completion of their team's section of the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan, department/team performance scores, and Academy-wide scores, thus expecting to maintain PLC's and the PLC process within the Academy.

3.3.2.6. Random Evaluation: (Walk-through Evaluation) At any time the Director or designee may randomly and informally evaluate an Educator and record observations using the applicable Effectiveness Standards and evaluation instruments.

3.3.2.7. Additional Evaluation Evidence:

- Portfolio Evidence
- Completed Professional Development
- Student or parent expressed praise or concerns
- Peer feedback or expressed praise or concerns

3.3.3. Summative Evaluation:

3.3.3.1. Differentiated Levels of Performance:

- Highly Effective
- Effective
- Third level based on license level
 - Emerging Effective – First year of a new subject, grade level or Academy assignment.
 - Minimally Effective – Veteran Educators
- Not Effective

3.3.3.2. Components and Weight: Educators shall receive a Summative Evaluation score based on a formula using guidance from USOE that considers three weighted components;

- Educational Effectiveness,
- Stakeholder Input, and
- Student Growth.

Each component will be measured by one or more of the Multiple Lines of Evidence. The Summative Evaluation system shall align with the above four differentiated levels of performance:

3.3.3.3. The administrator responsible for an Educator's Summative Evaluation shall allow the Educator to make a written response to any part of the Summative Evaluation and attach the Educator's response to the evaluation.

3.3.3.4. Within 5 calendar days after the Summative Evaluation process is completed, the administrator shall discuss the written evaluation with the Educator and any revision of the written evaluation made after the discussion. The Administrator shall file the evaluation and any related reports or documents and provide the Educator access to the file.

3.3.3.5. Administrators shall share and discuss summative ratings with Educators by May 20 of each year. The evaluating administrator may conduct further Formative or Summative Evaluations throughout the year and if needed hold a teacher conference, develop a performance improvement plan, a Plan of Assistance, or adjust the Summative Evaluation rating as needed.

3.3.4. Summative Rating Review:

3.3.4.1. Any Educator who is not satisfied with a Summative Evaluation rating may request a review of the evaluation within 5 days after receiving the written evaluation.

3.3.4.2. If a review is requested, the Director or the Director's Designee shall appoint a person not employed by the Academy who has expertise in teacher or personnel evaluation to review the evaluation procedures and make recommendations to the Director regarding the Educator's Summative Evaluation in accordance with USOE guidelines.

3.3.5. Wage Increase and Legislative Supplemental Salary Adjustments

3.3.5.1. An Educator that receives the lowest level ("Not Effective") on the most recent evaluation may not advance on the salary schedule. A Not Effective Rating shall constitute a summative rating of less than satisfactory and subject the Educator to withholding of the most recent legislative allocated salary adjustment pursuant to UCA § 53A-17a-153 (4) c, and Administrative Rule R277-110.

3.4. Educator Deficiencies:

3.4.1. Notice of Improvement:

3.4.1.1. The administrator shall give an Educator whose performance is inadequate or in need of improvement a written document clearly identifying:

- specific, measurable, and actionable deficiencies;
- the available resources that will be provided for improvement; and
- a recommended course of action that will improve the Educator's performance.

3.4.1.2. The Educator is responsible for improving performance, including using any resources identified by the Academy, and demonstrating acceptable levels of improvement in the designated areas of deficiencies.

3.4.1.3. An administrator is not required to remediate an Educator with a Notice of Improvement if the Educator's unsatisfactory performance was documented for the same deficiency within the previous three years and a plan of assistance was implemented.

3.4.2. Plan of Assistance:

3.4.2.1. If the Academy intends to not renew an Educator's work agreement for unsatisfactory performance or to terminate the work agreement term for unsatisfactory performance, the Academy shall:

- provide and discuss with the employee written documentation clearly identifying the deficiencies in performance;
- provide written notice that the employee's work agreement is subject to non-renewal or termination if, upon a reevaluation of the employee's performance, the employee's performance is determined to be unsatisfactory;
- develop and implement a plan of assistance in an attempt to allow the employee an opportunity to improve performance;
- re-evaluate the employee's performance; and
- if the employee's performance remains unsatisfactory, give notice of intent to not renew or terminate the employee's work agreement.

3.4.2.2. The period of time for implementing a Plan of Assistance:

- may not exceed 120 school days, except as provided in this policy;
- may continue into the next school year;

- should be sufficient to successfully complete the plan of assistance; and
- shall begin when the employee receives the written notice provided and end when the determination is made that the employee has successfully remediated the deficiency.

3.4.2.3. The Director may extend the period of time for implementing a plan of assistance beyond 120 school days if:

- The employee has been approved and qualifies for leave under the Family Medical Leave Act during the time period the plan of assistance is scheduled to be implemented; or
- For other compelling reasons as approved by the Board if the leave was scheduled before the employee was placed on a Plan of Assistance.

3.4.2.4. If upon a reevaluation of the employee's performance, the Academy determines the employee's performance is satisfactory, and within a three-year period after the initial documentation of unsatisfactory performance for the same deficiency, the employee's performance is determined to be unsatisfactory, the Academy may elect to not renew or terminate the employee's work agreement without implementing a new Plan of Assistance.

3.4.2.5. If the Academy intends to not renew or terminate an employee's work agreement for performance under this section, the Director will provide written documentation of the employee's deficiencies in performance; and give notice of intent to not renew or terminate the employee's work agreement.

3.5. Nothing in this Policy shall prevent the Academy from taking appropriate disciplinary action for Misconduct.

