



Mountain Song Community School Teacher Evaluation Policy

Purposes

The primary purpose of teacher evaluation at Mountain Song Community School (MSCS) is to improve teacher practice in order to enhance student outcomes. Evaluations will also be used for making decisions about teacher retention.

Evaluation Instrument and Tools

MSCS will utilize the Danielson framework, 2013 edition, which incorporates Common Core Standards. In order to gather data on all the elements of the four domains, the Evaluator will conduct at least 4 walk-through observations per semester, in addition to 1 formal observation per semester. Teachers will also be asked to provide artifacts to support ratings of elements not directly observable, such artifacts to include parent newsletters, evidence of planning, record-keeping, etc. Measures of student growth will be weighted at 20% of the final evaluation.

Evaluator Selection

The evaluator will be selected by the Executive Leadership Team (ELT), such selection to be based on the proposed evaluator's competence to effectively carry out the evaluation policy.

Timeline:

August /September: Annual Orientation for teachers: Go over teacher evaluation rubric, method for teacher evaluation

September / October: Each teacher does a self-assessment using the evaluation rubric. This self-assessment is not necessarily shared with the Evaluator. Each teacher meets with the evaluator to discuss summer progress on Professional Growth Plan (PGP) goals (PGP to be developed at the time of the final evaluation meeting of the previous school year). In the first year of the policy, PGP goals will be developed at the October meeting.

At this meeting, teachers, in conjunction with evaluator, will develop Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) based on student scores on fall testing. Such SLOs shall be specific and measurable.

First semester: Each teacher is observed for a full period of instruction. Evaluator and teacher meet to discuss observation within 48 hours of evaluation. Progress on annual goals is also discussed. Teacher receives written report within five days of observation.

Four walk-through observations per class will also be conducted each semester. Teachers will receive verbal feedback on walk-throughs once per semester.

Second semester: Each teacher is again observed for a full period of instruction, with a meeting within 48 hours. Meeting discussion will include review of progress on annual goals as well as observation and reflection. Meeting will also include discussion on collecting and sharing evidence for domains not directly observable during observations.

Four walk-through observations per class will also be conducted during the second semester. Teachers will receive verbal feedback on walk-throughs once per semester.

Last six weeks of school: Each teacher meets with evaluator to finalize performance ratings. Teachers may bring a completed self-assessment to this meeting to aid in this discussion. At this meeting, a Professional Growth Plan will be collaboratively devised for returning teachers.

Improvement Plan

If, during either of the formal observations, a teacher receives a rating of Unsatisfactory in any component of the evaluation, the teacher will meet with the ELT and the Evaluator to develop an Improvement Plan which will include specific suggestions for improvement as well as a timeline for the implementation of those suggestions. Progress on the Improvement Plan will be monitored by the ELT and Evaluator with follow-up meetings.

Measures of Student Learning:

- For K - 8 class teachers, at least three different means of evaluating student learning will be used to comprise 20% of the teachers' evaluations. Such measures must include at least one for ELA, one for Math, and one for Social-Emotional Learning.
- Teachers of special subjects will develop Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) for each grade level. Student performance on these grade and subject specific SLOs will be used for 20% of special subject teachers' evaluation.
- For grades K - 3, READ Act evaluations will be used for one measure of student learning.
- For grades K - 8, social-emotional learning data will be used. These measures of social-emotional growth will be incorporated into yearly report cards, and teachers will assess students in the first month of school and at the end of the year.
- For grades 3 - 8, the NWEA MAP tests (both ELA and Math) shall be used.
- For grades K - 2, measures of student growth in math shall be derived from assessments included in the Pearson Investigations textbook series that the school has adopted.
- Each class teacher may, in collaboration with the Evaluator, choose one additional measure of student learning in addition to (not in place of) the measures that have been specified in this policy.
- Each measure of student learning will be weighted equally to make up 20% of the evaluation.

Scoring of Measures of Student Growth

Teachers will receive evaluation scores based on the percentage of students who attained the SLO goals set at the beginning of the year.

Distinguished: 95% or more of students achieve SLO goal

Proficient: 80 - 94% of students achieve SLO goal

Basic: 65 - 79% of students achieve SLO goal

Unsatisfactory: Fewer than 65% of students achieve SLO goal

Method of Final Scoring

Each rating will be scored as follows:

Distinguished: 4 points

Proficient: 3 points

Basic: 2 points

Unsatisfactory: 1 point

Each of the five sections of the evaluation (4 domains, plus measures of student growth) will be valued at 20 points per section for a total of 100 points. Scores for Domains 2 and 3 will be added for the total scores of these sections. Because Domains 1 and 4 contain 6 scorable items, scores will be added, then multiplied by .84. Because the Measures of Student Growth section has only 3 scorable items, scores will be added, then multiplied by 1.67. If teachers choose to use more than 3 measures of student growth, the final section scores will be adjusted accordingly.

Final Rating Scale

Distinguished - final score of 90 - 100 points

Proficient - final score of 75 - 89 points

Basic - final score of 50 - 74 points

Unsatisfactory - final score less than 50 points

Revision History

Date	Approval Status	Change Description
Unknown	APPROVED	Date of original approval unknown
2018-11-04	DRAFT	Updated format and changed Executive Director to Executive Leadership Team
2018-12-11	APPROVED	Approved by Board