

**District School Board of Pasco County
Race to the Top Evaluation System**

Section I. System Components Referenced both by the RTTT Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Florida Statutes

1. Core Effective Practices

- a. The purpose of the redeveloped evaluation system is to increase student-learning growth by improving the quality of instructional practices. The adoption of the state approved Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model (MCTEM) will achieve this goal.
- b. In order to accomplish this purpose, the MCTEM includes observation instruments to connect specific practices to research and evidence of student learning.
- c. The MCTEM establishes a clear connection to each of the six Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. These connections are referenced in the state provided crosswalk (Addendum B). The District will refine and/or revise during the next four years, as understanding of the research base for MCTEM becomes known.
- d. The list of related research to support the MCTEM is found in the document entitled *Research Base and Validation Studies on the Marzano Evaluation Model, April 2011* (Addendum A).
- e. The District will contract with an accomplished educational consulting group to provide training and support, and to ensure inter-rater reliability.

2. Student Growth Measures

- a. The District School Board of Pasco County (DSBPC) Student Growth portion of the Teacher Evaluation Model will be implemented using the assessments indicated in Table 1 for 2013-2014.

Table 1.

Student Growth Assessment Measures SY 2013-2014

Elementary Schools	Middle Schools	High Schools
SAT10 (Grades K-1) Discovery Ed Reading (Grades 2-3) FCAT VAM 4-5	FCAT VAM FCAT R VAM (Roster-based) Algebra 1 VAM, if approved EOC	FCAT VAM Algebra 1 VAM EOCs College Readiness AP, IB

- b. For the VAM and college readiness measures, the percentage of students assigned to the teacher will be calculated (meeting the defined measure or not).

Table 2 outlines the classification to be used based on this rating. In order to calculate the three-year average, the district will average the student growth rating for the previous two years with the current year to produce the three-year average for the current school year's student growth measure.

Table 2.

DSBPC Student Growth Classification SY2013-2014

Rating	Percentage of Students Meeting Defined Criteria
Highly Effective	75-100%
Effective	40-74%
Needs Improvement	20-39%
Unsatisfactory	0-19%

c. Elementary Schools

Pre-K teachers will receive a student growth measure based on the Teaching Strategies Gold which measures five domains: Language/Literacy, Approaches to Learning, Social Emotional Development, General Cognition, and Physical Health. Growth will be determined based on the comparison from Test 1 to Test 3 where students meet the development range identified by Teaching Strategies Gold. The percentage of students meeting a growth determinant will be calculated for the teacher and the teacher's rating will be based on Table 1. The Pre-K VE student growth measure will be based on the IEP goals.

Primary Teachers (K-3) will be measured by the reading performance of students on the SAT 10 (grades K-1) or Discovery Education (Grades 2-3). For SAT10, the average percentage of students in the class will be compared to the school average for classification where the school average will equate to a 3.0 or Effective rating (see Table 4). For Discovery Education, teachers (grades 2-3) will be measured by the percentage of students who earn a learning gain on the Discovery Education Assessment Platform (DE). Learning Gains will be defined in the following way based on the student's performance from Test A to Test D:

- Student scores Level 3 or better on Test A and remains at this proficient level on Test D
- Student increases a level in performance from Test A to Test D
- Student scores Level 1 or 2 on Test A and remains in that level on Test D but earns the following point change in scale score.

Table 3.

DE Scale Score Point Change for Levels 1 and 2

Grade Level	Performance Level	CCSS ELA	CCSS Mathematics
Grade 2	Level 1	87	112
	Level 2	60	103
Grade 3	Level 1	106	149
	Level 2	75	122

Table 4

SAT10 Growth Rubric

Rating	Percentage of Students Meeting Defined Criteria
Highly Effective	5 percentage points more than school average
Effective	School Average for Grade Level
Needs Improvement	5 percentage points lower than school average
Unsatisfactory	10 percentage points lower than school average

Primary Teachers of students with disabilities for whom the SAT10 is not appropriate will be assessed using the IEP goals.

In grades 4 and 5, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their expected level of performance on the FCAT 2.0 Reading and/or Mathematics calculated by AIR for the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) will be used. For teachers of students with disabilities who are assessed with the FAA, the growth will be used to calculate the student growth measure where Level 4-9 will result in a gain or an increase in achievement level yields a gain.

For positions that work with the entire student body, a school-wide score will be applied based on the FCAT VAM data. These positions may include the ICT Coach, Art, guidance counselor, behavior specialist, nurse, social worker, psychologist, etc. Where there are multiple teachers serving the school, the FCAT VAM will be applied for the students assigned to the teacher.

d. Middle School

In grades 6-8, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their expected level of performance on the FCAT 2.0 Reading and/or Mathematics calculated by AIR for the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) will be used. Teachers of Reading and Language Arts will be based on the FCAT 2.0 Reading VAM. Teachers of middle school mathematics courses will be based on the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics. Teachers of Algebra 1 will be based on the proficiency (Levels 3-5)

on the Algebra 1 EOC (or VAM if one is approved by FLDOE). Non FCAT Teachers will be based on the FCAT 2.0 Reading VAM for students assigned to the teacher. For teachers of students with disabilities who are assessed with the FAA, the growth will be used to calculate the student growth measure where Level 4-9 will result in a gain or an increase in achievement level yields a gain.

For positions that work with the entire student body, a school-wide score will be applied based on the FCAT VAM data. These positions may include the ICT Coach, Art, guidance counselor, behavior specialist, nurse, social worker, psychologist, etc. Where there are multiple teachers serving the school, the FCAT VAM will be applied for the students assigned to the teacher.

e. High School

In grades 9-10, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their expected level of performance on the FCAT 2.0 Reading and/or Mathematics and /or Algebra 1 calculated by AIR for the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) will be used where appropriate. Teachers of Grade 9 or 10 Reading and Language Arts will be based on the FCAT 2.0 Reading VAM. Teachers of Algebra 1 will be based on the Algebra 1 EOC VAM. Non FCAT Teachers of grade 9 and 10 students will be based on the FCAT 2.0 Reading VAM for students assigned to the teacher. Teachers of students in courses for which a state EOC is administered (Algebra 1 without VAM, Geometry, Biology, or US History) will have student growth scores based on the percentage of students scoring proficient on these exams. Teachers of students in courses with an Advanced Placement (AP) exam or International Baccalaureate (IB) exam will have a student growth score measure based on the percentage of student scores. For teachers of students with disabilities who are assessed with the FAA, the growth will be used to calculate the student growth measure where Level 4-9 will result in a gain or an increase in achievement level yields a gain.

For positions that work with the entire student body, a school-wide score will be applied based on the FCAT VAM data. These positions may include the ICT Coach, Art, guidance counselor, behavior specialist, nurse, social worker, psychologist, etc. Where there are multiple teachers serving the school, the FCAT VAM will be applied for the students assigned to the teacher.

Teachers of grades 11 and 12 will be measured using a calculation of students assigned to them meeting College Readiness (See Table 5). Alternative: Students will be determined to meet the growth measure if they have met the expected score based on the regression formula for their FCAT 2.0 Reading score.

Table 5.

	SAT		ACT			PERT		
	R	M	R	E	M	R	W	M
College Ready 6A-10.0315	440	440	19	17	19	106	103	114

Teachers of students with disabilities for whom the identified tests are not appropriate will be assessed using the IEP goals.

- f. District Decisions
 - a. Evaluation Criteria
 - i. Classroom Teachers - Where less than three (3) years of data are available, the District will use data that is available for the 50% student growth portion of the teacher evaluation.

3. Evaluation Rating Criteria

- a. The District will use the state identified rating labels of “unsatisfactory,” “developing/needs improvement,” “effective,” and “highly effective.”
- b. The District’s adoption of the state approved MCTEM incorporates rubrics, weighting scales, and a scoring system to define and decide an employee’s final evaluation rating.
- c. For 2013 - 2014, the process of assigning the final evaluation rating will include data collection on the elements of Domain 1 of the MCTEM through observations and conferencing. The final rating will be assigned by a school administrator and will be based on a teacher’s status score (50%) and the teacher’s student growth calculation (50%). For the 2013-2014, the District will utilize an additive model to incorporate Deliberate Practice into a teacher’s final evaluation score. The Deliberate Practice component represents additional points that will be added to a teacher’s Status Score prior to it being averaged with the Student Growth Measure Score for the final summative evaluation score. The Deliberate Practice score is generated through administrative observation of one (1) Domain 1 element that the teacher and observing administrator select as a targeted element of instructional practice focus.

Section II. System Components Referenced only by the MOU

4. Teacher and Principal Involvement

- a. The District established a Race to the Top steering committee to oversee the implementation of each project associated with the grant. This committee is comprised of district and school based administrators, teachers as well as union representatives. The District also established an evaluation subcommittee

comprised of district based administrators, including representatives from the offices Human Resources, Employee Relations, Professional Development, Teaching and Learning, Student Support Services and Information Services. A diverse cross section of this subcommittee attended the technical assistance meetings conducted by the state.

- b. The Race to the Top steering committee and the evaluation subcommittee will continue to meet to monitor grant implementation and make recommendations for future implementation.
- c. The memorandum of understanding signed by the District and union is attached (Addendum B).

5. Multiple Evaluations for First Year Teachers

- a. First year teachers to the District will be formally observed a minimum of two (2) times each school year. Formative student performance data will be reviewed throughout the school year, and summative performance data (e.g. FCAT) will be reviewed when it is made available each year.
- b. The types of student performance data will include formative and summative measures (e.g. standardized assessments, attendance and course grades, student behavior strategies, curriculum based assessments, screening and diagnostic assessments, and benchmark assessments).
- c. Observations and data reviews are conducted by school administrators.
- d. The focus of the feedback for a newly hired teacher will be specific to improvements and level of progress toward effective instructional practice. Feedback will be provided during pre- and post-observation conferences and during data reviews.
- e. The same observation instrument and rating system will be utilized for all instructional personnel.

6. Additional Metric Evaluation Element

- a. The District will incorporate deliberate practice as an additional metric.
- b. This additional metric will be applied to all teachers for the 2013 – 2014 school year.
- c. The deliberate practice score will be multiplied by 20% and then added to the teacher's 50% instructional practice component.

7. Milestone Career Event

Because the District will be implementing a multi-metric evaluation for all teachers identification of individual milestone career events is not required.

Section III. System Components Referenced by Florida Statutes

8. Annual Evaluation

- a. All teachers, other than teachers new to the District, will be observed formally one (1) time during the 2013-2014 school year. Formative student performance data will be reviewed throughout the school year, and summative performance data (e.g. FCAT) will be reviewed when it is made available each year. Additionally, the District will introduce informal observations during the 2013 – 2014 school year. Informal observations will be unannounced observations that will generally last between 10 – 15 minutes each. Results from informal observations will be recorded and feedback will be provided to teachers for the purpose of growth in instructional practice.
- b. The types of student performance data will include formative and summative measures (e.g. standardized assessments, attendance and course grades, student behavior strategies, curriculum based assessments, screening and diagnostic assessments, and benchmark assessments).
- c. Observations and data reviews are conducted by trained school administrators.
- d. The focus of feedback for all teachers will be specific to improvements and level of progress toward effective instructional practice. Feedback will be provided during pre and post observation conferences and during data reviews.
- e. The same observation instrument and rating system will be utilized for all instructional personnel.

9. Improvement Plans

- a. Data from the teacher evaluation system will be analyzed at the district and school level to support improvement planning.
- b. Data on instructional practices from the teacher evaluation system will be collected annually and combined with student achievement data to inform school and district improvement plans and teachers' individual professional development plans, which will, in turn, inform the deliberate practice component of the teacher evaluation system.

10. Continuous Professional Improvement

- a. Data on instructional practices collected during conferencing and observations will be provided through verbal and/or written feedback to the teacher throughout the school year. This feedback will be used by administrators and teachers for individual improvement planning.
- b. During the 2013 – 2014 school year, data collected on individual teacher instructional practices in Domain 1 will be baseline data to inform individual professional development planning for the 2013 – 2014 school year. This

process will be continued in future years as the deliberate practice component.

11. Teaching Fields Requiring Special Procedures

- a. The District has not identified teaching fields requiring special procedures.

12. Evaluator Training

- a. The District will contract with an accomplished educational consulting group to develop training in the proper use of assessment criteria and procedures for all personnel with appraisal responsibilities. This training will be delivered to all school-based administrators during the 2013 – 2014 school year.
- b. The Office for Professional Development will conduct quality assurance reviews annually to monitor evaluator performance and ensure consistency of results. Training needs will be addressed through monthly administrator meetings.

13. Process of Informing Teachers About the Evaluation Process

- a. The District will develop training modules specific to the MCTEM to be utilized by each administrator as part of the annual professional development process.
- b. Newly hired teachers will participate in the teacher evaluation system training modules used annually at each school.

14. Parent Input

- a. Multiple opportunities for parents to provide input into employee performance evaluations may include:
 - a. School/district surveys
 - b. Conferences
 - c. Phone calls
 - d. Electronic communications
 - e. School Advisory Councils
 - f. Parent organizations and clubs

15. Annual Review by the District

- a. The District's Evaluation Steering Committee will annually review the ~~new~~ teacher evaluation system, as well as the results of the annual evaluations, for compliance with applicable statutes and to evaluate the effectiveness of the system itself in improving instruction and student learning.

- b. At the end of the 2013 – 2014 school year, in order to support improvements in instruction and student learning, the Office for Professional Development will analyze the distribution of the ratings of teacher effectiveness and the student performance data at each school site.

16. Peer Review Option

- a. The District will not utilize peer assistance as part of the teacher evaluation system.

17. Evaluation by Supervisor

- a. The administrator responsible for supervising the employee will evaluate the employee's performance.

18. Input into the Evaluation by Trained Personnel other than the Supervisor

- a. Only trained school or district administrators will be responsible for the evaluation of teachers they supervise.

19. Amending Evaluations

- a. The District reserves the right, as additional applicable data are received, to amend the evaluation process within the guidelines set forth in Florida statute.