Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan

2015-16
District Purpose:

The purpose of establishing procedures for evaluating the performance of duties and responsibilities of all instructional, administrative, and supervisory personnel is to increase student learning growth by improving the quality of instructional, administrative, and supervisory services.

District Mission: Supporting effective instruction and continuous professional learning that results in student learning outcomes.

District Vision: Sharing responsibility and taking ownership for student growth and outcomes.

District Core Beliefs:

- Our system will support interdependence among faculty and administrators, as well as individual accountability, for teacher learning and growth.
- Our system will support interdependence (vertically and horizontally) among faculty and administrators, as well as individual accountability, for student learning and academic growth and the development of the whole child.
- Our system will be designed to actively engage all faculty and administrators to collectively deepen knowledge and improve skills that result in improved student learning.
- Our system for measuring student growth and learning will include content knowledge and Pedagogy in Instructional Practice informed by state and national standards.
- For courses and subject areas not measured by statewide assessments, PKY will design course-description-aligned performance assessments and will include a percentage of state-testing measures.
- We will continue to strengthen our learning-goals-driven, formative assessment system (AFL) to align with student learning goals.
- Our system will be designed to support collective responsibility for post-secondary student success.

The Race to the Top MOU section (D)(2)(ii) and 1012.34(1)(b) requires that the school district’s instructional personnel and school administrator evaluation systems must be approved by the Department of Education. State Board Rule 6B-4.010, F.A.C., requires that where a district “…makes substantive modifications to an approved school district instructional personnel assessment system, the modified system shall be submitted to the Department of Education for review and approval.”

The purpose of P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School’s redeveloped Performance Evaluation System is to increase student learning growth by improving the quality of instructional, administrative, and supervisory service (1012.34 (1)(a), F.S. and MOU (D) (2)(ii)2. To this end, P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School (PKY) is committed to a cycle of continually updating the evaluation system to reflect state models, emerging best practices, and policy changes. PKY’s system was designed and developed by the Teacher Evaluation Leadership Team (TE-LT). The TE-LT team included representative teachers from each division and school leaders. Led by TE-LT, the process of designing and developing P.K. Yonge’s Teacher Evaluation System was informed by feedback and suggestions collected from P.K. Yonge faculty, the School Advisory Council (SAC) and interested stakeholders. Additionally, the PKY Teacher Performance Evaluation System will be put
forward to UFF to inform future contract negotiations in accordance with the district/university’s collective bargaining process as verified by the Memorandum of Understanding in Appendix A and signed by the UFF bargaining unit representative.

A stakeholder group, including administrators and teachers, will lead an annual review of the PKY appraisal system. This group will review yearly results of the evaluation system to ensure maximum intended impact on teachers' professional growth and student learning outcomes. This review process will be held in July of each year following the completion of all teacher evaluations. The stakeholder group will submit suggestions for revisions to TE-LT. Revisions requiring SAC, UFF, or DOE approval, will be put forward prior to implementation.

Factors considered in the annual review process may include:

- Trends in ratings within each domain
- Correlations among student achievement data and teacher evaluation scores
- Alignment of professional development plans and DPPs with evaluation results
- Appropriate support for professional development across different teacher groups
- Measures and scoring systems used for awarding Student Achievement scores
- Trends in score ranges
- Analysis of inter-rater reliability
- Development needs for district assessments
- Adherence of the overall system to the research model and original design elements

Transitioning to the redeveloped Performance Evaluation System requires educating personnel on the components of the system as well as the criteria and procedures on which teachers will be evaluated. Principals, school leaders, and assistant principals (more detail is available in section 6) initially trained will develop a half-day overview training and a Performance Evaluation System explanatory faculty website resource. The mandatory training will take place during pre-planning of each school year. During the pre-planning overview training the Performance Evaluation System will be explained and the faculty website resources will be explored. The overview workshop and the Performance Evaluation System faculty website resource page will serve as the initial component of the PKY yearlong induction program and as a component of the district’s Local Instructional Improvement System (LIIS).
1. Core of Effective Practices

P.K. Yonge’s Performance Evaluation System is based on the Florida Model grounded in the work of Robert Marzano and aligned with the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs – revised 12/17/6010). The observation instruments and documentation tools included in the iObservation System and referenced in subsequent sections of this plan will be used by all parties performing observations of instructional personnel. Appendix C contains a crosswalk illustrating the relationship between Marzano’s indicators and the FEAPs, and evidence supporting the link to increased student achievement. Evidence and results from iObservation System will inform the Instructional Practice score.

The Marzano Evaluation Model is based on a number of previous, related works that include: What Works in Schools (Marzano, 6003), Classroom Instruction that Works (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 6001), Classroom Management that Works (Marzano, Pickering, & Marzano, 6003), Classroom Assessment and Grading that Work (Marzano, 6006), The Art and Science of Teaching (Marzano, 6007), Effective Supervision: Supporting the Art and Science of Teaching (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 6011). Each of these works was generated from a synthesis of the research and theory. Thus the model can be considered an aggregation of the research on those elements that have traditionally been shown to correlate with student academic achievement. The model includes four domains:

Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors
Domain 2: Preparing and Planning
Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching
Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism

The four domains include 60 elements: 41 in Domain 1, 8 elements in Domain 2, 5 elements in Domain 3 and 6 elements in Domain 4. The specifics of each domain are listed in Figure 1. For a detailed discussion of these elements see Effective Supervision: Supporting the Art and Science of Teaching (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 6011).
Figure 1: Elements of the Marzano Evaluation Model

**Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Teacher Evaluation Model**

**DOMAIN 1: CLASSROOM STRATEGIES AND BEHAVIORS**

- **Learning Goals & Feedback**
  - What will I do to establish and communicate learning goals, track student progress, and celebrate success?
  - Providing Clear Learning Goals and Scales to Measure Those Goals
  - Tracking Student Progress
  - Celebrating Student Success

- **Rules & Procedures**
  - What will I do to establish or maintain classroom rules and procedures?
  - Establishing Classroom Routines
  - Organizing Physical Layout of the Classroom for Learning

- **Interacting With New Knowledge**
  - What will I do to help students effectively interact with the new knowledge?
  - Identifying Critical Information
  - Organizing Students to Interact with New Knowledge
  - Previewing New Content
  - Chunking Content into "Digestible Bites"
  - Processing of New Information
  - Elaborating on New Information
  - Recording and Representing Knowledge
  - Reflecting on Learning

- **Practicing & Deepening Knowledge**
  - What will I do to help students practice and deepen their understanding of new knowledge?
  - Reviewing Content
  - Organizing Students to Practice and Deepen Knowledge
  - Using Homework
  - Examining Similarities and Differences
  - Examining Errors in Reasoning
  - Practicing Skills, Strategies, and Processes
  - Revisiting Knowledge

- **Generating & Testing Hypotheses**
  - What will I do to help students generate and test hypotheses about new knowledge?
  - Organizing Students for Cognitively Complex Tasks
  - Engaging Students in Cognitively Complex Tasks Involving Hypothesis Generating and Testing
  - Providing Resources and Guidance

- **Student Engagement**
  - What will I do to engage students?
  - Noticing and Reacting when Students are Not Engaged
  - Using Academic Games
  - Managing Response Rates
  - Using Physical Movement
  - Maintaining a Lively Pace
  - Demonstrating Intensity and Enthusiasm
  - Using Friendly Controversy
  - Providing Opportunities for Students to Talk about Themselves
  - Presenting Unusual or Intriguing Information

- **Adherence to Rules & Procedures**
  - What will I do to recognize and acknowledge adherence and lack of adherence to classroom rules and procedures?
  - Demonstrating "Whiteness"
  - Applying Consequences
  - Acknowledging Adherence to Rules and Procedures

- **Teacher/Student Relationships**
  - What will I do to establish and maintain effective relationships with students?
  - Understanding Students’ Interests and Backgrounds
  - Using Behaviors that Indicate Affection for Students
  - Displaying Objectivity and Control

- **High Expectations**
  - What will I do to communicate high expectations for all students?
  - Demonstrating Value and Respect for Low Expectancy Students
  - Asking Questions of Low Expectancy Students
  - Frothing Incorrect Answers with Low Expectancy Students

Domain 1 identifies the 41 key strategies revealed by research for effective teaching presented in a robust, easy-to-understand model of instruction based on the Art and Science of Teaching.

All 41 key strategies are organized into 9 Design Questions, which are further organized into 3 Lesson Segments.
Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Teacher Evaluation Model

**DOMAIN 2: PLANNING AND PREPARING**

- **Planning and Preparing for Lessons and Units**
  1. Effective Scaffolding of Information within Lessons
  2. Lessons within Units
  3. Attention to Established Content Standards

- **Planning and Preparing for Use of Resources and Technology**
  1. Use of Available Traditional Resources
  2. Use of Available Technology

- **Planning and Preparing for Special Needs of Students**
  1. Needs of English Language Learners
  2. Needs of Special Education Students
  3. Needs of Students Who Lack Support for Schooling

**DOMAIN 3: REFLECTING ON TEACHING**

- **Evaluating Personal Performance**
  1. Identifying Areas of Pedagogical Strength and Weakness
  2. Evaluating the Effectiveness of Individual Lessons and Units
  3. Evaluating the Effectiveness of Specific Pedagogical Strategies and Behaviors

- **Developing and Implementing a Professional Growth Plan**
  1. Developing a Written Growth and Development Plan
  2. Monitoring Progress Relative to the Professional Growth and Development Plan

**DOMAIN 4: COLLEGIALLY AND PROFESSIONALISM**

- **Promoting a Positive Environment**
  1. Promoting Positive Interactions with Colleagues
  2. Promoting Positive Interactions about Students and Parents

- **Promoting Exchange of Ideas and Strategies**
  1. Seeking Mentorship for Areas of Need or Interest
  2. Mentoring Other Teachers and Sharing Ideas and Strategies

- **Promoting District and School Development**
  1. Adhering to District and School Rules and Procedures
  2. Participating in District and School Initiatives
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As indicated in Figure 1, Domain 1 contains 41 elements (5 + 18 + 18); Domain 2 contains 8 elements (3 + 2 + 3); Domain 3 contains 5 elements (3 + 2) and Domain 4 contains 6 elements (2 + 2 + 2). Given that 41 of the 60 elements in the model are from Domain 1, the clear emphasis in the Marzano model is what occurs in the classroom—the strategies and behaviors teachers use to enhance student achievement. The emphasis on classroom practice is what differentiates the Marzano model from other teacher evaluation models.

Teacher status and growth can be assessed in each component of the model in a manner that is consistent with the Florida DOE guidelines, requirements of Race to the Top, and legislation including but not limited to SB 736 and HB 7069.

The Research Base from Which the Model Was Developed
Each of the works (cited above) from which the model was developed report substantial research on the elements they address. For example, The Art and Science of Teaching includes over 25 tables reporting the research on the various elements of Domain 1. These tables report the findings from meta-analytic studies and the average effect sizes computed in these studies. In all, over 5,000 studies (i.e., effect sizes) are covered in the tables representing research over the last five decades. The same can be said for the other titles listed above. Thus, one can say that the model was initially based on thousands of studies that span multiple decades and these studies were chronicled and catalogued in books that have been widely disseminated in the United States. Specifically, over 2,000,000 copies of the books cited above have been purchased and disseminated to K-12 educators across the United States.

Experimental/Control Studies
Perhaps one of the most unique aspects of the research on this model is that it has a growing number of experimental/control studies that have been conducted by practicing teachers on the effectiveness of specific strategies in their classrooms. This is unusual in the sense that these studies are designed to establish a direct causal link between elements of the model and student achievement. Studies that use correlation analysis techniques (see next section) can establish a link between elements of a model and student achievement; however, causality cannot be easily inferred. Other evaluation models currently used throughout the country only have correlational data regarding the relationship between system elements and student achievement.

To date over 300 experimental/control studies have been conducted. Those studies involved over 14,000 students, 300 teachers, across 38 schools in 14 districts. The average effect size for strategies addressed in the studies was .42 with some studies reporting effect sizes of 2.00 and higher. An average effect size of .42 is associated with a 16 percentile point gain in student achievement. Stated differently: on the average, when teachers use the classroom strategies and behaviors in the Marzano Evaluation Model the typical gain in student achievement is 16 percentile points. However, great gains (i.e., those associated with an effect size of 2.00) can be realized if specific strategies are used in specific ways.

Correlational Studies
As mentioned above, correlational studies are the most common approach to examining the validity of an evaluation model. Such studies have been, and continue to be conducted, on various
elements of the Marzano Evaluation Model. For example, one such study was recently conducted in the state of Oklahoma as a part of their examination of elements related to student achievement in K-12 schools (see *What Works in Oklahoma Schools: Phase I Report* and *What Works in Oklahoma School: Phase II Report*, by Marzano Research Laboratory, 6010 and 6011 respectively). Those studies involved 59 schools, 117 teachers and over 40,000 K-12 students. Collectively, these reports indicate positive relationships with various elements of the Marzano Evaluation Model across the domains. Specific emphasis was placed on Domain 1 in particular in the Phase II report. Using state mathematics and reading test data, 96% of the 82 correlations (i.e., 41 correlations for mathematics and 41 for reading) were found to be positive with some as high as .40 and greater. A .40 correlation translates to an effect size (i.e., standardized mean difference) of .87 which is associated with a 31 percentile point gain in student achievement. These studies also aggregated data across the nine design questions in Domain 1. All correlations were positive for this aggregated data. Seven of those correlations ranged from .100 to .40. These correlations translate into effect sizes of .70 and higher. High correlations such as these were also reported for the total number of Domain 1 strategies teachers used in a school. Specifically, the number of Domain 1 strategies teachers used in school had a .35 correlation with reading proficiency and a .26 correlation with mathematics proficiency.

**Technology Studies**

Another unique aspect of the research conducted on the model is effects that have been examined in the context of technology. For example, a two year study was conducted to determine (in part) the relationship between selected elements from Domain 1 and the effectiveness of interactive whiteboards in enhancing student achievement (see *Final Report: A Second Year Evaluation Study of Promethean ActivClassroom* by Haystead and Marzano, 6010). In all, 401 experimental/control studies were conducted across the spectrum of grade levels. Selected elements of Domain 1 were correlated with the effect sizes for use of the interactive white boards. All correlations for Domain 1 elements were positive with some as high as .70. This implies that the effectiveness of the interactive whiteboards as used in these 401 studies was greatly enhanced by the use of Domain 1 strategies.

**Summary**

In summary, the Marzano Evaluation Model is grounded in thousands of studies conducted over the past five or more decades and published in books that have been widely used by K-12 educators. In addition, experimental/control studies have been conducted establishing a more direct causal link with enhanced student achievement than can be established by other types of studies. Correlation studies (a typical approach to examining the viability of a model) have also been conducted indicating positive correlations between the elements of the model and student mathematics and reading achievement. Finally, the model has been used to study the effects of technology use (i.e., interactive whiteboards) resulting in strong correlations between technology use and the Marzano evaluation model.
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2. Student Academic Performance -33% value in Teacher Performance Evaluation

An instructional employee’s annual evaluation will consist of three parts: 33% Student Academic Performance, 50% Instructional Practice, and 17% Performance Portfolio.

For classroom teachers (throughout this document the term “teachers” excludes substitutes), Table 1 will be used to determine the assessment type and weighting in the Student Academic Performance rating. Table 1 also serves as a tool for organizing and weighting student academic performance measures for teachers with multiple classes/courses. The weighting reflects the percentage of students in each course in relationship to the total number of students assigned to the teacher. Student results used in evaluation of all personnel are based on students assigned to the individual being evaluated. Table 1 will be updated through the revision process to reflect state models, state assessments, state provided item banks, and other resources as they become available.

Annual evaluations of instructional personnel who are not classroom teachers will include student academic performance from statewide assessments for students assigned to the instructional personnel. This measure will count for one-third of the overall evaluation score.

Where possible, district calculations will parallel state rules, policies, and procedures for determining student inclusion in calculations. School or district wide VAM scores are not used in the calculation of classroom instructional personnel or non-classroom instructional personnel performance evaluations, unless they are assigned responsibility for all students in the school or district.

P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School will develop and implement policies and procedures to guide the development, administration, and scoring of local assessments. These procedures will be included as appendices to the Teacher Performance Evaluation System following review and approval.
Points for determining a teacher’s impact on academic performance will be determined based upon the teacher’s Value-Added Model (VAM) score when applicable along with other district determined measures. The VAM score will apply to those teachers who teach a state assessed grade level and content area including a course with a state EOC exam that has a state approved VAM model. The student academic performance factor for all other instructional employees will be based upon student proficiency on a teacher selected or district developed assessment as defined in table 1.

The teacher’s performance as indicated by the academic performance of students assigned will be entered into the teacher’s annual performance evaluation. This category will compose one third of the P.K. Yonge Teacher Performance Evaluation.

The teacher’s impact on student academic performance will be determined by applying the state prescribed Value-Added Model, common metric approach, when available.

The district will evaluate the impact that differing confidence intervals, cut scores, minimum student counts and scale ranges have on performance classifications. The measures used to establish the final rating of student academic performance are listed below and specific scoring procedures are determined by type of measure in Appendix F of the P.K. Yonge Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan. Using the established scale(s) listed in appendix F, specific to each type of measure, a Measure of Academic Performance score of 0 to 4, will show the degree to which the teacher has produced measurable evidence of student academic performance.

The Final Student Academic Performance score will be weighted at one third of the overall Teacher Performance Evaluation according to procedures identified in section 5.
## Table 1: Measures of Academic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level/Subject</th>
<th>Measures of Academic Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>100% District Selected Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Grade</td>
<td>100% District Selected Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Grade</td>
<td>100% District Selected Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Grade Reading</td>
<td>100% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment Achievement and District Selected Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth and Fifth Grade Reading</td>
<td>100% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment VAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third, Fourth, Fifth Grade Writing</td>
<td>100% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment VAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third, Fourth, Fifth Grade Mathematics</td>
<td>100% FSA Mathematics Statewide Standardized Assessment VAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third, Fourth, Fifth Grade Social Studies</td>
<td>100% District Developed Course Specific Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third and Fourth Grade Science</td>
<td>100% District Developed Course Specific Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Grade Science</td>
<td>100% FCAT SCIENCE ACHIEVEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level/Subject</td>
<td>Measures of Academic Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Grade Language Arts</td>
<td>100% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment VAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Grade Mathematics</td>
<td>100% FSA Mathematics Statewide Standardized Assessment VAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Grade Social Studies</td>
<td>40% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60% District Developed Course Specific Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Grade Science</td>
<td>40% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60% District Developed Course Specific Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Grade Language Arts</td>
<td>100% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment VAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Grade Mathematics</td>
<td>100% FSA Mathematics Statewide Standardized Assessment VAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Grade Social Studies/Seventh Grade Civics</td>
<td>40% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60% District Selected Course Specific Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(District will use the Civics statewide EOC as the district selected assessment for the students enrolled in the course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Grade Geography</td>
<td>40% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60% District Selected Course Specific Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Grade Science</td>
<td>40% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60% District Developed Course Specific Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Grade Language Arts</td>
<td>100% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment VAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level/Subject</td>
<td>Measures of Academic Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Grade Mathematics</td>
<td>100% FSA Mathematics Statewide Standardized Assessment VAM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Eighth Grade Social Studies | 40% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment  
60% District Developed Course Specific Assessment |
| Eighth Grade Science | 40% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment  
60% FCAT SCIENCE ACHIEVEMENT |
| English I | 100% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment VAM |
| English II | 100% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment VAM |
| English III | 100% District Developed Course Specific Assessment  
*note: district has the option of using the AP Subject-area test results for the students enrolled in AP courses* |
| English IV, AP Literature and Composition, AP Language and Composition, Speech, Creative Writing | 100% District Developed Course Specific Assessment  
*note: district has the option of using the AP Subject-area test results for the students enrolled in AP courses* |
| World History, AP World History | 40% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment  
60% District Developed Course Assessment  
*note: district has the option of using the AP Subject-area test results for the students enrolled in AP courses* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level/Subject</th>
<th>Measures of Academic Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AP Human Geography, World Cultural Geography | 40% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment  
60% District Developed Course Assessment  
\textit{note: district has the option of using the AP Subject-area test results for the students enrolled in AP courses} |
| American History, AP American History | 100% US History EOC Statewide Assessment  
\textit{note: district has the option of using the AP Subject-area test results for the students enrolled in AP courses}  
\textit{note: for the 6014-15 school year the district selected assessment will be the statewide US history EOC} |
| AP Micro Economics, AP Macro Economics, Economics, American Government, Comparative Politics | 100% District Developed Course Specific Assessment  
\textit{note: district has the option of using the AP Subject-area test results for the students enrolled in AP courses} |
| Algebra I, Algebra IA, Algebra IB | 100% Algebra 1 EOC Achievement (based on student performance for students enrolled in grade levels other than 9th grade)  
100% Algebra 1 EOC VAM Results for teachers assigned to 9th grade students |
| Geometry | 100% Geometry state standardized EOC Achievement |
| Algebra II, Trigonometry, Pre-Calculus, Calculus, Liberal Arts Math, Math Analysis, Analytic Geometry, Math for College Readiness, AP Statistics, AP Calculus | 100% Algebra 2 Statewide EOC Assessment (for students enrolled in Alg 2)  
100% District Developed Course Specific  
\textit{note: district has the option of using the AP Subject-area test results for the students enrolled in AP courses} |
<p>| Biology | 100% Biology state standardized EOC Achievement |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level/Subject</th>
<th>Measures of Academic Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AP Environmental Science, Environmental Science, Marine Science, Chemistry, Physics, Anatomy and Physiology, AP Biology | 100% District Developed Course Specific Assessments  
*note: district has the option of using the AP Subject-area test results for the students enrolled in AP courses* |
| Visual Arts, Performing Arts, Physical Education, Technology | 100% District Developed Course Specific Assessment  
*note: when students are assigned to courses and individuals where student academic performance is measured by statewide assessments the teacher will have the option of selecting the statewide assessment as the measurement of student academic performance* |
<p>| World Languages | 100% District Selected Course Specific Assessment |
| Additional Courses not associated with VAM | 100% District Developed Course Specific Assessment |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level/Subject</th>
<th>Measures of Academic Performance 2014-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensive Reading</td>
<td>100% FSA ELA Statewide Standardized Assessment VAM or FCAT reading retake as applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support</td>
<td>60% FSA ELA and Mathematics Statewide Standardized Assessments based only on academic performance of assigned students 40% District Developed Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Coaches, Reading Coaches, Curriculum Coordinators, Guidance Counselors, Media Specialists</td>
<td>Defined in Non-Instructional Evaluation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Defined in Administrative Evaluation Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Instructional Practice – 50% value in Teacher Performance Evaluation
An Instructional Practice score will be computed for all instructional personnel. For teachers, Marzano’s Florida Model will be used. The Marzano Florida Model—

- reflects teachers’ performance in Domain 1 of the Marzano framework
- accounts for teachers’ experience levels (Category I, II)
- acknowledges teachers’ focus on professional growth by measuring teacher improvement over time on specific elements within the framework

An Instructional Practice score will consist of ratings which reflect the performance of an individual educator. Ratings will be derived from specific elements identified by the teacher in consultation with their observer.

- An Instructional Practice Score –
  - measures teacher’s proficiency against elements in domain 1 of the Marzano Model
  - recognizes teachers’ use of research based strategies in the instructional framework
  - measures progress against specific targeted elements for improvement
  - recognizes teacher’s deliberate practice
  - supports annual growth in teacher practice
  - informs the development of the Individual Professional Development Plan

In order to provide a supportive context for growth in teacher practice, the Instructional Practice portion of the Teacher Performance Evaluation system is centered on data collected through a minimum of two Targeted Feedback Cycles in 2015-16 (Year One) and a minimum of three Targeted Feedback Cycles in Year Two and consecutive years. Each Targeted Feedback Cycle will consist of a minimum of three and a maximum of five classroom observations, using a strengths-based communication and feedback model. Each classroom observation will be a component of the Targeted Feedback Cycle and will support the teacher in professional growth by focusing on specific areas of practice. Areas for growth (two areas for year 1 of implementation; three areas for year 2 and beyond) will be collaboratively identified by the teacher and the observer during the initial pre-conference of the first Targeted Feedback Cycle. Data that has quantitative value toward the Instructional Practice portion of the Teacher Performance Evaluation will be collected during the final observation of each Targeted Feedback Cycle. Providing a cycle of feedback prior to the determination of a quantitative rating of value in the Instructional Practice score allows each teacher to participate in Targeted Feedback Cycles and provides a supportive context for professional growth.

For evaluation purposes, teachers are assigned to one of two categories:

- Category I: one to three years of service
- Category II: more than 3 years of service

Teachers new to the district will be placed in Category I for the first year. If rehired, the teacher will then be placed in Category I or II as appropriate.

For Category I teachers, multiple observations provided by multiple observers, including but not limited to the category 1 teachers assigned professional learning partner, provide ongoing feedback to support teachers’ professional growth and gather sufficient evidence to measure effectiveness as teachers transition to the district. Multiple observations provide regular opportunities and
support for teacher reflection and growth through the planning, observation, and feedback cycle reflection process.

Observations of Category I teachers will be conducted as part of each Targeted Feedback Cycle. Each cycle will include a minimum of three observation events. Prior to each observation within the Targeted Feedback Cycle, the observer and the teacher will collaborate on the element or elements of practice to be observed in that specific observation event. The observer and teacher will consider strengths of the teacher’s practice based on initial observation data. Areas of practice ready for next steps in professional growth will be identified. These areas for growth – one per cycle – will be the focus throughout the Targeted Feedback Cycles. Evaluative data used for a quantitative rating of value in the Instructional Practice score will be collected during the final observation of each Targeted Feedback Cycle, only.

Year One (2015-16) Targeted Feedback Cycles, will include the assigned professional learning partners, as available, in side-by-side observations with administrative faculty. During Year Two (2016-17), assigned professional learning partners will participate in Targeted Feedback Cycles as observers, participating in both feedback and data collection during the Targeted Feedback Cycle. Beginning in Year Three (2017-18), assigned professional learning partners will be in the role of observer and evaluator during Targeted Feedback Cycles. The assigned professional learning partner (PLP-a) will conduct the Targeted Feedback Cycle following procedures for observation, feedback, and data collection aligned with professional learning and Targeted Feedback Cycle protocols used by all observers.

Feedback for first-year teachers also includes feedback provided through induction and observations conducted by the PLP-A. Each Category I teacher additional receives a formal pre-ninety day review.

Observations of Category II teachers will be conducted as part of each Targeted Feedback Cycle. Each cycle will include a minimum of three observation events. The observer and teacher will consider strengths of the teacher’s practice based on initial observation data. Areas of practice ready for next steps in professional growth will be identified. These areas for growth – one per cycle – will be the focus throughout the Targeted Feedback Cycles. Evaluative data used for a quantitative rating of value in the Instructional Practice score will be collected during the final observation of each Targeted Feedback Cycle, only.

Tables 2.10 provide additional information on types of observations, frequency, instruments used, feedback, and timelines. More detail on the calculation of the Instructional Practice score is included in Section 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Targeted Feedback Cycles Year One (2015-16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeted Feedback Cycles:</strong> Cycles of observation and feedback structured on a strengths-based communication model and focused on a single area of Instructional Practice. Each cycle is designed to be a partnership between the teacher and observer and focused on professional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycle Date Ranges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Assigned to a Single Observer during each Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Number of Observations per Teacher during each Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Observers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Targeted Feedback Cycles Year Two and Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeted Feedback Cycles:</strong> Cycles of observation and feedback structured on a strengths-based communication model and focused on a single area of Instructional Practice. Each cycle is designed to be a partnership between the teacher and observer and focused on professional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cycle Date Ranges</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Assigned to a Single Observer during each Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Number of Observations per Teacher during each Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Observers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Observation Types and Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Initial Data Collection** | • Unannounced within the first 20 days of school  
• Includes a post-conference between teacher and observer  
• Collaborative identification of design question related elements as a focus for Targeted Feedback Cycle |
| **Formative**             | • Announced  
• Formative data collection  
• Average length of 20 minutes  
• Focuses on targeted elements of practice  
• Includes a post-conference between teacher and observer  
• Occur in a cycle of three-five events |
| **Data Collection Event** | • Announced  
• Final event in a Targeted Feedback Cycle  
• Average length of 20 minutes  
• Data collected is used as summative rating toward Instructional Practice Score |
Table 5: Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Category I Teachers</th>
<th>Category II Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers not Meeting Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>Develop Schedule of Targeted Feedback Cycles</td>
<td>Initial observations for baseline data collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial observations for baseline data collection</td>
<td>Establish Initial Individual Professional Growth Plan in aligned to Targeted Feedback Cycle One in Post-Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>Initial observations for baseline data collection</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 1</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 1</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 1</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 1</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Mid-Year Evaluation including Data from Targeted Feedback Cycle 1</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 2</td>
<td>Mid-Year Evaluation including Review of Professional Growth Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Category I - Newly Hired 90 day review Targeted Feedback Cycle 1</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 2</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 1/2</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 1/2</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 2</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 2</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 2/3</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 2/3</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 2/3</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 2/3</td>
<td>Targeted Feedback Cycle 2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Final Evaluation-Sign Instructional Practice portion of Teacher Performance Evaluation &amp; when available sign Student Growth/Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-November</td>
<td>Peer Review Panel review and render rating on Teacher Performance Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 6: Identification and Support of Teachers Not Meeting Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification and Support of Teachers not Meeting Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of the Process</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Definition of Teachers not Meeting Expectations** | Category I Teachers: Unsatisfactory Summative Teacher Evaluation Score  
Category II Teachers: Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory Summative Teacher Evaluation Score |
| **General Procedures** | • The district will assign a PLP to the struggling teacher based on their areas of need. Specific professional learning in those particular areas will be assigned and required to be progress monitored through the iObservation system. Evidence gathered in the areas of need would reflect an improvement in Marzano’s five-point scale through developing (II) and above to indicate improvement.  
• If a PLP was assigned to a Category I teacher, the PLP can be reassigned to ensure a match of needs.  
• Progress will be assessed and documented through the formal and informal observation process.  
• A team consisting of at a minimum of an administrator and PLP, but also including Professional development staff, instructional coaches will meet at least quarterly to ensure that the needs of the struggling teacher are met. |
| **Roles and Responsibilities** | Administrator(s)  
• Observe  
• Develop the professional growth plan to address the area(s) of need  
• Render the final rating  
PLP  
• Observe  
• Develop the professional growth plan to address the area(s) of need  
• Provide coaching and professional development  
Professional Learning Staff  
• Observe  
• Develop the professional growth plan to address the area(s) of need  
• Provide coaching and professional development  
Teacher not Meeting Expectations  
• Engage in the professional learning  
• Participate in the development of the professional growth plan  
• Provide documentation of professional learning  
• Provide evidence of implementation  
• Attend all meetings with their PLP, Professional Development Staff, Administrator(s), Instructional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involvement of UFF (as appropriate)</strong></td>
<td>Consult with University of Florida Human Resources and United Faculty of Florida as appropriate to ensure compliance with current contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timelines</strong></td>
<td>As indicated in Table 6, the teacher identified as “not meeting expectations” will receive a minimum of three observations as part of Targeted Feedback Cycles. Additionally, walkthroughs will be conducted at minimum, twice per month by an administrator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Teacher Performance Portfolio – Peer Review Component – 17% of Teacher Performance Evaluation

Overview

P.K. Yonge has included a Teacher Performance Portfolio with Peer Review as a component of the PKY evaluation system. All P.K. Yonge teachers will participate in peer review and feedback as part of the evaluation process. Peers serving in this role are designated as Portfolio Review Panel Members and elected by peers through a faculty vote. Training for teachers serving as Portfolio Review Panel Members will occur as a part of the initial and ongoing professional development to support implementation of the P.K. Yonge Teacher Performance evaluation system. The performance portfolios will be submitted by faculty and include evidence reflecting educator practice in eight design questions related to Domains 2-4 of the Marzano Framework. Teachers will have discretion over evidence type included in the portfolio. Student and parent feedback will be gathered through faculty-adopted instruments aligned with the P.K. Yonge DRS Faculty promotion process.

Teacher Performance Portfolios will be scored based on criteria identified in rubrics representing domains 2-4 and related design questions. Additionally, the evidence gathered and showcased in the annual Teacher Performance Portfolio will align with promotion criteria and evidence in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Professional Public Service.

Scoring Criteria

During year two implementation (2016-17), portfolios will be scored annually by the peer review team and administrative team using the rubrics specific to each domain and shown in Appendix B. The weighting of administrative and peer review team scores will be determined by each individual faculty member prior to submission of the Teacher Performance Portfolio. The options for weighting of scores is listed in Table 7 below.

If no choice is made, the scoring option defaults to option C, identified in Table 7.

Table 7: Performance Portfolio Scoring Options, Year Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Option</th>
<th>Administrative Score Weight</th>
<th>Peer Review Score Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring of the Teacher Performance Portfolios will be based on scoring of individual Design Questions within each of the three domains (Domains 2-4). Each Design Question will receive a whole number score of 1-4 based on evidence provided specific to that Domain and Design Question. A Total Score in the range of 8-31 will be independently calculated for each of the Teacher Performance Portfolios by both the administrative and peer review teams. The total scores submitted by each of the review teams will be rated according to the weights referenced in Table 7. Domains and Design Questions evaluated as part of the Teacher Performance Portfolio are reflected in Table 8 below. Specific Rubrics aligned to each of the design questions are shown in appendix B. This weighting and combining of scores yields the final Teacher Performance Portfolio score, which in year two and beyond (2016-17), will count for one-third of the overall Teacher Performance Evaluation. Specific scoring procedures are outlined in section 4 of the Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan.

During Year One (2015-16) implementation, Teacher Performance Portfolios will be self-scored by the individual teacher and then submitted for review and feedback to the 2015-16 Teacher Evaluation Leadership Team (TELT). The self-score provided by the individual teacher will count for seventeen percent of the overall Teacher Performance Evaluation in year one. Specific scoring procedures are outlined in section 4 of the Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan.

Table 8: Teacher Performance Portfolio Domains, Design Questions, and Overall Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 2: Planning and Preparing For High Quality Instruction (aligned to Teaching in Promotion Criteria)</th>
<th>Overall Scoring Per Design Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Question 1: Planning High Quality Lessons and Units</td>
<td>U=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Question 2: Using High Quality Resources including Digital Tools</td>
<td>U=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Question 3: Meeting the Needs of All Students</td>
<td>U=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching and Learning (aligned to Teaching in Promotion Criteria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Question 4: Reflecting on Teaching Practice</td>
<td>U=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Question 5: Reflecting on Student Work</td>
<td>U=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism (aligned to Scholarship and Professional Public Service in Promotion Criteria)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Question 6: Promoting a Positive Environment</td>
<td>U=1</td>
<td>NI=2</td>
<td>E=3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Question 7: Contributions to District and School Development</td>
<td>U=1</td>
<td>NI=2</td>
<td>E=3</td>
<td>HE=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Question 8: Promoting Professional Exchange of Ideas and Strategies</td>
<td>U=1</td>
<td>NI=2</td>
<td>E=3</td>
<td>HE=4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Annual Evaluation Ratings and Calculations

P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School’s Performance Appraisal System has identified four categories of performance for instructional personnel summative ratings:

- Highly Effective (4)
- Effective (3)
- Needs Improvement [Developing for Category I teachers] (2)
- Unsatisfactory (1)

The combined summative rating combines the results of the Student Academic Performance score, Instructional Practice score, and Teacher Performance Portfolio score as detailed below.

**Determining Student Academic Performance Score**

The Student Growth score will be calculated as discussed in section 2.

**Determining the Instructional Practice Score**

The scale used by Marzano’s model is a five-point scale consisting of:

- Innovating (4)
- Applying (3)
- Developing (2)
- Beginning (1)
- Not using (0)

Sources of evidence for the Instructional Practice Score will be exclusive to the final rating and data collection in each Targeted Feedback Cycle. There will be a annual minimum of two Targeted Feedback Cycles for each teacher in year one (2015-16) and three Targeted Feedback Cycles in year two and consecutive years following year one implementation.
A conversion from the five point Marzano scale to a 4-point scale follows:

**Step 1:** Drawing from the sources of evidence listed above and recorded in the *iObservation System*, observed elements are rated on the five-point scale.

**Step 2:** The number of ratings at each level in domain 1 is counted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>D1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 3:** The count from step 2 is converted to a percentage for each level of performance in domain 1. (number of ratings in domain 1 at that level/total number of occurrences domain 1*100).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>D1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 4:** For domain 1, the result from step 3 is applied to the description for each level on the Proficiency Scale (Appendix E) for the appropriate category of teacher (I or II).

**Step 5:** The Domain 1 proficiency score is weighted at 100% and that score determines an overall Instructional Practice score. The Instructional Practice Score will be weighted as one third of the overall Teacher Performance Evaluation as described in section 4.
Determining the Teacher Performance Portfolio Score

**Step 1:** Scoring of the Teacher Performance Portfolios will be based on scoring of individual Design Questions within each of the three domains (Domains 2-4). Each Design Question will receive a whole number score of 1-4 based on evidence provided specific to that Domain and Design Question.

**Step 2:** A total score in the range of 8-31 will be calculated by adding the scores for each DQ outlined in step 1.

**Step 3:** The total score from step 2 will be divided by 8 in order to calculate a Teacher Performance Portfolio Score.

**Step 4:** Teacher Performance Portfolio scores will be weighted and combined according to teacher selection of scoring options and weights identified in Table 7 in order to establish the final Teacher Performance Portfolio rating.

**Step 5:** The Teacher Performance Portfolio Score will be applied to the table below to determine HIGHLY EFFECTIVE, EFFECTIVE, NEEDS IMPROVEMENT or DEVELOPING, or UNSATISFACTORY status in the Teacher Performance Portfolio.

Table 9: Instructional Practice Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT or DEVELOPING</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2 – 4.0</td>
<td>2.7 – 3.19</td>
<td>2.10 – 2.69</td>
<td>&lt;2.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Teacher Performance Portfolio Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT or DEVELOPING</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.25 – 4.0</td>
<td>2.75 – 3.24</td>
<td>1.875 – 2.74</td>
<td>&lt;1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3 in all DQ</td>
<td>2.75 – 3.24</td>
<td>No level 1 DQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum of 32 level 4 DQ ratings</td>
<td>No level 1 DQ ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Combining the Student Academic Performance Score, Instructional Practice Score, and Teacher Performance Portfolio score for a Final Summative Teacher Evaluation Score and Rating.

Once a Student Academic Performance score, Instructional Practice score, and Teacher Performance portfolio score have been determined, it is necessary to combine these scores into a final Summative Teacher Evaluation Score and Rating. The Instructional Practice score will be weighted at one third, teacher performance portfolio at one third, and the Student Academic performance score at one third, in the Overall Teacher Evaluation Score.

Weighting and combining each of the Student Academic Performance, Instructional Practice, and Teacher Performance Portfolio scores will be accomplished by converting each score to a percentage, multiplying by the appropriate weighting factor adding the scores and multiplying by 100. This will give a final Summative Teacher Evaluation Score that will then correspond to the following scale ranges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGHLY EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT or DEVELOPING</th>
<th>UNSATISFACTORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80 - 100</td>
<td>68 - 79</td>
<td>52 - 67</td>
<td>1-51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School administrators and non-classroom instructional personnel will use the same Summative Evaluation scale as above. One third of the Performance Evaluation is based on the student data as outlined in section 2, table 1.

Evaluations of instructional personnel may be amended as much as 90-days after the end of the school year in order to accommodate the availability of test results. P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School expects this amendment process to be completed before the submission of final evaluation results with Survey 5.

6. A System of Improvement

The purpose of P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School’s redeveloped Performance Evaluation System is to establish an overall system of continuous improvement focused on increasing student learning growth by improving the quality of instructional, administrative, and supervisory service (1012.34 (1)(a), F.S. and MOU (D) (2)(ii)2.

School improvement goals are informed by data based on student learning outcomes and trends in instructional practice as captured and aggregated in iObservation. These same data are used to measure teacher effectiveness and inform decisions about classroom practice, staffing, and professional learning needs. Instructional evaluation results will be used to identify both challenge areas and possible solutions to be addressed in school and district improvement plans.

At the teacher, school, and district level this system is based on a cycle of instructional improvement. This system is illustrated in Figure 3.
Teacher action plans will be documented in their Individual Professional Development Plans (DPPs). DPPs will identify target areas for deliberate practice based on instructional practice observation results and student learning outcomes from the previous year. Timelines for this process are detailed in Table 9.

As outlined in Table 8, teachers may receive observations from educators with various instructional roles. Supporting continuous progress in instructional growth will generate input from numerous sources. For teachers and instructional personnel, administrators will conduct the final Summative Teacher Evaluation. All personnel giving input into the evaluation of another employee MUST have attended training on the evaluation and observation process prior to performing any observations. A comprehensive understanding of the Marzano Evaluation Model’s 4 Domains, 60 elements, observation forms and procedures, and overall evaluation system process is critical to ensure both the accuracy and reliability of observations, feedback, and input.
7. Evaluator Training

In the summer of 2011, all administrators and professional development staff responsible for observations and evaluations will attend an initial 2-day training in Dr. Robert Marzano's Observation and Feedback Protocol. Dr. Marzano’s system upgrades walkthroughs, instructional rounds, and observations to monitor and support use of research-based strategies for effective teaching in every classroom. Participants will learn how to use the protocol, provide meaningful feedback, and to support teachers’ growth through a revised teacher performance evaluation system. Subsequent initial training opportunities for new administrators and personnel with other educational roles will be offered periodically either by the district or on a regional basis by the North East Florida Educational Consortium (NEFEC).

Cohorts of initially trained participants will participate in ongoing professional development spread throughout the school year to augment the learning of the initial 2-day training. Offered by NEFEC staff who will be certified in Marzano’s Leaders of Learning Program, topics will include:

- Marzano’s Observation and Feedback Protocol
- Inter-rater reliability for observers
- Constructing effective feedback
- Analyzing data on teacher practice for trends and patterns
- Collecting data to convene collegial conversation
- Connecting teacher practice to student achievement

Ongoing training for system evaluators will be provided to ensure integrity of the system.
APPENDIX A – Evidence of Collective Bargaining

24 May 2011

United Faculty of Florida-University of Florida
308 Yon Hall
P O Box 112070
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611-2070

To whom it may concern:

Please be advised that the University of Florida Board of Trustees and the bargaining agent United Faculty of Florida-University of Florida (UFF-UF) have begun collective bargaining negotiations consistent with the precepts contained in SB 736 and the Race to the Top grant for P K Yonge Developmental Research School to enable implementation of a revised faculty evaluation system for the PKY Developmental Research School and to carry out any statutorily necessary changes required to enable PKY to meet the requirements of Race to the Top and SB 736 if funded. It remains our intent to continue good faith negotiations in accordance with Chapter 447. It is also our intent that this document will assist DOE in ensuring that we have met the requirements in each area for the RTTT grant and SB 736, while also satisfying requirements for State Board Rule.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John P Leavey
UFF-UF Chief Negotiator
APPENDIX B – Teacher Performance Portfolio Rubrics

TBD

To be developed during the 2015-16 school year through the TELT Committee.
APPENDIX C – Marzano/FEAPs Crosswalk

The state crosswalk illustrating the relationship between Marzano’s domain segments and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices can be found at:
APPENDIX D – FSA Associated Courses

READING:
ESOL English for Speakers of Other Language-Elementary
Functional Basic Skills in Reading-Elementary
Functional Basic Skills in Communications-Elementary
Language Arts-Elementary
Reading-Elementary
Integrated Language Arts-Elementary
Handwriting-Elementary
Spelling-Elementary
Writing-Elementary
Sixth Grade
Academics K-5
Academic Skills K-5
Advanced Academic Skills K-5
Developmental Skills K-5
Language Arts K-5
Communications K-5
Spelling K-5
Writing K-5
M/J Intensive Language Arts (MC)
M/J Intensive Reading (MC)
M/J Language Arts 1

M/J Language Arts, 1 Adv.
M/J Language Arts 2
M/J Language Arts 2, Adv
M/J Language Arts 3
M/J Language Arts 3, Adv
M/J Language Arts 1 through ESOL
M/J Language Arts 2 through ESOL
M/J Language Arts 3 through ESOL
M/J Developmental Language Arts Through ESOL (MC)
M/J Journalism 1
M/J Journalism 2
M/J Speech and Debate 1
M/J Speech and Debate 2
M/J Speech and Debate 3
M/J Reading 1
M/J Reading 1, Advanced
M/J Reading 2
M/J Reading 2, Advanced
M/J Reading 3
M/J Reading, Advanced

Communications 6-8
Academics 6-8
Academic Skills 6-8
Advanced Academics 6-8
Developmental Skills 6-8
Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum
Intensive Language Arts
Intensive Reading
English Skills I
English I
English Honors I
English Skills II
English II
English Honors II
English Skills III
English III
English Honors III
English Skills IV
English IV
English Honors IV
Advanced Placement Language Composition
Advanced Placement English Literature and Composition
Business English I
Business English II
Applied Communication I
Applied Communication II
Advanced Communication Methodology
AICE English Language
Pre-AICE English Language
English I Pre-International Baccalaureate
English II Pre-International Baccalaureate
English III International Baccalaureate
English IV International Baccalaureate
English I through ESOL
English II through ESOL
English III through ESOL
English IV through ESOL
Developmental Language Arts Through ESOL
Semantics and Logic
AICE Thinking Skills
World Literature
M/J Creative Writing 1
M/J Creative Writing 2
M/J Creative Writing 3
M/J Expository Writing 1
M/J Expository Writing 2
Language Arts 6-8
Reading: 6-8
AICE English Literature
Pre-AICE English Literature
Journalism I
Journalism II
Journalism III
Journalism IV
Journalism V
Journalism VI
Journalism VII
Journalism VIII
Mass Media I
Mass Media II
Mass Media III
Mass Media IV
Speech I
Speech II
Speech III
Debate I
Debate II
Debate III
Debate IV
Debate V
Debate VI
Debate VII
Debate VIII
Reading I
Reading II
Advanced Reading
Reading III
Writing I
Writing II
Creative Writing I
Creative Writing II
Creative Writing III
Creative Writing IV
Creative Writing V
Screenplay Writing
Play Writing
Sign Language I
Sign Language II
American Literature
British Literature
Contemporary Literature
Classical Literature
Literature and the Arts I
Literature and the Arts II
Literature in the Media
World Literature Honors
Great Books
M/J Language Arts 1, International Baccalaureate
M/J Language Arts 2, International Baccalaureate
M/J Language Arts 3, International Baccalaureate
AICE English Literature II
AICE General Paper
M/J Intensive Reading and Career Planning
Reading for College Success
Intensive Writing
IB Middle Years Program English I
IB Middle Years Program English II
IB Middle Years Program Speech Honors
Writing for College Success
Sign Language III
Braille Reading and Writing
American Literature Honors
British Literature Honors
Classical Literature Honors
Contemporary Literature Honors
World Literature Honors
Great Books
Reading 9-12
English 9-12
Life Skills Communications 9-12
Life Skills Reading: 9-12
American Literature Honors
British Literature Honors
Classical Literature Honors
Contemporary Literature Honors
MATH:
Algebra I
Algebra I Honors
Algebra II
Algebra II Honors
Algebra IA
Algebra IB
Intensive Mathematics
Analysis of Functions
International Baccalaureate Math Analysis
Calculus
Advanced Placement Calculus AB
Advanced Placement Calculus BC
Pre-Calculus
AICE Further Mathematics
International Baccalaureate Pre-Calculus
Calculus-International Baccalaureate
International Baccalaureate Calculus and Descriptive Statistics
International Baccalaureate Further Mathematics
International Baccalaureate Advanced Calculus
M/J Intensive Mathematics (MC)
M/J Mathematics 1
M/J Mathematics 1, Advanced
M/J Mathematics 2
M/J Mathematics 2, Advanced
M/J Mathematics 3
M/J Mathematics 3, Advanced
Consumer Mathematics
Applied Mathematics I
Applied Mathematics II
Applied Mathematics III

Explorations in Mathematics I
Explorations in Mathematics II
Business Mathematics
Informal Geometry
Geometry
Geometry Honors
Analytic Geometry
Analytic Geometry-International Baccalaureate
Integrated Mathematics I
Integrated Mathematics II
Integrated Mathematics III
Liberal Arts Mathematics
Mathematics Studies-International Baccalaureate
Pre-AICE Mathematics I

Discrete Mathematics
Advanced Topics in Mathematics
Mathematics K-5
Academics K-5
Academic Skills K-5
Advanced Academic Skills K-5
Developmental Skills K-5
Mathematics: 6-8
Academics 6-8
Academic Skills 6-8
Advanced Academics 6-8
Developmental Skills 6-8
Mathematics 9-12
Life Skills Math: 9-12
Math for College Success
Advanced Algebra with Financial Applications
Math College Readiness
AICE Math Analysis
AICE Math 1
AICE Math and Mechanics and Prob and Stat
Pre-AICE Additional Math III
M/J Mathematics IB
M/J Pre-algebra IB
Math Grade K
Math Grade 1
Math Grade 2
Math Grade 3
Math Grade 4
Math Grade 5
Academic Skills 6-8 and Career Planning
Advanced Academics 6-8 and Career Planning
Gifted
AICE Math and Prob and Stat 1
AICE Math and Prob and Stat 2
Pre-Algebra
AICE Math and Mech 1
AICE Math and Mech 2
Pre-AICE Mathematics II
International Baccalaureate Mathematics Higher Level
Probability & Statistics with
IB Statistics and Introductory Differential Calculus
Advanced Placement Statistics
AICE Mathematics Statistics
Trigonometry
Trigonometry-International Baccalaureate
Linear Algebra
Abstract Algebra
APPENDIX E – Proficiency Scales

### Category I Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>Highly Effective (4)</th>
<th>Effective (3)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>≥ 3.10</td>
<td>2.60 – 3.09</td>
<td>2.00 – 2.59</td>
<td>&lt; 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category II Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CI</th>
<th>Highly Effective (4)</th>
<th>Effective (3)</th>
<th>Needs Improvement (2)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>≥ 3.20</td>
<td>2.70 – 3.19</td>
<td>2.10 – 2.69</td>
<td>&lt; 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Teacher Evaluation Procedures for Calculating Student Achievement

District Measure Scoring Procedures for Assessments with Established Benchmark Guidelines

Including but not limited to SAT-10, FL DOE End of Course Assessments, local assessments of student academic performance, and curriculum-based measures

Steps for calculating a student achievement score based on district measures with established benchmarks:

For each district measure the following steps will be taken to establish a numeric value used in calculating the student achievement portion of each instructional faculty members’ evaluation.

1. Establish the benchmark or standard for achievement based on the measure, score type, and grade level
2. Calculate the total number of students assessed on the measure
3. Calculate the number of students meeting the proficiency or growth benchmark
4. Determine the percentage of students meeting the proficiency or growth benchmark
5. Apply the scale listed below to determine a value used in the student achievement portion of the teacher evaluation score.
6. The common metric (1,2,3,4) established based on the scale below will be weighted based on the percentages outlined in the Elementary district measures table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>49% or below</th>
<th>50%-59%</th>
<th>60%-74%</th>
<th>75% or greater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-UN</td>
<td>2-NI</td>
<td>3-E</td>
<td>4-HE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Measure Scoring Procedures for Advanced Placement Assessments with Established Benchmark Guidelines

Student Academic Performance based on Advanced Placement or AP Courses will be calculated following the five steps listed and the scale listed below will be applied to the percentage determined at the end of step 5 in order to determine the value used in the Student Academic Performance portion of the teacher evaluation score.

1. Establish the benchmark or standard for achievement based on the measure, score type, and grade level (for all AP courses the benchmark will be established at level 2)
2. Calculate the total number of students assessed on the measure
3. Calculate the number of students meeting the proficiency or growth benchmark
4. Determine the percentage of students meeting the proficiency or growth benchmark
5. Apply the scale listed below to determine a value used in the student achievement portion of the teacher evaluation score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39% or below</td>
<td>1- UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%-49%</td>
<td>2- NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%-59%</td>
<td>3- E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% or greater</td>
<td>4- HE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District Measure Scoring Procedures for Assessments Without Established Benchmarks

Steps for calculating a student achievement score based on district measures in courses without established benchmarks:

For each course code associated with a district assessment (i.e., any course using a measure for student achievement beyond the FL DOE provided VAM score) the following steps will be taken to establish a numeric value used in calculating the student achievement portion of each instructional faculty members’ evaluation.

1. Establish the highest student score on the measure
2. That number becomes the “top score” or highest possible score
3. The scores are sorted from highest score to zero
4. The scores are separated into quartiles and each score given a value (based on the table below) representing the scores position in the quartiles
5. The quartile scores are then averaged to result in a score used to represent student achievement on the district measure.
6. The score established in step 5 is then weighted in the overall calculation based on the number of students represented in steps 1-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quartile 1</th>
<th>Quartile 2</th>
<th>Quartile 3</th>
<th>Quartile 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- UN</td>
<td>2- NI</td>
<td>3- E</td>
<td>4- HE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Value Added Model Score Calculation Procedures

P.K. Yonge Developmental Research School will use the Common Metric System for value added for instructional personnel, teaching English Language Arts and/or Math Courses associated to state assessments as defined in Appendix D. A value added score based on Common Metric will also be established for instructional personnel teaching courses other than those defined as English Language Arts or Math courses in Appendix D provided students enrolled in the course are enrolled in English Language Arts or Math courses associated with a state assessment during the same time frame.

A three parameter confidence interval with a zero cut point will be applied to determine a final rating as outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Rating</th>
<th>K=0</th>
<th>K=.5</th>
<th>K=1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective=4</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective=3</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective = 3</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective = 3</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs improvement=2</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory=1</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where possible, P.K. Yonge will compute a score based on multi-year data and data from only the most recent year and use the higher of the two scores.

To review VAM Technical Assistance: [http://bit.ly/1bc8gVg](http://bit.ly/1bc8gVg)