



2015-2020

Leon LEADS Instructional Evaluation System



Leon County Schools

Rocky Hanna, Superintendent

Contact Person:

Shane Syfrett

Director of Professional Learning

Rule 6A-5.030
Form IEST-2015
Effective Date: March 2016
Last Edit: January 2018

Table of Contents

1. Performance of Students
2. Instructional Practice
3. Other Indicators of Performance
4. Summative Evaluation Score
5. Additional Requirements
6. District Evaluation Procedures
7. District Self-Monitoring
8. Appendix A – Checklist for Approval

Directions:

This document has been provided in Microsoft Word format for the convenience of the district. The order of the template shall not be rearranged. Each section offers specific directions, but does not limit the amount of space or information that can be added to fit the needs of the district. All submitted documents shall be titled and paginated. Where documentation or evidence is required, copies of the source document(s) (for example, rubrics, policies and procedures, observation instruments) shall be provided. Upon completion, the district shall email the template and required supporting documentation for submission to the address DistrictEvalSysEQ@fldoe.org.

****Modifications to an approved evaluation system may be made by the district at any time. A revised evaluation system shall be submitted for approval, in accordance with Rule 6A-5.030(3), F.A.C. The entire template shall be sent for the approval process.**

1. Performance of Students

The Student Performance Measure comprises 35% of all teachers' evaluations in Leon County Schools, whether newly-hired or continuing with the district. The source of this student performance measure is derived from teacher-created Student Learning Objectives. Each teacher's Student Learning Objectives will vary based on the matched and qualified students assigned to the teacher in relation to subject and grade level taught. Student Learning Objectives are derived from data based on proficiency and growth measures for state, national and international assessments as well as proficiency rates and growth data based on district, curricular, or teacher assessments.

International/National Assessment Data

Some courses include an international or national assessment as an expectation of student participation. When an international or national assessment is administered, student performance data is used to generate the student performance measure component in teacher evaluation. Because of a commitment by LCS to encourage all students who are motivated to participate in advanced coursework, regardless of previous assessment performance and for the purposes of teacher evaluation, proficiency is defined as students earning a "2" or higher on an Advanced Placement exam. See Appendix C.

Student Learning Objectives

Teachers that are assigned courses that require the following assessments will be required to write Student Learning Objectives to reflect student achievement on the following assessments: Grades 3-8 Math, Grades 3-10 ELA, Algebra I, Civics, US History, Biology, and Geometry. Student performance on these assessments are used to determine if the Student Learning Objective is met. To achieve this determination, teachers and principals are required to identify outcome measures of student learning. These student learning objectives (SLOs) are based on data of the students assigned to the teacher. Data is gathered from multiple sources including previous state assessment data, school level, and classroom level assessments, as well as student performance on classwork during the first weeks of the school year. Each teacher meets with his or her administrator to discuss and develop goals based on this data. The goals are aligned to the data and reflect all students and student groups assigned to the teacher. The attainment of the student learning objectives is quantified and converted into the student performance measure reported on the teacher evaluation instrument based on students that are matched and qualified.

Converting Student Learning Objectives to Student Performance Measures

To convert Student Learning Objective data to student performance measures, a percentage of goal attainment will be calculated. Teacher performance will be assigned using quartiles. This percentage of Student Learning Objective (SLO) targets met will be used to assign each teacher a student performance measure score (1-4). See Appendix

Student Growth for Instructional Personnel without Assigned Students

Both the instructional practice and student performance measure components are a part of the evaluation of non-classroom instructional personnel. Instructional practice is observed and evaluated by an administrator. Student performance measures are calculated using student learning objectives that are based on the function of each particular non-classroom instructional personnel's job.

District Assessment Chart for Teacher Evaluation 2015-2016	
Subject/ Class	Assessment
Pre-K	SLOs based on assigned students
Kindergarten	SLOs based on assigned students
First Grade	SLOs based on assigned students
Second Grade	SLOs based on assigned students
Third Grade	SLOs based assigned student specific FSA
Fourth Grade	SLOs based assigned student specific FSA
Fifth Grade	SLOs based assigned student specific FSA
Fifth Grade Science	SLOs based on assigned student specific FCAT
Kindergarten Art	SLOs based on assigned students
First Grade Art	SLOs based on assigned students
Second Grade Art	SLOs based on assigned students
Third Grade Art	SLOs based on assigned students
Fourth Grade Art	SLOs based on assigned students
Fifth Grade Art	SLOs based on assigned students
Kindergarten Music	SLOs based on assigned students
First Grade Music	SLOs based on assigned students
Second Grade Music	SLOs based on assigned students
Third Grade Music	SLOs based on assigned students
Fourth Grade Music	SLOs based on assigned students
Fifth Grade Music	SLOs based on assigned students
Kindergarten PE	SLOs based on assigned students
First Grade PE	SLOs based on assigned students
Second Grade PE	SLOs based on assigned students
Third Grade PE	SLOs based on assigned students
Fourth Grade PE	SLOs based on assigned students
Fifth Grade PE	SLOs based on assigned students
Sixth Grade Math	SLOs based assigned student specific FSA
Sixth Grade Language Arts	SLOs based assigned student specific FSA
Sixth Grade Social Studies	SLOs based on assigned students
Sixth Grade Science	SLOs based on assigned students
Seventh Grade Math	SLOs based assigned student specific FSA
Seventh Grade Language Arts	SLOs based assigned student specific FSA
Civics	SLOs based on assigned student specific EOC
Seventh Grade Science	SLOs based on assigned students
Eighth Grade Math	SLOs based assigned student specific FSA
Eighth Grade Language Arts	SLOs based assigned student specific FSA
Eighth Grade Social Studies	SLOs based on assigned students
Eighth Grade Science	SLOs based on assigned student specific FCAT
MS Art	SLOs based on assigned students

MS Music	SLOs based on assigned students
MS PE	SLOs based on assigned students
MS Home Economics	SLOs based on assigned students
MS Technology	SLOs based on assigned students
MS AVID	SLOs based on assigned students
Algebra 1	SLOs based on assigned student specific EOC
Algebra 2	SLOs based on assigned students
Geometry	SLOs based on assigned student specific EOC
Biology	SLOs based on assigned student specific EOC
Ninth Grade Language Arts/Reading	SLOs based assigned student specific FSA
Tenth Grade Language Arts/Reading	SLOs based assigned student specific FSA
Grade 11 Language Arts/Reading	SLOs based on assigned students
US History	SLOs based on assigned student specific EOC
AP courses	AP exams
IB courses	IB exams
9-12 Math (excluding Algebra 1, Geometry, Algebra 2)	SLOs based on assigned students
12 Language Arts/Reading	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Social Studies (excluding US History)	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Science	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Art	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Music	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 PE	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Culinary Arts	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Business/ Technology	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 AVID	SLOs based on assigned students
9-12 Carpentry	SLOs based on assigned students
Guidance Counselors	SLOs based on job functions
Media Specialists	SLOs based on job function/ assigned students
Academic Coaches	SLOs based on job function/ assigned students
Graduation Coach	SLOs based on job functions
Dean	SLOs based on job functions

2. Instructional Practice

Classroom Teachers

Instructional Practice comprises 45% of all classroom teachers' evaluations in Leon County Schools, whether newly-hired or continuing with the district.

The purpose of the evaluation system is to increase student learning by improving instructional practice. The Leon Educator Assessment and Development System (LEADS) is designed to assess the classroom teacher's performance in relation to the Florida Educators Accomplished Practices and is based on the Marzano's Framework for Effective Teaching.

The practices identified in the framework are strongly linked through research to increased student achievement (see Appendix F). An additional outcome goal of the system is for the educator to use the evaluation to design a plan for professional growth (Deliberate Practice Plan). The principal or a designee (hereinafter "principal") will conduct the evaluation process in which the classroom teacher will actively participate through the use of self-assessment, reflection, presentation of artifacts, and classroom demonstration.

The results of evaluations, along with student achievement data, will be used as the basis for School Improvement Plans and the District Improvement Plan.

The same core of effective strategies will be used by all evaluators for all classroom teachers. The strategies are captured as elements in an overall evaluation framework. The LEADS framework contains the following domains for Instructional Practice:

- Domain 1: Collaborative Planning
- Domain 2: Instruction
- Domain 3: Reflection and Revision

Calculating the Instructional Practice Score – Classroom Teacher

As mentioned previously, the Instructional Practice score equals 45% of a teacher's overall evaluation. Within the Instructional Practice component, each domain is weighted according to the following percentages:

- Domain 1 = 20%
- Domain 2 = 60%
- Domain 3 = 20%

All elements are averaged within each domain and combined for a final Instructional Practice score based on the weighting described above. Each element is scored with a rating of Highly Effective (4), Effective (3), Developing (2), Beginning (1), or Not Using (0).

For newly-hired beginning teachers, their first evaluation score is calculated at the midpoint of the year. This is comprised of Instructional Practice and Student Performance Measures based on Student Learning Objectives developed by the teacher at the beginning of the academic year.

Alignment to the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAP)

Practice	Evaluation Indicators
1. Instructional Design and Lesson Planning	
Applying concepts from human development and learning theories, the effective educator consistently:	
a. Aligns instruction with state-adopted standards at the appropriate level of rigor;	Ensure the unit reflects the state standards and includes common formative and summative assessments.
b. Sequences lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and required prior knowledge;	Provide scaffolding within lessons so that each piece of new information clearly builds on the previous piece.
c. Designs instruction for students to achieve mastery;	Ensure that the unit moves students from lower levels to higher levels of cognitive complexity.
d. Selects appropriate formative assessments to monitor learning;	Ensure the unit reflects the state standards and includes common formative and summative assessments.
e. Uses diagnostic student data to plan lessons; and,	Use data analysis to make instructional decisions.
f. Develops learning experiences that require students to demonstrate a variety of applicable skills and competencies.	Identify the adaptations, accommodations, and modifications that will be used to meet the needs of special learners, including ESE, ELL and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for learning.
2. The Learning Environment	
To maintain a student-centered learning environment that is safe, organized, equitable, flexible, inclusive, and collaborative, the effective educator consistently:	
a. Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, and attention;	Maintain an orderly classroom utilizing established classroom routines and procedures.
b. Manages individual and class behaviors through a well-planned management system;	Maintain an orderly classroom utilizing established classroom routines and procedures.
c. Conveys high expectations to all students;	Provide a rubric that describes levels of performance and includes the learning goal
d. Respects students' cultural linguistic and family background;	Identify the adaptations, accommodations, and modifications that will be used to meet the needs of special learners, including ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for learning.
e. Models clear, acceptable oral and written communication skills;	Use behavior associated with "with-it-ness" to maintain adherence to rules and procedures.
f. Maintains a climate of openness, inquiry, fairness and support;	Use behavior associated with "with-it-ness" to maintain adherence to rules and procedures. Display objectivity and control.
g. Integrates current information and communication technologies;	Identify traditional resources and available technologies that enhance student understanding and how to use them appropriately
h. Adapts the learning environment to accommodate the differing needs and diversity of students; and	Identify the adaptations, accommodations, and modifications that will be used to meet the needs of special learners, including ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for learning.
i. Utilizes current and emerging assistive technologies that enable students to participate in high-quality communication interactions and achieve their educational goals.	Identify traditional resources and available technologies that enhance student understanding and how to use them appropriately. Provide feedback to students regarding their progress and assists students in tracking their progress according to the rubric.
3. Instructional Delivery and Facilitation	
The effective educator consistently utilizes a deep and comprehensive knowledge of the subject taught to:	
a. Deliver engaging and challenging lessons;	Use techniques to establish and maintain student engagement (investment in learning)
b. Deepen and enrich students' understanding through content area literacy strategies, verbalization of thought, and application of the subject matter;	All Elements in Focus 4: Deepening and Practicing Knowledge. (See Appendix E)
c. Identify gaps in students' subject matter knowledge;	Ensure that the unit moves students from lower levels to higher levels of cognitive complexity.

	Engage students in activities that help them reflect on the learning process, their learning and effort.
d. Modify instruction to respond to preconceptions or misconceptions;	Help students deepen knowledge by examining their own reasoning or logic. Engage students in examining how the current lesson changed their perception and understanding of previous content.
e. Relate and integrate the subject matter with other disciplines and life experiences;	Engage students in linking activities to connect what they already know to new content.
f. Employ higher-order questioning techniques;	Ensure that the unit moves students from lower levels to higher levels of cognitive complexity. Use response rate techniques to maintain student engagement in questions. Engage students in activities that require elaborative inferences.
g. Apply varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology, to provide comprehensible instruction, and to teach for student understanding;	Provide scaffolding within lessons so that each piece of new information clearly builds on the previous piece. Identify traditional resources and available technologies that enhance student understanding and how to use them appropriately. Identify the adaptations, accommodations, and modifications that will be used to meet the needs of special learners, including ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for learning. All of Focus 3: Interacting with New Knowledge
h. Differentiate instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students;	Identify the adaptations, accommodations, and modifications that will be used to meet the needs of special learners, including ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for learning. Provide students with recognition of their growth, effort and accomplishments on the rubric/learning goal.
i. Support, encourage, and provide immediate and specific feedback to students to promote student achievement;	Provide feedback to students regarding their progress and assists students in tracking their progress according to the rubric.
j. Utilize student feedback to monitor instructional needs and to adjust instruction.	Provide feedback to students regarding their progress and assists students in tracking their progress according to the rubric. Engage students in practice activities that help them develop competence and confidence. Use data analysis to make instructional decisions. Determine the effectiveness of selected strategies for subgroups (ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for schooling).
4. Assessment	
The effective educator consistently:	
a. Analyzes and applies data from multiple assessments and measures to diagnose students' learning needs, informs instruction based on those needs, and drives the learning process;	Use data analysis to make instructional decisions. Determine the effectiveness of selected strategies for subgroups (ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for schooling).
b. Designs and aligns formative and summative assessments that match learning objectives and lead to mastery;	Provide a rubric that describes levels of performance and includes the learning goal.

	Provide feedback to students regarding their progress and assists students in tracking their progress according to the rubric.
c. Uses a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress, achievement and learning gains;	Identify the adaptations, accommodations, and modifications that will be used to meet the needs of special learners, including ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for learning. Determine the effectiveness of selected strategies for subgroups (ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for schooling).
d. Modifies assessments and testing conditions to accommodate learning styles and varying levels of knowledge;	Identify the adaptations, accommodations, and modifications that will be used to meet the needs of special learners, including ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for learning. Determine the effectiveness of selected strategies for subgroups (ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for schooling).
e. Shares the importance and outcomes of student assessment data with the student and the student's parent/caregiver(s); and,	Provide students with recognition of their growth, effort and accomplishments on the rubric/learning goal.
f. Applies technology to organize and integrate assessment information.	Implement the school and district rules/procedures and adhere to them (Parent Portal).
5. Continuous Professional Improvement	
The effective educator consistently:	
a. Designs purposeful professional goals to strengthen the effectiveness of instruction based on students' needs;	Identify specific strategies and behaviors from Domain 2 on which to improve and develop a written Deliberate Practice Plan.
b. Examines and uses data-informed research to improve instruction and student achievement;	Use data analysis to make instructional decisions.
c. Uses a variety of data, independently, and in collaboration with colleagues, to evaluate learning outcomes, adjust planning and continuously improve the effectiveness of the lessons;	Use data analysis to make instructional decisions.
d. Collaborates with the home, school and larger communities to foster communication and to support student learning and continuous improvement;	Interact with students and parents in a positive manner to foster learning and promote positive home/school relationships.
e. Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices; and,	Identify specific strategies and behaviors from Domain 2 on which to improve and develop a written Deliberate Practice Plan. Demonstrate a professional growth mindset.
f. Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development in the teaching and learning process.	Demonstrate a professional growth mindset. Identify specific strategies and behaviors from Domain 2 on which to improve and develop a written Deliberate Practice Plan.
6. Professional Responsibility and Ethical Conduct	
Understanding that educators are held to a high moral standard in a community, the effective educator adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession of Florida, pursuant to Rules 6A-10.080 and 6A-10.081, F.A.C., and fulfills the expected obligations to students, the public and the education profession.	All of Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities – see Other Indicators of Performance and Appendix E

Non-classroom Instructional Personnel – Student Services

The purpose of the evaluation system is to increase student learning by improving instructional practice. The Leon Educator Assessment and Development System (LEADS) is designed to assess the non-classroom instructional personnel's performance (Speech Language Pathologists, District ESE Specialists, District Guidance, etc.) in relation to the Florida Educators Accomplished Practices and is based on the Danielson Framework for Teaching.

The practices identified in the framework are strongly linked through research to increased student achievement (see Appendix F). An additional outcome goal of the system is for the educator to use the evaluation to design a plan for professional growth (Deliberate Practice Plan). The principal or a designee (hereinafter "principal") will conduct the evaluation process in which the non-classroom instructional personnel will actively participate through the use of self-assessment, reflection, presentation of artifacts, and observation.

The results of evaluations, along with student achievement data, will be used as the basis for School Improvement Plans and the District Improvement Plan.

The same core of effective strategies will be used by all evaluators for all classroom teachers. The strategies are captured as elements in an overall evaluation framework. The LEADS framework contains the following domains for Instructional Practice for non-classroom instructional personnel:

- Domain 1: Planning and Preparation
- Domain 2: The Environment
- Domain 3: Delivery of Service

Calculating the Instructional Practice Score – Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel

As mentioned previously, the Instructional Practice score equals 45% of a teacher's overall evaluation. Within the Instructional Practice component, each domain is weighted according to the following percentages:

- Domain 1 = 20%
- Domain 2 = 60%
- Domain 3 = 20%

All elements are averaged within each domain and combined for a final Instructional Practice score based on the weighting described above. Each element is scored with a rating of Highly Effective (4), Effective (3), Developing (2), Beginning (1), or Not Using (0).

Procedures for Conducting Observations and Collecting Data

The Leon LEADS evaluation process shall include the following components:

Training

Before participating in the evaluation process, all principals and other evaluators must complete training on the evaluation process. Administrators conduct formative and summative observations for the evaluation process. Anyone conducting an evaluative observation will be required to complete training on the process before acting in that capacity. Initial and follow-up training will include learning walks to ensure evaluator consistency. Teacher leaders, instructional coaches, teacher mentors, and district staff may act as non-evaluative observers and provide insight for growth and improvement on instructional practices.

Orientation

Within two weeks of a teacher's first day of work in any school year, the principal will provide the teacher with a copy of/or directions for obtaining access to a copy of the District Handbook for Teacher Evaluation. Included in the handbook will be:

- A. The Learning Map for Leon LEADS
- B. The Leon LEADS Instructional Evaluation System
- C. A schedule of observations according to teacher category
- D. Copies of all forms that can be used in the evaluation process
- E. Research associated with the model

Copies may be provided by electronic means.

Any new-hires to the Leon County Schools System will be provided training on the evaluation system.

Teacher Self-Assessment

Using the Leon LEADS Learning Map and online self-assessment tool, the teacher shall rate his or her own performance at the beginning of the year and reflect on his or her performance throughout the year. This self-assessment may be used by teachers to assist in setting individual goals reflected in the Deliberate Practice Plan (DPP). Prior years' evaluations can also be used in setting goals for improvement.

Formal Observations

Formal observations will have the following components:

- A. Pre-Observation Conference
Before the first formal, announced observation the principal shall meet with the teacher to discuss the teacher's Deliberate Practice Plan and the lesson(s) to be observed. The teacher will provide the principal with a description of the lesson(s). A description will be in the form of a lesson plan or pre-conference form. The goal of this conference is to prepare the principal and the teacher for the observation. Pre-observation conferences for subsequent observations may/may not contain all of the above elements.

B. Classroom Observation

- The formal observation is planned through the pre-observation conference.
- The formal observation will be approximately forty-five minutes or an entire class period.
- Results will be used for the annual evaluation.
- Written feedback will be provided to the teacher via the **Leon LEADS** online evaluation system.

C. Post Observation Conference

The principal shall conduct a post-observation conference no later than ten school days after each formal, announced observation. During the post-observation conference, the principal and teacher shall discuss and document the strengths and areas of growth demonstrated in the teacher's instructional practice during the observed lesson.

Informal Observations

Informal observations will have the following components:

A. Classroom Observation

- The informal observation is an observation that may be announced or unannounced.
- The results will be used for the annual evaluation.
- Written feedback is provided to the teacher via the **Leon LEADS** online evaluation system immediately upon sharing and finalizing by the evaluator.

Walkthroughs

Walkthroughs will have the following components:

B. Classroom Observation

- The walkthrough is a brief observation that may be announced or unannounced.
- The results will be used for the annual evaluation.
- Written feedback is provided to the teacher via the **Leon LEADS** online evaluation system immediately upon sharing and finalizing by the evaluator.

Beginning on the next page is a sample evaluation form for a walkthrough for a classroom teacher. The observation instruments are identical for each type of observation (Formal, Informal, or Walkthrough). The variance in each observation type is outlined above. The evaluation form is completed online through the **Leon LEADS** evaluation platform.

Instructional Practice (Domains 1-3) Observation Instrument - Instructional

Domain 1: Collaborative Planning	Not Using	Beginning	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
----------------------------------	-----------	-----------	------------	-----------	------------------

1. The team or teacher ensures that the unit **reflects** the state **standards** and includes **common formative** and **summative assessments** when applicable. (Utilizes LCS pacing guide when applicable)
2. The teacher or team ensures that the unit **moves** students from lower levels to **higher levels** of **cognitive complexity**.
3. The team or teacher provides **scaffolding** within lessons so that each piece of new information clearly builds on the previous piece.
4. The teacher identifies **traditional resources** and available **technologies** that enhance student understanding and how to use them appropriately.
5. The teacher identifies the **adaptations, accommodations, and modifications** that will be used to meet the needs of special learners (including **ESE, ELL, 504** and **low expectancy/high risk** students who lack support for learning).

Domain 2: Instruction	Not Using	Beginning	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
-----------------------	-----------	-----------	------------	-----------	------------------

6. The teacher provides a **learning progression** that describes levels of performance and understanding and includes the **learning goal**. (Focus 1)
7. The teacher provides **feedback** to students regarding their progress and assists students in **monitoring** their progress. (Focus 1)
8. The teacher provides students with **recognition** of their growth, effort and accomplishments. (Focus 1)
9. The teacher uses techniques to **establish** and **maintain** student **engagement** (investment in learning). (Focus 1)
10. The teacher uses **response rate** techniques to maintain student engagement in questions. (Focus 1)
11. The teacher maintains an **orderly classroom** utilizing established classroom routines and procedures. (Focus 2)
12. The teacher uses behavior associated with "**with-it-ness**" to maintain adherence to rules and procedures. (Focus 2)
13. The teacher displays **objectivity** and **control**. (Focus 2)
14. The teacher engages students in **linking** activities to connect what they already know to new content. (Focus 3)
15. The teacher **cues critical information** to students. (Focus 3)
16. The teacher uses **cooperative learning strategies** to implement effective small groups. (Focus 3)
17. The teacher **chunks** new information into small amounts and actively engages groups of students in **processing** the chunks of new information. (Focus 3)
18. The teacher provides **opportunities** for students to **record** their understanding of new content in linguistic and/or non-linguistic ways. (Focus 3)

Domain 2: Instruction	Not Using	Beginning	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
19. The teacher engages students in activities that require elaborative inferences . (Focus 3)					
20. The teacher engages students in activities that help them reflect on the learning process, their learning and effort. (Focus 3)					
21. The teacher engages students in a brief review of content that highlights critical information. (Focus 4)					
22. The teacher uses the cooperative learning process and strategies to help students practice and deepen knowledge . (Focus 4)					
23. The teacher helps students deepen knowledge by examining similarities and differences in informational content. (Focus 4)					
24. The teacher helps students deepen knowledge by examining their own reasoning or logic . (Focus 4)					
25. The teacher engages students in practice activities that help them develop competence and confidence with procedural knowledge (skill, strategy, or process). (Focus 4)					
26. The teacher provides opportunities for independent practice at home . (Focus 4)					
27. The teacher engages students in examining how the current lesson changed their perception and understanding of previous content . (Focus 4)					
28. The teacher engages groups of students in activities to facilitate student work on complex tasks . (Focus 5)					
29. The teacher facilitates students making decisions, solving problems, investigating, engaging in experimental inquiry, and/or authoring personal writings . (Focus 5)					

Domain 3: Reflection and Revision	Not Using	Beginning	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
30. The teacher/team uses data analysis to make instructional decisions .					
31. The teacher determines the effectiveness of selected strategies for subgroups (ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for schooling).					
32. The teacher identifies specific strategies and behaviors from Domain 2 (instruction) on which to improve and develops a written Deliberate Practice Plan (DPP).					
33. The teacher demonstrates a professional growth mindset . (actively seeks input, open to feedback, shares expertise)					

Instructional Practice (Domains 1-3) Observation Instrument – Non-instructional

Formal Observation/Evaluation Rubric – Instructional Specialists

Teacher _____ School _____
 Participants _____ Type of Specialist _____
 Observer _____ Date _____

Summary of the Activity

Evidence of Professional Activity

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
1a Demonstrating Knowledge of Current Trends in Specialty Area Weight 5.0	Instructional specialist demonstrates little or no familiarity with specialty area.	Instructional specialist demonstrates basic familiarity with specialty area.	Instructional specialist demonstrates thorough knowledge of specialty area.	Instructional specialist's knowledge of specialty area is wide and deep; specialist is regarded as an expert by colleagues.
Evidence:				
Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
1b Demonstrating Knowledge of the School's Program and Levels of Teacher Skill in Delivering that Program Weight 4.0	Instructional specialist demonstrates little or no knowledge of the school's program or of teacher skill in delivering that program.	Instructional specialist demonstrates basic knowledge of the school's program and of teacher skill in delivering that program.	Instructional specialist demonstrates thorough knowledge of the school's program and of teacher skill in delivering that program.	Instructional specialist is deeply familiar with the school's program and works to shape its future direction and actively seeks information as to teacher skill in that program.
Evidence:				

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
1c Establishing Goals for the Instructional Support Program Appropriate to the Setting and the Teachers Served Weight 4.0	Instructional specialist has no clear goals for the instructional support program. Goals are inappropriate to either the situation or the needs of the staff.	Instructional specialist's goals for the instructional support program are rudimentary and are partially suitable to the situation and the needs of the staff.	Instructional specialist's goals for the instructional support program are clear and are suitable to the situation and the needs of the staff.	Instructional specialist's goals for the instructional support program are highly appropriate to the situation and the needs of the staff. They have been developed following consultation with administrators and colleagues.

Evidence:

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
1d Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources, both Within and Beyond the School and District Weight 3.0	Instructional specialist demonstrates little or no knowledge of resources available in the school or district for teachers to advance their skills.	Instructional specialist demonstrates basic knowledge of resources available in the school and district for teachers to advance their skills.	Instructional specialist is fully aware of the resources available in the school and district and in the larger professional community for teachers to advance their skills.	Instructional specialist actively seeks out new resources from a wide range of sources to enrich teachers' skills in implementing the school's program.

Evidence:

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
1e Planning the Instructional Support Program, Integrated with the Overall School Program Weight 5.0	Instructional specialist's plan consists of a random collection of unrelated activities, lacking coherence or an overall structure.	Instructional specialist's plan has a guiding principle and includes a number of worthwhile activities, but some of them don't fit with the broader goals.	Instructional specialist's plan is well designed to support teachers in improvement of their instructional skills.	Instructional specialist's plan is highly coherent, taking into account the competing demands of making presentations and consulting with teachers, and has been developed following consultation with administrators and colleagues.

Evidence:

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
1f Developing a Plan to Evaluate the Instructional Support Program Weight 4.0	Instructional specialist has no plan to evaluate the program or resists suggestions that such an evaluation is important.	Instructional specialist has a rudimentary plan to evaluate the instructional support program.	Instructional specialist's plan to evaluate the program is organized around clear goals and the collection of evidence to indicate the degree to which the goals have been met.	Instructional specialist's evaluation plan is highly sophisticated, with various sources of evidence and a clear path toward improving the program on an ongoing basis.

Evidence:

Domain 2: The Environment

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>2a</p> <p>Creating an Environment of Trust and Respect</p> <p>Weight 6.0</p>	Teachers are reluctant to request assistance from the instructional specialist, fearing that such a request will be treated as a sign of deficiency.	Relationships with the instructional specialist are cordial; teachers do not resist initiatives established by the instructional specialist.	Relationships with the instructional specialist are respectful, with some contacts initiated by teachers.	Relationships with the instructional specialist are highly respectful and trusting, with many contacts initiated by teachers.
Evidence:				
Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>2b</p> <p>Establishing a Culture for Ongoing Instructional Improvement</p> <p>Weight 6.0</p>	Instructional specialist conveys the sense that the work of improving instruction is externally mandated and is not important to school improvement.	Teachers do not resist the offerings of support from the instructional specialist.	Instructional specialist promotes a culture of professional inquiry in which teachers seek assistance in improving their instructional skills.	Instructional specialist has established a culture of professional inquiry in which teachers initiate projects to be undertaken with the support of the specialist.
Evidence:				

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>2c</p> <p>Establishing Clear Procedures for Teachers to Gain Access to Instructional Support</p> <p>Weight 4.0</p>	When teachers want to access assistance from the instructional specialist, they are not sure how to go about it.	Some procedures (for example, registering for workshops) are clear to teachers, whereas others (for example, receiving informal support) are not.	Instructional specialist has established clear procedures for teachers to use in gaining access to support.	Procedures for access to instructional support are clear to all teachers and have been developed following consultation with administrators and colleagues.
Evidence:				
Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>2d</p> <p>Establishing and Maintaining Norms of Behavior for Professional Interactions</p> <p>Weight 6.0</p>	No norms of professional conduct have been established; teachers are frequently disrespectful in their interaction with one another.	Instructional specialist's efforts to establish norms of professional conduct are partially successful.	Instructional specialist has established clear norms of mutual respect for professional interaction.	Instructional specialist has established clear norms of mutual respect for professional interaction. Teachers take an active role in adhering to these standards of conduct.
Evidence:				

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>2e</p> <p>Organizing Physical Space for Professional Learning Activities</p> <p>Weight 3.0</p>	<p>Instructional specialist makes poor use of the physical environment, resulting in poor access by some participants, time lost due to poor use of training equipment, or little alignment between the physical arrangement and the professional learning activities.</p>	<p>The physical environment does not impede professional learning activities.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist makes good use of the physical environment, resulting in engagement of all participants in the professional learning activities.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist makes highly effective use of the physical environment with teachers contributing to the physical arrangement.</p>
<p>Evidence:</p>				

Domain 3: Delivery of Service

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>3a</p> <p>Collaborating with Teachers in the Design of Instructional Units and Lessons</p> <p>Weight 4.0</p>	<p>Instructional specialist declines to collaborate with classroom teachers in the design of instructional lessons.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist collaborates with classroom teachers in the design of instructional lessons and units when specifically asked to do so.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist initiates collaboration with classroom teachers in the design of instructional lessons and units.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist initiates collaboration with classroom teachers in the design of instructional lessons and units, locating additional resources outside the school.</p>
<p>Evidence:</p>				

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
3b Engaging Teachers in Learning New Instructional Skills Weight 6.0	Teachers decline opportunities to engage in professional learning.	Instructional specialist's efforts to engage teachers in professional learning are partially successful, with some participating.	All teachers are engaged in acquiring new instructional skills.	Teachers are highly engaged in acquiring new instructional skills, and take initiative in suggesting new areas for growth.
Evidence:				

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
3c Sharing Expertise with Staff Weight 6.0	Instructional specialist's model lessons and/or professional learning activities are of poor quality or are not appropriate to the needs of the teachers being served.	The quality of the instructional specialist's model lessons and/or professional learning activities is mixed, with some of them being appropriate to the needs of the teachers being served.	The quality of the instructional specialist's model lessons and/or professional learning activities is uniformly high and appropriate to the needs of the teachers being served.	The quality of the instructional specialist's model lessons and/or professional learning activities is uniformly high and appropriate to the needs of the teachers being served. The instructional specialist conducts extensive follow-up work with teachers.
Evidence:				

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
3d Locating Resources for Teachers to Support Instructional Improvements Weight 5.0	Instructional specialist fails to locate resources for instructional improvement for teachers, even when specifically requested to do so.	Instructional specialist's efforts to locate resources for instructional improvement for teachers are partially successful, reflecting incomplete knowledge of what is available.	Instructional specialist locates appropriate and sufficient resources for instructional improvement for teachers when asked to do so.	Instructional specialist is highly proactive in locating resources for instructional improvement for teachers, anticipating their needs.
Evidence:				

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
3e Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness Weight 4.0	Instructional specialist adheres to his/her plan, in spite of evidence of its inadequacy.	Instructional specialist makes modest changes in the support program when confronted with evidence of the need for change.	Instructional specialist makes revisions to the support program when it is needed.	Instructional specialist is continually seeking ways to improve the support program and makes changes as needed in response to student, parent, or teacher input.
Evidence:				

3. Other Indicators of Performance

In accordance with s. 1012.34(3)(a)4., F.S., Leon County Schools has chosen to add additional performance indicators to the Leon LEADS framework. Other Indicators of Performance in LCS will be evaluated using Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities from the Leon LEADS framework. Professional Responsibilities comprises 20% of all classroom teachers and non-instructional personnel evaluations in Leon County Schools, whether newly-hired or continuing with the district.

Domain 4 element ratings are earned through observations and all elements are averaged within the domain for a final Professional Responsibilities score based on the weighting described above. Each element is scored with a rating of Highly Effective (4), Effective (3), Developing (2), Beginning (1), or Not Using (0).

Following is a sample of the Domain 4 observation instrument for instructional personnel. The evaluation form is completed online through the **Leon LEADS** evaluation platform.

Professional Responsibilities (Domains 4) Observation Instrument – Instructional Personnel

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities	Not Using	Beginning	Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
34. The teacher implements and consistently adheres to the school and district rules/procedures.					
35. The teacher knows the district and school initiatives and participates accordingly.					
36. The teacher positively contributes to the overall school culture .					
37. The teacher interacts with students and parents in a positive manner to foster learning and promote positive home/school relationships .					

T

he following is a sample of the Domain 4 observation instrument for non-instructional personnel.

Formal Observation/Evaluation Rubric – Instructional Specialists

Teacher _____ School _____
 Participants _____ Type of Specialist _____
 Observer _____ Date _____

Summary of the Activity

Evidence of Professional Activity

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
4a Reflecting on Practice Weight 5.0	Instructional specialist does not reflect on practice, or the reflections are inaccurate or self-serving.	Instructional specialist’s reflection on practice is moderately accurate and objective without citing specific examples and with only global suggestions as to how it might be improved.	Instructional specialist’s reflection provides an accurate and objective description of practice, citing specific positive and negative characteristics. Instructional specialist makes some specific suggestions as to how the support program might be improved.	Instructional specialist’s reflection is highly accurate and perceptive, citing specific examples. Instructional specialist draws on an extensive repertoire to suggest alternative strategies.
Evidence:				

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
4b Preparing and Submitting Reports Weight 4.0	Instructional specialist does not follow established procedures for preparing and submitting reports. Reports are routinely late.	Instructional specialist's efforts to prepare reports are partially successful and follow established procedures. Reports are sometimes submitted on time.	Instructional specialist's reports are complete and follow established procedures. Reports are submitted on time.	Instructional specialist anticipates and responds to teacher needs when preparing reports, following established procedures and suggesting improvements to those procedures. Reports are always submitted on time.
Evidence:				

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
4c Coordinating Work with Other Instructional Specialists Weight 4.0	Instructional specialist makes no effort to collaborate with other instructional specialists within the district.	Instructional specialist responds positively to the efforts of other instructional specialists within the district to collaborate.	Instructional specialist initiates efforts to collaborate with other instructional specialists within the district.	Instructional specialist takes a leadership role in coordinating projects with other instructional specialists within and beyond the district.
Evidence:				

<p>4d</p> <p>Participating in a Professional Community</p> <p>Weight 4.0</p>	<p>Instructional specialist's relationships with colleagues are negative or self-serving, and the specialist avoids being involved in school/ district events and initiatives.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist's relationships with colleagues are cordial, and the specialist participates in school/district events and initiatives when specifically requested.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist participates actively in school/district events and initiatives. Instructional specialist maintains positive and productive relationships with colleagues.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist makes a substantial contribution to school/district events and initiatives. Instructional specialist assumes a leadership role with colleagues.</p>
<p>Evidence:</p>				

Component	Unsatisfactory	Improvement Needed/Developing	Effective	Highly Effective
<p>4e</p> <p>Engaging in Professional Development</p> <p>Weight 3.0</p>	<p>Instructional specialist does not participate in professional development activities, even when such activities are clearly needed for the enhancement of skills.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist's participation in professional development activities is limited to those that are convenient or are required.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist seeks out opportunities for professional development based on an individual assessment of need.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist actively pursues professional development opportunities and makes a substantial contribution to the profession through such activities as participating in professional learning activities outside the district.</p>
<p>Evidence:</p>				

<p>4f</p> <p>Showing Professionalism including Integrity and Confidentiality</p> <p>Weight 5.0</p>	<p>Instructional specialist displays dishonesty in interactions with colleagues and violates norms of confidentiality.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist is honest in interactions with colleagues and respects norms of confidentiality.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist displays high standards of honesty and integrity in interactions with colleagues and respects norms of confidentiality.</p>	<p>Instructional specialist can be counted on to hold the highest standards of honesty and integrity. Instructional specialist takes a leadership role with colleagues in respecting the norms of confidentiality.</p>
<p>Evidence:</p>				

.....

4. Summative Evaluation Score

A performance evaluation will be conducted for each employee at least once a year. This teacher evaluation score will have a cut score of zero.

Prior to the end of the school year and in accordance with Local Education Agency (LEA) timelines, the principal shall conduct a summary evaluation conference with teacher. During the summary evaluation conference, the principal and teacher shall discuss the teacher’s Deliberate Practice Plan, the components of the Leon LEADS process, observations, artifacts submitted or collected during the evaluation process, and other evidence of the teacher’s performance on the Leon LEADS Learning Map. (See Appendix E)

At the conclusion of the evaluation process, the principal shall:

- A. Examine all sources of evidence for each of the three domains as they apply to the teacher’s Instructional Practice score within the **Leon LEADS** platform.
- B. Examine all sources of evidence for Domain 4 as they apply to the teacher’s Professional Responsibilities score (Other Indicators of Performance) within the **Leon LEADS** platform.
- C. Use the LCS SLO Excel worksheet to confirm the number of SLO targets met by teachers. This data will be submitted to the district to assign student performance measure scores accordingly.
- D. The evaluation may be amended based on achievement data that becomes available within 90 days of the end of the school year.

- E. Review the overall evaluation with the teacher, sign the form, and obtain the signature of the teacher. *A signature indicates acknowledgement, not agreement with the contents of the evaluation. Should a teacher wish to initiate a written response to the evaluation, it must be submitted to Human Resources to become a permanent attachment to his or her personnel file.*

Scoring Method

The instructional summative evaluation score is comprised of three parts: Instructional Practice, Student Performance Measures, and Professional Responsibilities. The weighting of each component is as follows:

- Instructional Practice = 45%
- Student Performance Measures = 35%
- Professional Responsibilities = 20%

Within the Instructional Practice component, there are three domains that are weighted equally to determine the overall Instructional Practice score.

- Domain 1 Collaborative Planning x 20%
- Domain 2 Instruction x 60%
- Domain 3 Reflection and Revision x 20%

The Student Performance Measures score is calculated by the percentage of Student Learning Objectives met. The Professional Responsibilities score is determined by the teacher's ratings on the elements within Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities.

The final summative rating is then calculated using the weighting described above:

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{Instructional Practice} \times 0.45 \\ \text{Student Performance Measures} \times 0.35 \\ + \text{Professional Responsibilities} \times 0.20 \\ \hline \text{Summative Evaluation Score} \end{array}$$

The four final rating categories used in the system are:

- **Highly Effective** – Teacher consistently and significantly exceeded the standard(s) of performance
- **Effective** – Teacher exceeded or demonstrated the standard(s) of performance most of the time
- **Needs Improvement or Developing (first three years of teaching)** – Teacher demonstrated adequate growth toward achieving standard(s) of performance, but did not demonstrate competence on all standards of performance
- **Unsatisfactory** – Teacher did not demonstrate competence on or adequate growth toward achieving standard(s) of performance.

Final rating categories are determined based on the following scale:

HIGHLY EFFECTIVE (4)	EFFECTIVE (3)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT/DEVELOPING (2)	UNSATISFACTORY (1)
Overall Final Score of 3.35 – 4.0	Overall Final Score of 2.35 – 3.349	Overall Final Score of 1.35 – 2.349	Overall Final Score of 0 – 1.349

Please see next page for the LCS Summative Evaluation Form. LCS is currently working with **Leon LEADS**, our evaluation platform, to develop the summative evaluation form within the system. The Summative Evaluation Form included here represents the scoring accurately. LCS will submit an amendment with the actual summative evaluation form as it is represented inside of **Leon LEADS** once it is built and finalized.





**School District of Leon County
Leon Evaluation and Development System
LEADS**

INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE (IP) CALCULATION:

Domain 1 x 20%
 Domain 2 x 60%
 + Domain 3 x 20%
 Overall IP score

All elements are averaged within each domain and combined for an overall Instructional Practice score based on the weighting described above. The Instructional Practice score is 45% of the summative evaluation score.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE MEASURE (SPM) CALCULATION:

The SPM is calculated by the percentage of Student Learning Objectives met.

SLO – percent met (75-100% = 4, 50-74% = 3, 25-49% = 2, 0-24% = 1)

The Student Performance Measure score is 35% of the summative evaluation score.

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES CALCULATION:

Domain 4 x 20%

The Professional Responsibilities score is 20% of the summative evaluation score.

Instructional Practice Score (45%)	
Student Performance Measure Score (35%)	
Professional Responsibilities Score (20%)	
Final Evaluation Score	

(HE) HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	(E) EFFECTIVE	(NI) NEEDS IMPROVEMENT OR (D) DEVELOPING	(U) UNSATISFACTORY
3.35 – 4.0	2.35 – 3.349	1.35 – 2.349	0 – 1.349

5. Additional Requirements

Observation and Evaluation Process

In LCS, the evaluator is the individual responsible for supervising the employee [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(f)2., F.A.C.]. The evaluators may consider input from other personnel trained in evaluation practices. Assistant Principals and district administrators are approved to evaluate and provide input on instructional personnel. Observations are limited to those provided with observer rights within the **Leon LEADS** evaluation platform. In the case of instructional personnel, this is limited to the principal, assistant principal, and district administrators.

Evaluators and employees subject to an evaluation system are informed on evaluation criteria, data sources, methodologies, and procedures associated with the evaluation [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(f)3., F.A.C.]. Evaluators and employees meet during pre-planning week to review evaluation documentation, such as the LEADS framework and our evaluation platform (**Leon LEADS**). District personnel from both the Professional Development and Testing, Research, and Evaluation Departments conduct trainings during faculty meetings during pre-planning week and before or after school within the first month of the school year. Additional information is available weekly through an online newsletter distributed to all employees by the Professional Learning Department. The evaluation platform also contains a Resources area where employees and evaluators can access all related documentation, including the Leon LEADS Learning Map (see Appendix E), the Schedule of Observations (see below), and a detailed description of each element and its associated rubric.

Evaluators and those who provide input toward evaluations understand the proper use of the evaluation criteria and procedures [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(f)3., F.A.C.]. Required trainings include reviewing the Leon LEADS Learning Map (see Appendix E) and the evaluation platform. In addition, each evaluator and those that provide input toward evaluations participate in cadres of learners. These cadres function as professional learning communities that meet five times during the year. The purpose of these PLCs is to deepen the understanding of the teacher evaluation process through learning walks and learning strategies discussion within the Leon LEADS framework. In addition, our beginning administrators meet monthly to reinforce the implementation of the evaluation process and the Leon LEADS framework.

Evaluators are expected to provide timely feedback to the individual being evaluated [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(f)4., F.A.C.]. This is accomplished by sharing an in-process or completed evaluation with the instructional personnel through the **Leon LEADS** evaluation platform. Sharing of an evaluation should be completed within 10 days of the documented observation.

Pursuant to [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(f)7., F.A.C.], all instructional personnel must be evaluated at least once a year. Evaluators will use the following Schedule of Observations (see below) to ensure all classroom teachers are observed a minimum number of times, according to their years of experience. Note in the Schedule of Observations below that in LCS, our minimum number of required observations and evaluations for even our most experienced classroom teachers exceeds the state minimum of once a year pursuant to [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(f)8., F.A.C.].

All classroom teachers newly hired by the district will either be assigned a status of Category 1a or Category 1. A Category 1a classroom teacher has no prior teaching experience and is newly hired to LCS.

A Category 1 teacher is newly hired to LCS, but has previous teaching experience. Note in the Schedule of Observations below that both Category 1a and 1 classroom teachers are observed and evaluated at least twice in the first year of teaching in the district pursuant to s. 1012.34(3)(a), F.S. [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(f)8., F.A.C.].

Example Schedule of Observations - Updated Annually

2017-18 Schedule of Observations

Status	Formal Observations (Announced)	Informal Observations (Announced or Unannounced)	Walkthroughs (not a limited number)
Category I A New Teacher <i>(0 years of teaching)</i>	2 1 by 10/10/17 <i>(1A teachers should be observed in the first 45 days)</i> 2 by 4/18/18	2 1 by 12/12/17 2 by 4/18/18	Once each nine weeks 2 by 12/12/17 4 by 4/18/18 Minimum Requirement
Category I <i>* (2nd or 3rd year of teaching or new to LCS.)</i>	2 1 by 12/12/17 2 by 4/18/18	2 1 by 12/12/17 2 by 4/18/18	Once each Semester 1 by 12/12/17 2 by 4/18/18 Minimum Requirement
Category II Teacher <i>Starting with your 4th year of teaching</i>	1 1 by 5/11/18 Annual Teachers by 4/18/18	1 1 by 5/11/18 Annual Teachers by 4/18/18	Once each Semester 1 by 12/12/17 2 by 5/11/18 Annual Teachers by 4/18/18 Minimum Requirement
Category III Teacher <i>Starting with your 10th year of teaching</i>	1 1 by 5/11/18 Annual Teachers by 4/18/18	1 1 by 5/11/18 Annual Teachers by 4/18/18	Optional
Instructional Support Teacher <i>Determined by the prior year's Instructional Practice Score</i>	2 1 by 12/12/17 2 by 4/18/18	4 2 by 12/12/17 4 by 4/18/18	Once each nine weeks 2 by 12/12/17 4 by 4/18/18 Minimum Requirement

*Teachers new to the district with 3 or more years of teaching experience will be assigned to Category 1 status for their first year in LCS. Upon completing the first year with a final evaluation rating of effective or higher, the teacher will move into the category associated with his/her overall documented years of teaching experience. Teachers hired after Jan. 18th do not receive credit for a full year's service and will not be reported to the state as evaluated, therefore will not be eligible for a pay adjustment the next year.

The number of observations listed above is a minimum requirement
TERC Approved 2017

Professional Development Plans

Evaluation results will be used to inform individual professional development. Teachers will develop Deliberate Practice Plans using individual data from the Summary Evaluation Form and Student Achievement Data.

Deliberate practice is a way for teachers to improve student learning outcomes by growing their expertise through a series of planned action steps, reflections, and collaboration. The Deliberate Practice Plan includes: setting student learning objectives, targeting elements for instructional growth to support student achievement, focused feedback, progress monitoring, and observing/discussing teaching.

Step 1: Needs Assessment

Complete a student needs assessment using either the available district level data or baseline classroom assessment data, as available.

Step 2: Student Learning Objectives

Based on what these data reveal, identify 3-4 *student learning objectives*. *Student learning objectives* are long term targets of academic growth that are measurable and standards based. These targets are developed by reviewing available data, identifying student needs, and targeting specific areas.

Step 3: Identify Instructional Practice Areas of Focus

Identify one element (instructional strategy) upon which the teacher will focus and demonstrate their instructional skill growth this year by collaborating with the principal, reviewing previous year's evaluation, and keeping student learning objectives in mind. The focus strategy should be identified as an area in which the teacher has room to grow in his or her instructional practice, as determined by a self-assessment, previous year's observations, or the beginning of the year walk through data.

Step 4: Identify Specific Action Steps and Resources

Action steps are based on the identified element (instructional strategy) upon which the teacher will focus on for the year. These steps may include Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), book studies, training, etc.

Step 5: Progress Monitoring

Student Learning Objective

Varies based on identified student learning objectives and identified measurement tools. (See Step 2)

Instructional Practice

Monitor instructional strategies identified in Step 3. Midpoint data can be pulled from formal, informal, peer, or walkthrough observation(s).

Individual Growth Plans

Teachers who are rated at least effective shall develop a Deliberate Practice Plan designed to improve performance on a specifically identified instructional strategy.

Instructional Support Plan

Pursuant to s. 1012.98(10), F.S. [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(f)6., F.A.C.], a teacher shall be placed on an Instructional Support Plan whenever he or she:

- A. Is rated “Developing” or lower on the Instructional Practice component of the evaluation; and
- B. Is not recommended for dismissal, demotion, or non-reappointment.

An Instructional Support Plan shall, at a minimum, identify the instructional strategies to be improved, the goals to be accomplished, and the specific professional development programs the teacher should undertake to achieve proficiency. It must also include a timeline for achieving proficiency within one school year or shorter, as determined by the LEA.

Parental Involvement

As per Rule 6A-5.030(2)(f)9., F.A.C., the evaluation system must include a mechanism to give parents an opportunity to provide input into performance assessments when appropriate. The Leon LEADS Instructional Evaluation System provides this opportunity through three avenues:

- The Leon County School District Annual Climate Survey,
- Presentation to various stakeholder groups, such as District Advisory Council, and
- Individual classroom surveys as prescribed by the administrator when deemed necessary

Peer Observation

Teachers have the opportunity to be observed and receive feedback on their instructional practice from peers through a non-evaluative observation process. This is mainly used through our Beginning Teacher Program by our mentor teachers.

Annual Review by District

A formal review will be conducted annually to determine the compliance of the district in implementing the Teacher Evaluation Process with fidelity. The review will focus on the aspects of the system that support improvements in instruction and student learning. In addition, the Teacher Evaluation Revision Committee meets monthly to ensure consistency in implementation and address any issues that arise throughout the year.

.....

6. District Evaluation Procedures

Employees, the Department of Human Resources, and the Superintendent have access to the **Leon LEADS** system to review all evaluations. Evaluators meet with employees individually to review and discuss their evaluations report. The summative evaluation report is provided to employees no later than 10 days after the evaluation is finalized. At this time, any notification of unsatisfactory performance is provided to the employee. The LCS evaluation procedures for notification of unsatisfactory performance comply with the requirements outlined in s. 1012.34(4) [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(h), F.A.C.].

A teacher shall be placed on an Instructional Support Plan whenever he or she:

- A. Is rated “Developing” or lower on the Instructional Practice component of the evaluation; and
- B. Is not recommended for dismissal, demotion, or non-reappointment.

An Instructional Support Plan shall, at a minimum, identify the instructional strategies to be improved, the goals to be accomplished, and the activities the teacher should undertake to achieve proficiency. It must also include a timeline for achieving proficiency within one school year or shorter, as determined by the LEA.

The employee shall have the right to initiate a written response to the evaluation and the response shall become a permanent attachment to his or her personnel file [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(g)4., F.A.C.].

DOE is notified annually of all LCS final evaluation ratings, including those who receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations. Additionally, LCS shall notify the DOE of any instructional personnel who are given written notice by the district of intent to terminate or not renew employment, as outlined in s. 1012.34(5), F.S. [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(i), F.A.C.].

7. District Self-Monitoring

LCS uses the **Leon LEADS** evaluation platform to conduct and monitor all evaluations and correlating observations of instructional practice. Before participating in the evaluation process, all principals and other evaluators must complete training on the evaluation platform, district policies and procedures, and process.

Initial and follow-up training that include norming measures to ensure evaluator accuracy and reliability are provided through the Department of Professional Learning. School administrators are divided into cadres of learners. These cadres function as professional learning communities that meet five times during the year. The purpose of these PLCs is to deepen the understanding of the teacher evaluation process through learning walks and learning strategies discussion within the Leon LEADS framework. In addition, our beginning administrators meet monthly to reinforce the implementation of the evaluation process and the Leon LEADS framework.

Leon LEADS provides reporting capability that allows the district to monitor timely feedback to employees that have been evaluated. Data extracted from **Leon LEADS** is used to determine appropriate and timely professional development needs for employees and is used in the development of school and district improvement plans.

Appendix A – Checklist for Approval

Performance of Students

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

For all instructional personnel:

- The percentage of the evaluation that is based on the performance of students' criterion.
- An explanation of the scoring method, including how it is calculated and combined.
- At least one-third of the evaluation is based on performance of students.

For classroom teachers newly hired by the district:

- The student performance measure(s).
- Scoring method for each evaluation, including how it is calculated and combined.

For all instructional personnel, confirmed the inclusion of student performance:

- Data for at least three years, including the current year and the two years immediately preceding the current year, when available.
- If less than the three most recent years of data are available, those years for which data are available must be used.
- If more than three years of student performance data are used, specified the years that will be used.

For instructional personnel of students for courses assessed by statewide, standardized assessments:

- Student Learning Objectives are derived from data based on proficiency and growth measures for state, national and international assessments as well as proficiency rates and growth data based on district, curricular, or teacher assessments.

For all instructional personnel of students for courses not assessed by statewide, standardized assessments:

- For classroom teachers, the district-determined student performance measure(s) used for personnel evaluations.
- For instructional personnel who are not classroom teachers, the district-determined student performance measure(s) used for personnel evaluations.

Instructional Practice

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

For all instructional personnel:

- The percentage of the evaluation system that is based on the instructional practice criterion.
- At least one-third of the evaluation is based on instructional practice.
- An explanation of the scoring method, including how it is calculated and

- combined.
- The district evaluation framework for instructional personnel is based on contemporary research in effective educational practices.

For all instructional personnel:

- A crosswalk from the district's evaluation framework to the Educator Accomplished Practices demonstrating that the district's evaluation system contains indicators based upon each of the Educator Accomplished Practices.

For classroom teachers:

- The observation instrument(s) that include indicators based on each of the Educator Accomplished Practices.

For non-classroom instructional personnel:

- The evaluation instrument(s) that include indicators based on each of the Educator Accomplished Practices.

For all instructional personnel:

- Procedures for conducting observations and collecting data and other evidence of instructional practice.

Other Indicators of Performance

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

- Described the additional performance indicators, if any.
- The percentage of the final evaluation that is based upon the additional indicators.
- The scoring method, including how it is calculated and combined.

Summative Evaluation Score

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

- Summative evaluation form(s).
- Scoring method, including how it is calculated and combined.
- The performance standards used to determine the summative evaluation rating (the four performance levels: highly effective, effective, needs improvement/developing, unsatisfactory).

Additional Requirements

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

- Confirmation that the district provides instructional personnel the opportunity to review their class rosters for accuracy and to correct any mistakes.
- Documented that the evaluator is the individual who is responsible for

- supervising the employee.
- Identified additional positions or persons who provide input toward the evaluation, if any.

Description of training programs:

- Processes to ensure that all employees subject to an evaluation system are informed on evaluation criteria, data sources, methodologies, and procedures associated with the evaluation before the evaluation takes place.
- Processes to ensure that all individuals with evaluation responsibilities and those who provide input toward evaluation understand the proper use of the evaluation criteria and procedures.

Documented:

- Processes for providing timely feedback to the individual being evaluated.
- Description of how results from the evaluation system will be used for professional development.
- Requirement for participation in specific professional development programs by those who have been evaluated as less than effective.
- All instructional personnel must be evaluated at least once a year.
- All classroom teachers must be observed and evaluated at least once a year.
- Newly hired classroom teachers are observed and evaluated at least twice in the first year of teaching in the district.

For instructional personnel:

- Inclusion of opportunities for parents to provide input into performance evaluations when the district determines such input is appropriate.
- Description of the district's criteria for inclusion of parental input.
- Description of manner of inclusion of parental input.
- Identification of the teaching fields, if any, for which special evaluation procedures and criteria are necessary.
- Description of the district's peer assistance process, if any.

District Evaluation Procedures

The district has provided and meets the following criteria:

- That its evaluation procedures comply with s. 1012.34(3)(c), F.S., including:
 - That the evaluator must submit a written report of the evaluation to the district school superintendent for the purpose of reviewing the employee's contract.
 - That the evaluator must submit the written report to the employee no later than 10 days after the evaluation takes place.
 - That the evaluator must discuss the written evaluation report with the employee.
 - That the employee shall have the right to initiate a written response to the evaluation and the response shall become a permanent attachment to his

- or her personnel file.
- That the District's procedures for notification of unsatisfactory performance meet the requirement of s. 1012.34(4), F.S.
 - That district evaluation procedures require the district school superintendent to annually notify the Department of any instructional personnel who receives two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations and to notify the Department of any instructional personnel who are given written notice by the district of intent to terminate or not renew their employment, as outlined in s. 1012.34, F.S.

District Self-Monitoring

The district self-monitoring includes processes to determine the following:

- Evaluators' understanding of the proper use of evaluation criteria and procedures, including evaluator accuracy and inter-rater reliability.
- Evaluators provide necessary and timely feedback to employees being evaluated.
- Evaluators follow district policies and procedures in the implementation of evaluation system(s).
- The use of evaluation data to identify individual professional development.
- The use of evaluation data to inform school and district improvement plans.

Appendix B – TERC

The Teacher Evaluation Revision Committee (TERC) was established in 2010 to begin discussion around the development of a new teacher evaluation system. From the outset of our deliberations, the structure of TERC reflected strong stakeholder involvement. Teachers, principals, and LCS district level administrators continue to work collaboratively to oversee and monitor our Leon LEADS evaluation system.

Appendix C – National & International Assessments

Advanced Placement

LCS has established a “2” as the cut score for all AP exams. The global pass rate for each course establishes the cut score for a 4 (Exception: Spanish Language and Literature. For these courses, the Florida rate is used because it is higher than the global rate.)

A rate of 26% establishes the cut score for a 3.

A rate of 10% establishes the cut score for a 2.

ExamCode	ExamTitle	1	2	3	4
31	Computer Science A	0-9	10-25	26-63	64-100
55	German Language	0-9	10-25	26-66	67-100
58	Compare Gov & Politics	0-9	10-25	26-59	60-100
64	Japanese Lang & Culture	0-9	10-25	26-75	76-100
15	Art: Studio Art-2-D Desig	0-9	10-25	26-71	72-100
16	Art: Studio Art-3-D Desig	0-9	10-25	26-61	62-100
14	Art: Studio Art-Drawing	0-9	10-25	26-71	72-100
20	Biology	0-9	10-25	26-50	51-100
66	Calculus AB	0-9	10-25	26-55	56-100
68	Calculus BC	0-9	10-25	26-79	80-100
25	Chemistry	0-9	10-25	26-54	55-100
28	Chinese Language	0-9	10-25	26-94	95-100
35	Economics: Macroeconomics	0-9	10-25	26-53	54-100
36	English Language & Compos	0-9	10-25	26-60	61-100
37	English Literature & Comp	0-9	10-25	26-56	57-100
40	Environmental Science	0-9	10-25	26-48	49-100
43	European History	0-9	10-25	26-64	65-100
48	French Language	0-9	10-25	26-57	58-100
57	Government & Politics: Un	0-9	10-25	26-51	52-100
13	History of Art	0-9	10-25	26-57	58-100
53	Human Geography	0-9	10-25	26-50	51-100
60	Latin: Vergil	0-9	10-25	26-63	64-100
75	Music Theory	0-9	10-25	26-58	59-100
78	Physics B	0-9	10-25	26-61	62-100
82	Physics C - Electricity &	0-9	10-25	26-70	71-100
80	Physics C - Mechanics	0-9	10-25	26-72	73-100
85	Psychology	0-9	10-25	26-54	55-100
87	Spanish Language	0-9	10-25	26-74	75-100
89	Spanish Literature	0-9	10-25	26-66	67-100
90	Statistics	0-9	10-25	26-58	59-100

7	United States History	0-9	10-25	26-52	53-100
93	World History	0-9	10-25	26-47	48-100
83	Physics 1	0-9	10-19	20-38	39-100
84	Physics 2	0-9	10-19	20-38	39-100

International Baccalaureate

The chart below shows the range for IB cut scores with the following criteria:

- A 60% pass rate establishes the cut growth score for a 4.
- A 40% pass rate establishes the cut growth score for a 3.
- A 30% pass rate establishes the cut growth score for a 2.

IB Course	4	3	2	1
English A1 HL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
French B SL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Latin HL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Latin SL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Spanish AB, SL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Spanish B HL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Spanish B SL	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Env. And Soc. SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Hist. Americas HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
History SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Philosophy HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Philosophy SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Psychology HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Psychology SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Chemistry HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Chemistry SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Math Studies SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Mathematics HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Mathematics SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Music HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Music SO.Perf. SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Visual Arts Option A HL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29
Visual Arts Option A SL in English	60+	40-59	30-39	0-29

- IB subject exams are scored on a 1-7 scale. 4 is considered a passing score.
- In most cases, there is one teacher for two classes—the standard level and the higher level. Of the six exams, a minimum of three and maximum of four are taken at the higher level (after a minimum of 240 teaching hours) and the remaining two or three subjects are taken at standard level (after a minimum of 150 teaching hours). IB students are expected to take their

examinations at the conclusion of the two-year Diploma Program. However, the IB permits students to take one or two standard level examinations at the end of the first year of the Diploma Program. The remaining exams are taken at the conclusion of the second year of the Diploma Program. Higher level exams can only be taken at the end of the second year. In many schools, all examinations are taken in the final year.

Appendix D

Student Learning Objectives are calculated based on a percentage of attainment. The percentages are as follows:

Percentage of SLOs Met	SPM Score
75-100%	Highly Effective (4)
50-74%	Effective (3)
25-49%	Developing/Needs Improvement (2)
0-24%	Unsatisfactory (1)

Appendix E – Learning Map

Domain 1 Collaborative Planning	Domain 2 Instruction	Domain 3 Reflection and Revision
<p>The team or teacher will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure the unit reflects the state standards and includes common formative and summative assessments. (Utilizes LCS pacing guide when applicable) 2. Ensure that the unit moves students from lower levels to higher levels of cognitive complexity. 3. Provide scaffolding within lessons so that each piece of new information clearly builds on the previous piece. 4. Identify traditional resources and available technologies that enhance student understanding and how to use them appropriately. 5. Identify the adaptations, accommodations, and modifications that will be used to meet the needs of special learners, including ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for learning. 	<p>Focus 1: Assuring Quality Student Work</p> <p>The teacher will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Follow a learning progression that describes levels of performance and includes the learning goal. 7. Provide feedback to students regarding their progress and assists students in monitoring their progress. 8. Provide students with recognition of their growth, effort and accomplishments. 9. Use techniques to establish and maintain student engagement (investment in learning). 10. Use response rate techniques to maintain student engagement in questions. <p>Focus 2: Classroom Environment</p> <p>The teacher will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Maintain an orderly classroom utilizing established classroom routines and procedures. 12. Use behavior associated with “with-it-ness” to maintain adherence to rules and procedures. 13. Display objectivity and control. 	<p>Focus 3: Interacting with New Knowledge</p> <p>The teacher will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Engage students in linking activities to connect what they already know to new content. 15. Cue critical information to students. 16. Use cooperative learning strategies to implement effective small groups. 17. Chunk new information into small amounts and actively engage groups of students in processing the chunks of new information. 18. Provide opportunities for students to record their understanding of new content in linguistic and/or non-linguistic ways. 19. Engage students in activities that require elaborative inferences. 20. Engage students in activities that help them reflect on the learning process, their learning and effort.
<p>Focus 4: Deepening and Practicing Knowledge</p> <p>The teacher will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 21. Engage students in a brief review of content that highlights the critical information. 22. Use the cooperative learning process and strategies to practice and deepen knowledge. 23. Help students deepen knowledge by examining similarities and differences. 24. Help students deepen knowledge by examining their own reasoning or logic. 25. Engage students in practice activities that help them develop competence and confidence. 26. Provide opportunities for independent practice at home. 27. Engage students in examining how the current lesson changed their perception and understanding of previous content. <p>Focus 5: Applying Learned Knowledge</p> <p>The teacher will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 28. Engage groups of students in activities to facilitate student work on complex tasks. 29. Facilitate students making decisions, solving problems, investigating, engaging in experimental inquiry, and / or authoring personal writings. 	<p>The teacher/ team will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 30. Use data analysis to make instructional decisions. 31. Determine the effectiveness of selected strategies for subgroups (ESE, ELL, 504 and low-expectancy/high-risk students who lack support for schooling). 32. Identify specific strategies and behaviors from Domain 2 on which to improve and develop a written Deliberate Practice Plan. 33. Demonstrate a professional growth mindset. 	
Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities		
<p>The teacher will</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 34. Implement the school and district rules/procedures and adhere to them. 35. Know the district and school initiatives and participate accordingly. 36. Positively contribute to the overall school culture. 37. Interact with students and parents in a positive manner to foster learning and promote positive home/school relationships. 		



LEON LEADS

Teacher Evaluation Framework

Revised May 2017

Based on the FEAMS & the 2007 Morzano Framework adapted by FLDCE

Appendix F

CONTEMPORARY RESEARCH ON THE
SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

Reference List

Derived from Marzano, R. J., Frontier, T., Livingston, D., (in press).
Supervising the art and science of teaching. Alexandria, VA. ASCD.

References

- Barton, P. E. (2006). Needed: Higher standards for accountability. *Educational Leadership*, 64(3), 28-31.
- Burke, P., & Krey, R. (2005). *Supervision: A guide to instructional leadership*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Tomas.
- Burke, P., Krey, R. (2005). *Supervision: A guide to instructional leadership* (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.
- Calandra, B., Brantley-Dias, L., Lee, J. K., & Fox, D. L. (2009, Fall). Using video editing to cultivate novice teachers' practice. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42(1), 73-94.
- Charalambos, V., Michalinos, Z., & Chamberlain, R. (2004). The design of online learning communities: Critical issues. *Educational Media International*, 135-143.
- City, E. A., Elmore, R. F., Fiarman, S. E., & Teitel, L. (2009). *Instructional rounds in education: A network approach to improving teaching and learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Power, C. (2010). New direction in teacher preparation. *Educational Leadership*, 67(8) 6-13.
- Coggsall, J. G., Ott, A., & Lasagna, M. (2010). *Convergence and contradictions in teachers' perceptions of policy reform ideas*. (Retaining Teacher Talent, Report No. 3). Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates and New York: Public Agenda. Available: www.learningpt.org/expertise/educatorquality/genY/CommunicatingReform/index.php
- Cooper, H., Robinson, J. C., & Patall, E. A. (2006). Does homework improve academic achievement? A synthesis of research, 1987-2003. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(1), 1–62.
- Cronin, J., Dahlin, M., Adkins, D., & Gage, Kingsbury, G.G. (October, 2007). *The proficiency illusion*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute and the Northwest Evaluation Association. (available online at http://www.edexcellence.net/doc/The_Proficiency_Illusion.pdf)
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2009). Teaching and the change wars: The professional hypothesis. In A. Hargreaves & M. Fullan (Eds.), *Change wars* (pp. 45–70). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- David, J. L. (2010). What research says about using value-added measures to evaluate teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 67(8), 81-83.
- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., & Koestner, R. (2001). The pervasive effects of rewards on intrinsic motivation: Response to Cameron (2001). *Review of Educational Research*, 71(1), 43–51.
- Downey, C. J., Steffy, B. E., English, F. W., Frase, L. E., & Poston, W. K., Jr. (2004). *The three-minute classroom walk-through: Changing school supervisory practice one teacher at a time*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Downey, C. J., Steffy, B. E., English, F. W., Frase, L. E., & Poston, W. K. Jr. (2004). *The three-minute classroom walk-through: Changing school supervisory practice one teacher at a time*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). *Revisiting professional learning communities at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Karhanek, G. (2004). *Whatever it takes: How professional learning communities respond when kids don't learn*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2006). *Learning by doing: A handbook for professional learning communities at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- DuFour, R., Eaker, R. & DuFour, R. (2005). *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Editorial Projects in Education (2009). *The Obama education plan: An education week guide*.
- Ericsson, A., Charness, N., Feltovich, P., & Hoffman, R. (Eds.). (2006). *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ericsson, K. A., & Charness, N. (1994). Expert performance: Its structure and acquisition. *American Psychologist*, 49(8), 725–747.
- Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., & Tesch-Romer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, 100(3), 363–406.
- Evertson, C., & Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Fehr, S. (2001, August). *The role of educational supervision in the United States public schools from 1970 to 2000 as reflected in the supervision literature*. Doctoral Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.
- Foltos, L. (n.d.). Peer coaching: Changing classroom practice and enhancing student achievement. Retrieved March 25, 2010 from <http://www.psctl.org/tl/resources/peercoachinglf.pdf>
- Gijbels, D., Dochy, F., Van den Bossche, P., & Segers, M. (2005). Effects of problem-based learning: A meta-analysis from the angle of assessment. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(1), 27–61.
- Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (2003). *Looking in classrooms* (9th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Grossman, P., & Loeb, S. (2010). Learning from multiple routes. *Educational Leadership*, 67(8), 22-27.
- Haas, M. (2005). Teaching methods for secondary algebra: A meta-analysis of findings. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89(642), 24–46.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge.

- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.
- Jackson, C. K. & Bruegmann, E. (2009). *Teaching students and teaching each other: The importance of peer learning for teachers*. NBER Working Paper Series. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Jaffe, R., Moir, E., Swanson, E. & Wheeler, G. (2006). E-mentoring for student success: Online mentoring and professional development for new science teachers. In C. Dede (Ed.), *Online professional development for teachers: Emerging models and methods*, pp. 89-116. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Kane, T. J. & Staiger, D. O. (2005). *Using imperfect information to identify effective teachers*. Los Angeles, CA: (unpublished paper) School of Public Affairs, University of California-Los Angeles. (Note that this is in Toch and Rothman (2008))
- King, S. E. (2008, Winter). Inspiring critical reflection in preservice teachers. *Physical Educator*, 65(1), 21-29.
- Kleinman, G. M. (2001). *Meeting the need for high quality teachers: E-learning solutions*. White paper distributed at the U.S. Department of Education Secretary's No Child Left Behind Leadership Summit, Newton, MA. Education Development Center, Inc. (EDC).
- Linden, D. E., Bittner, R. A., Muckli, L., Waltz, J. A., Kriegeskorte, N., Goebel, R., Singer, W., & Munk, M. H. (2003). Cortical capacity constraints for visual working memory: Dissociation of fMRI load effects in a fronto-parietal network. *Neuroimage*, 20(3), 1518–1530.
- Mahaffey, D., Lind, K., & Derse, L. (2005). Professional development plan: Educator toolkit. Milwaukee, WI: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J. (2006). *Classroom assessment and grading that work*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J. (2006). *Classroom assessment and grading that work*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J. (2009). Setting the record straight on “high yield” strategies. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(1), 30-37.
- Marzano, R. J. (2010). Developing expert teachers. In R. J. Marzano (Ed.), *On excellence in teaching* (pp. 213-246). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

- Marzano, R. J. (2010). *Formative assessment and standards-based grading*. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory.
- Marzano, R. J., & Brown, J. L. (2009). *A handbook for the Art and Science of Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., & Kendall, J. S. (2007). *The new taxonomy of educational objectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Marzano, R. J., & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). *Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, J. J., & Pollack, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mayer, R. E. (2003). *Learning and instruction*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill, Prentice Hall.
- Neufeld, B., & Roper, D. (2003). Coaching: A strategy for developing instructional capacity. Providence, RI: The Annenberg Institute for School Reform. Retrieved March 25, 2010 from www.annenberginstitute.org/pdf/Coaching.pdf
- Newby, T. J., Stepich, D. A., Lehman, J. D., Russell, J. D., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. (2011). *Educational technology for teaching and learning* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Reeve, J. (2006). Extrinsic rewards and inner motivation. In C. Evertson, C. M. Weinstein & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 645–664). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Reeves, D. B. (2008). *Reframing teacher leadership to improve your school*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Rosaen, C. L., Lundeberg, M., Cooper, M., Fritzen, A., & Terpstra, M. (2008, September/October). Noticing noticing: How does investigation of video records change how teachers reflect on their experiences? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 347-360.
- Rosenshine, B. (2002). Converging findings on classroom instruction. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *School reform proposals: The research evidence*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University Research Policy Unit. Retrieved June 2006 from <http://eps1.asu.edu/epru/documents/EPRU%202002-101/Chapter%2009-Rosenshine-Final.rtf>.

- Ross, J., & Bruce, C. (2007). Teacher self-assessment: A mechanism for facilitating professional growth. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 23*(2), 146-159. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.035
- Sadoski, M., & Paivio, A. (2001). *Imagery and text: A dual coding theory of reading and writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schoenfeld, A. H. (2006). Mathematics teaching and learning. In P. Alexander & P. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 479-510.
- Semadeni, J. (2010). When teachers drive their learning. *Educational Leadership, 67*(8), 66-69.
- Sewall, M. (2009, Fall). Transforming supervision: Using video elicitation to support preservice teacher-directed reflective conversations. *Issues in Teacher Education, 18*(2), 11-30.
- Surowiecki, J. (2004). *The wisdom of crowds: Why the many are smarter than the few and how collective wisdom shapes business, economics, societies, and nations*. New York: Doubleday.
- Thirunarayanan, M. O. (2004). National Board Certification for Teachers: A billion dollar hoax. *Teachers College Record*. Date published: February 10, 2004 <http://www.tcrecord.org> ID Number: 11266. Date accessed: 5/18/2010 5:10:20 PM.
- Toch, T. & Rothman, R. (January, 2008). *Rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public education*. Washington, D.C.: Education Sector.
- Tucker, P. D., & Stronge, J. H. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tucker, P. D., & Stronge, J. H. (2005). *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Twadell, E. (2008). Win-win contract negotiation: Collective bargaining for student learning. In *The collaborative administrator: Working together as a professional learning community*, pp. 218-233. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- U.S. Department of Education (2002). *Meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge: The secretary's annual report on teacher quality*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education.
- Weinstein, R. S. (2002). *Reaching higher: The power of expectations in schooling*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., & Keeling, D. (2009). *The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness*. Brooklyn, NY: The New Teacher Project. (retrieved, August 27, 2009 from <http://widgeteffect.org/downloads/TheWidgetEffect.pdf>)
- Wubbles, T., Brekelmans, M., & den Brok, P., & van Tartwijk, J. (2006). An interpersonal perspective on classroom management in secondary classrooms in the Netherlands. In C. Evertson & C. S.

Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues* (pp. 1161–1191). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(3), 255-316.