



2015-2016 School Year

Instructional Evaluation System



Rule 6A-5.030
Form IEST-2015
Effective Date: July 1, 2015

Lafayette County School District
Robert Edwards, Superintendent
Gina Hart, Director of Teaching & Learning

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
9. Attachments

1. Performance of Students

Student Growth will count as 40% of an employee's final evaluation score. The intent here is for reading and/or math student academic performance to be measured by statewide standardized assessment VAM results AND the other subject areas the teacher teaches to be assessed by a local assessment using a student growth rubric individualized to the teacher and/or grade level. A teacher's student growth score will only come from the students the teacher teaches. The department of education sends out roster verifications twice a year to the district. All teachers in Lafayette County Schools are given opportunity to verify and approve their rosters.

Teachers new to the district will be placed in Category I for the first year. If rehired, the teacher will then be placed in category II. Newly hired teachers will be formally evaluated two times each year, mid-year and end of the year summative evaluation, both of these evaluations will include a student performance measure. The Summative Evaluation Score is a combination of the three weighted categories: Student Growth (40%), Instructional Practice (40%) and Deliberate Practice (20%). Student Growth for the mid-year assessment for newly hired teachers (who have not taught a full year in the district) will come from a local assessment using a student growth rubric individualized to the teacher and/or grade level. A teacher's student growth score will only come from the students the teacher teaches and will count as 40% of their mid-year assessment. Student Growth for the end of the year summative evaluation for newly hired teachers will be measured by statewide standardized assessment VAM results AND the other subject areas the teacher teaches to be assessed by a local assessment using a student growth rubric individualized to the teacher and/or grade level. A teacher's student growth score will only come from the students the teacher teaches.

The proficiency/growth assessment(s) to be used are: appropriate state and District EOC scores, Science statewide standardized assessment, Industry Certification Exams (CTE), College Ready Reading, Progress Monitoring growth in Reading and Math, Brigance Comprehensive Inventory of Basic Skills, PERT and Benchmark assessments.

Student Performance Measures

Student Performance Measure:

All instructional personnel will include 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.

Teaching Assignment	Performance Measure(s) for Evaluation Purposes	Percentage Associated with Final Summative Evaluation
Pre-Kindergarten (PK)	Battelle Developmental Inventory	40%
Pre-Kindergarten Handicap	Star Fall	40%
Kindergarten (K)	Discovery Ed Reading & Math (EOC)	40%
First Grade (1)	Discovery Ed Reading & Math (EOC)	40%

Second Grade (2)	Discovery Ed Reading & Math (EOC)	40%
Third Grade (3)	Florida State Assessment	40%
Fourth Grade (4)	VAM: ELA and Math	40%
Fifth Grade (5)	VAM: ELA and Math	40%
ESE Teacher	VAM: ELA and Math	40%
PE Teacher/tutor	VAM, Presidential Fitness Test	40%
Tutor Teacher	VAM	40%
Other (K-5): Reading Coach, Guidance Counselor	School wide VAM	40%
Math Courses (6-8)	VAM	40%
Science Courses (8)	8 th Gr. Science FCAT	40%
English/Language Arts/Reading Courses (6-8)	VAM	40%
Spanish	District EOC	40%
Civics	State EOC	40%
English 1	VAM	40%
English 2	VAM	40%
English 3	District EOC	40%
English 4	District EOC	40%
Algebra 1; Algebra 1 Honors	VAM	40%
Algebra 2; Algebra 2 Honors	State EOC	40%
Geometry; Geometry Honors	State EOC	40%
Biology 1; Biology Honors	State EOC	40%
Ag Foundations/Ag Tech	District EOC & Industry Certification (CTE)	40%
US History	State EOC	40%
MS/HS Science	(w/out State EOCs) district EOCs	40%
MS/HS Social Studies	(w/out State EOCs) District EOCs	40%
Comp.Col.Car./Dig.Design	District EOC & Ind. Cert. (CTE)	40%
MS Wheel/ HS Ag. Tech	Industry Certifications (CTE)	40%
MS/HS PE	District EOC	40%
Crit.Thinking/St. Skills	District EOCs	40%
ESE ACCESS Courses	Achieve and FAA	40%
ESE Inclusion Teacher	School-wide VAM	40%
Allied Health, Culinary Arts (Vocational)	Industry Certifications (CTE)	40%
Other (9-12): Reading coach and Guidance Counselor	Schoolwide VAM	40%
District Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel	Growth of students assigned to position using state and district measures.	40%

Performance Score Ranges are: **Performance Level Ratings are:**

Four (4) = Highly Effective

Three (3)	=	Effective
Two (2)	=	Needs Improvement
One (1)	=	Unsatisfactory

Highly Effective

Indicates performance that consistently meets an extremely high quality standard. This service exceeds the typical standard of normal level service and is held in high regard by supervision and colleagues. Specific comments and examples of high quality work must be included in the assessment

Effective

Indicates performance that consistently meets a high quality standard. This is professional level service that meets the district expectations and is consistent with the experience level of the employee.

Needs Improvement

Indicates performance that requires additional attention to ensure an acceptable level of proficiency. Further, this performance is not consistently characteristic of the requirements for the position and experience of the employee. If this category is used, there must be written support regarding how performance is to be improved.

Unsatisfactory

Indicates performance that does not meet the minimum requirements of the position and the level of performance commensurate with the experience of the employee. If this category is used, there must be written support regarding how performance is to be improved. The rating of Unsatisfactory indicates performance that is not acceptable for continued employment provided that level of service continues. An employee receiving this rating should be notified that future performance assessments will be conducted according to the Department of Education Professional Practices Services Section NEAT procedures. Continued performance at this level should result in notice of termination when the rights of due process and just cause are evident. School districts should remain particularly sensitive to the appeal rights of employees identified in 1012.34, F.S.

Calculation of Student Growth:

- Value Added Scores sent from the state in 2015-2016 will range from 1 (Ineffective), 2 (Emerging), 3 (Effective) and 4 (Highly Effective). These scores will correlate directly with the district's rating scale of 1 (unsatisfactory), 2 (Needs Improvement), 3 (Effective) and 4 (Highly Effective). The state VAM score (1, 2, 3, or 4) will be multiplied by 4 (40%) and entered as the total Student Growth Score on the Summative Evaluation Form. See Summative Evaluation Form attached.
- For instructors who teach courses measured by a combination of FSAs, State EOCs, and/or local pre-/post-tests, the growth measure will be pro-rated between the categories and based on a rubric individualized to the teacher or grade level. The growth measure rubric is agreed upon by teacher and principal at beginning of school year. Once the growth is calculated, the score will be multiplied by 4 (40%) and entered as the total Student Growth Score on the Summative Evaluation form. See Summative Evaluation Form attached.

2. Instructional Practice

An Instructional Practice score will be computed for all instructional personnel. The Instructional Practice score is 40% of the teacher's evaluation. For teachers, Marzano's Florida Model will be used. The Lafayette County School district uses the iObservation digital data base to conduct and record teacher observations of instructional practice. At the end of the year, all observations are used in the calculation of the instructional practice score. The state crosswalk illustrating the relationship between Marzano's domain segments and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices can be found at:

http://www.marzanoevaluation.com/files/FEAPs_Crosswalk_Marzano.pdf

This model:

- Reflects teachers' performance across all elements within the framework (Domains 1-4);
- Accounts for teachers' experience levels;
- Assigns weight to the domain with the greatest impact on student achievement (Domain 1); and
- Acknowledges teachers' focus on deliberate practice by measuring teacher improvement over time on *specific* elements within the framework.

For evaluation purposes, teachers will be in one of two categories:

- Category I: one year of service
- Category II: two or more years of service

Description of Observations:

There are two types of observations, formal and informal. Formal observations are announced ahead of time and require a Pre and Post observation conference with written feedback. Informal observations do not have to be announced a head of time, however immediate feedback is required and comments may be given on the observation. The district uses the iObservation observation system, at the completion of every observation, an email is sent to the teacher and he/she may access it via the online, web based system. All observations, informal or formal, count towards the final evaluation. Both forms of observation provide an opportunity for ongoing feedback and support that informs opportunities for professional growth and provides a means of gathering sufficient evidence to determine the effectiveness of new and experienced teachers in their professional teaching experience. These

observations provide multiple opportunities for teacher reflection as well as professional growth through the planning, observation and reflection conference process.

Teachers new to the district will be placed in Category I for the first year. If rehired, the teacher will then be placed in category II. Newly hired teachers will be formally evaluated two times each year, mid-year and end of the year summative evaluation, both of these evaluations will include a student performance measure. The Summative Evaluation Score is a combination of the three weighted categories: Student Growth (40%), Instructional Practice (40%) and Deliberate Practice (20%). Category I teachers will receive a minimum of two formal observations and four informal observations. All formal observations of first year teachers will include a review of data appropriate to the Design Question focus for that observation. This may include but is not limited to: Curriculum-based measures; Grade distributions; Mastery checklists; Student work samples; and Discipline data.

Teachers with two or more years of services are considered Category II Teachers. Category II teachers will receive a minimum of one formal observation and five informal observation.

DETERMINING THE INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE SCORE

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

- Innovating
- Applying
- Developing
- Beginning
- Not using

The following sources of evidence may be used to determine an Instructional Practice score using Marzano's five point scale.

Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors

- Formal observation(s)
- Informal, announced observation(s)
- Informal unannounced observations(s)
- Walkthroughs
- Student surveys
- Videos of classroom practice
- Artifacts

Domain 2: Planning and Preparing

- Conferences
- Self-assessment
- Discussions
- Artifacts

Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching

- Conferences
- Self-assessment
- Discussions
- Artifacts

Domain 4: Collegiality & Professionalism

- Conferences
- Self-assessment
- Discussions
- Artifacts

A conversion from the 5 point Marzano scale to 4 point scale will be done as follows:

Step 1: Using the sources of evidence above and the Domain Forms each observed element is rated on the 5 point scale.

Step 2: The number of ratings at each level for each of the four domains is counted.

Frequency	D1	D2	D3	D4
Level 4				
Level 3				
Level 2				
Level 1				
Level 0				
Total Elements Used	-	-	-	-

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

Percentages	D1	D2	D3	D4
Level 4				
Level 3				
Level 2				
Level 1				
Level 0				
	%	%	%	%

Step 4: For each domain, the result from step 3 is applied to the description for each level on the Proficiency Scale (Appendix E) for the appropriate category of teacher (I, II,). This results in a domain proficiency score between 1 and 4 for each domain.

Step 5: Each domain proficiency score is weighted and combined to determine an overall status score according to the following weights:

- Domain 1: 68% (41 elements)
- Domain 2: 14% (8 elements)
- Domain 3: 8% (5 elements)
- Domain 4: 10% (6 elements)

Calculation of the final Instructional practice score will be automatically calculated in the iObservation data base.

Four Point Marzano Scale Ranges are:

Highly Effective =3.5-4.0, Effective = 2.5-3.49, Needs Improvement or Developing = 1.5-2.49, Unsatisfactory= 0.0-1.49

3. Other Indicators of Performance

Other indicators of performance will be in the form of the Deliberate Practice score. This will be 20% of the instructional evaluation. The purpose of Lafayette School District's Instructional Evaluation System is to work in perfect concert with an overall system of continuous improvement flowing up from growth in teacher quality to school and district improvement as measured by common metrics reflective of student academic performance. Simply stated, district and school improvement plans use data to establish learning goal outcomes for students. These same data as well as the teacher evaluation data are used to measure teacher effectiveness and inform decisions about classroom practice, staffing, and professional development needs. Instructional evaluation results will be used to identify both challenge areas and possible solutions to be addressed in school and district improvement plans. Teacher action plans will include Individual Professional Learning Plans (IPLPs).

For the Deliberate Practice Score, each teacher will complete an Individual Professional Learning Plan annually. The plan will focus on three indicator areas of improvement: District Indicator, School-wide Indicator and an Individual Indicator. Each indicator will specify a targeted area, an objective and measurable goal for the targeted area and the professional development planned focused on the targeted area. At the end of the school year, results will be documented in order to evaluate the success of the plan. Each teacher will preview their plan at the beginning of the year with the principal or designee and again at the end of the year. Success or mastery will be determined by the principal and or designee.

Rubric for Individual Professional Learning Plan:

Highly Effective rating (4) - indicates a complete plan with all indicators addressed and completed as well as evidence of continuous progress monitoring throughout the year.

Effective rating (3) - indicates a complete plan with all indicators and addressed and majority completed and evidence of some progress monitoring throughout the year.

Needs Improvement rating 2 -indicates a complete plan with all indicators addressed and partial completion and little to no evidence of progress monitoring throughout the year.

Unsatisfactory rating (1) -indicates an incomplete plan.

4. Summative Evaluation Score

The Summative Evaluation Score is a combination of the three weighted categories: Student Growth, Instructional Practice and Deliberate Practice.

Calculation of the final Student Growth score:

- Value Added Scores sent from the state in 2015-2016 will range from 1 (Ineffective), 2 (Emerging), 3 (Effective) and 4 (Highly Effective). These scores will correlate directly with the district's rating scale of 1 (unsatisfactory), 2 (Needs Improvement), 3 (Effective) and 4 (Highly Effective). The state VAM score (1, 2, 3, or 4) will be multiplied by 4 (40%) and entered as the total Student Growth Score on the Summative Evaluation Form. See Summative Evaluation Form attached.
- For instructors who teach courses measured by a combination of FSAs, State EOCs, and/or local pre-/post-tests, the growth measure will be pro-rated between the categories and based on a rubric individualized to the teacher or grade level. The growth measure rubric is agreed upon by teacher and principal at beginning of school year. Once the growth is calculated, the score will be multiplied by 4 (40%) and entered as the total Student Growth Score on the Summative Evaluation form. See Summative Evaluation Form attached.

Calculation of the final Instructional Practice score:

Calculation of the final Instructional practice score will be automatically calculated in the iObservation data base for Category I and Category II teachers. Newly hired teachers will be formally evaluated two times each year, mid-year and end of the year summative evaluation, both of these evaluations will include a student performance measure. The Summative Evaluation Score is a combination of the three weighted categories: Student Growth (40%), Instructional Practice (40%) and Deliberate Practice (20%). Category I teachers will receive a minimum of two formal observations and four informal observations. All formal observations of first year teachers will include a review of data appropriate to the Design Question focus for that observation. This may include but is not limited to: Curriculum-based measures; Grade distributions; Mastery checklists; Student work samples; and Discipline data.

The Lafayette County School district uses the iObservation digital data base to conduct and record teacher observations of instructional practice. At the end of the year, all observations are used in the calculation of the instructional practice score. The principal will submit an evaluation request in the iObservation data system for each individual teacher. A report will be processed immediately with an Instructional Practice score. Once the instructional practice score is calculated, the score will be multiplied by 4 (40%) and entered as the total Instructional Practice Score on the Summative Evaluation form. See Summative Evaluation Form attached.

Calculation of the final Deliberate Practice score:

The Deliberate Practice score will be correlated to the 4 point scale ranges of the Individual Professional Learning Plan rubric. Once the score is determined, it is multiplied by 2 (20%) and entered as the total Deliberate Practice Score on the Summative Evaluation form. See Summative Evaluation Form attached.

All of the final scores (Student Growth, Instructional Practice and Deliberate Practice) will be added together and divided by 10 to obtain the Final Summative Score. The Final Summative Score will be entered on the Summative Evaluation Form (see attached).

SEE Attachment #1, Summative Evaluation Form.

5. Additional Requirements

District Purpose:

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

District Vision:

The vision of the Lafayette County School District is to provide all students with educational opportunities within a safe environment conducive to learning which will enable them to become successful students and positive productive citizens.

District Mission:

“Building a Community of Learners”

District Core Beliefs:

Each student regardless of race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, age, ethnic or national origin, genetic information, marital status, pregnancy, qualified disability defined under the ADA, or on the basis of the use of a language other than English, except as provided by law, is expected to have the opportunity for success in a high-choice, dynamic learning environment. Our District vision is fulfilled as all stakeholders recognize and accept their responsibilities for working together and building a better future. Toward this end, the District is developing its human resources, particularly its school leaders, who have an important influence over the lives of students and the future of our state and county.

Class Roster:

The district provides instructional personnel the opportunity to review their class rosters for accuracy and to correct any mistakes via the State’s Roster Verification Tool. The RVT is available twice a year at the end of each semester. Each Teacher is given the opportunity to access the tool and report any necessary changes to the district office, specifically the Director of Teaching and Learning Services.

Evaluator:

The evaluator of instructional personnel is the individual responsible for supervising the instructional personnel. The principal is the evaluator of instructional personnel at each school. The principal at each school may consider input from the assistant principal. The assistant principal at each school has been trained in the Marzano observation system and the evaluation process.

Timely Feedback:

All instructional observations are conducted electronically. Instructional personnel are given immediate feedback via email once an observation has been completed by an evaluator and submitted. Conferences are also part of the observation system and encourage communication between the evaluator and the personnel being evaluated. Every instructional personnel will be given at least one formal observation during the year, a face to face preconference will be held with the evaluator and the personnel being evaluated as well as a post conference after the evaluation is completed. Again, immediate feedback is given via email once the observation is submitted by the evaluator. The Individual Professional Learning Plan is completed for each year in a face to face meeting between the evaluator and the personnel being evaluated. The Individual Professional Learning Plan is reviewed at the end of the year or beginning of the next year (depending on data availability) in a face to face meeting between the evaluator and the personnel being evaluated.

Connection between Evaluation and Professional Learning:

The purpose of Lafayette School District's Instructional Evaluation System is to work in perfect concert with an overall system of continuous improvement flowing up from growth in teacher quality to school and district improvement as measured by common metrics reflective of student academic performance. Simply stated, district and school improvement plans use data to establish learning goal outcomes for students. These same data as well as the teacher evaluation data are used to measure teacher effectiveness and inform decisions about classroom practice, staffing, and professional development needs. Instructional evaluation results will be used to identify both challenge areas and possible solutions to be addressed in school and district improvement plans. Teacher action plans will include Individual Professional Learning Plans (IPLPs).

Newly Hired Instructional Personnel:

Teachers new to the district will be placed in Category I for the first year. If rehired, the teacher will then be placed in category II. Newly hired teachers will be formally evaluated two times each year (mid-year and end of the year summative evaluation). Category I teachers will receive a minimum of two formal observations and four informal observations.

Parent Input:

Parent input is encouraged through various district and school surveys, however, it is not a part of the evaluation process.

Peer Review Option:

Will not be implemented at this time.

Peer Assistance program:

All newly hired instructional personnel are assigned a paid Mentor Teacher. The Mentor Teacher must have at least 3 years teaching experience and Clinical Education Training. In the event an instructional personnel falls into the Needs Improvement rating, the principal may decide to assign a Mentor Teacher to the personnel for additional support.

Professional Learning for less than effective teachers:

The purpose of Lafayette School District's Instructional Evaluation System is to work in perfect concert with an overall system of continuous improvement flowing up from growth in teacher quality to school and district improvement as measured by common metrics reflective of student academic performance. Simply stated, district and school improvement plans use data to establish learning goal outcomes for students. These same data as well as the teacher evaluation data are used to measure teacher effectiveness and inform decisions about classroom practice, staffing, and professional development needs. Instructional evaluation results will be used to identify both challenge areas and possible solutions to be addressed in school and district improvement plans. Teacher action plans will include Individual Professional Learning Plans (IPLPs).

Connection of Teacher Evaluation to District Strategic Plan:

This performance appraisal system relates to our Strategic Plan under Focus Area 2 titled Improving the Quality of Teaching in the Education System, Objective 3, Align requirements for district performance appraisal to the state's expectations.

Board Policies Relating to Performance Appraisal:

Policy 6.81

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

The purpose of Lafayette School District's redeveloped Performance Evaluation System is to increase student academic performance by improving the quality of instructional, administrative, and supervisory service (1012.34 (1)(a), F.S. and MOU (D) (2)(ii)2. To this end, Lafayette School District is committed to a cycle of continually updating the evaluation system to reflect state models, best practices that emerge over time, and changes in policy. Our system was created by a representative team of stakeholders, including principals and teachers, serving on an evaluation system redevelopment committee. The performance appraisal has not been part of the bargaining process in Lafayette County, but has always been agreed upon with union members in informal settings. This plan is also being written collaboratively with the union president. All teachers who receive a VAM score from the state will have the opportunity to verify their class rosters each semester using the state's Roster Verification Tool (RVT). All other teachers will have the opportunity to verify their class rosters at any point during the school year. Peer surveys will not be used at this time for teacher evaluations. As always, parents will continue to be given climate surveys at each school providing input into the school as a whole, their principal their teacher. However, these will not be used at this time for teacher evaluations.

CORE EFFECTIVE PRACTICES

Lafayette District's Performance Evaluation System is based on the work of Robert Marzano and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs – revised 12/17/2010) using the Florida Model. The observation instruments attached in Appendix B and referenced in subsequent sections of this plan will be used by all parties performing observations of instructional personnel. Appendix C contains a crosswalk illustrating the relationship between Marzano's indicators and the FEAPs, supporting the link to increased student achievement. Evidence and results from observations will comprise the Instructional Practice score.

The Marzano Evaluation Model is based on a number of previous, related works that include: *What Works in Schools* (Marzano, 2003), *Classroom Instruction that Works* (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001), *Classroom Management that Works* (Marzano, Pickering, & Marzano, 2003), *Classroom Assessment and Grading that Work* (Marzano, 2006), *The Art and Science of Teaching* (Marzano, 2007), *Effective Supervision: Supporting the Art and Science of Teaching* (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Each of these works was generated from a synthesis of the research and theory. Thus the model can be considered an aggregation of the research on those elements that have traditionally been shown to correlate with student academic achievement. The model includes four domains: Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors, Domain 2: Preparing and Planning, Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching, Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism. The four domains include 60 elements: 41 in Domain 1, 8 elements in Domain 2, 5 elements in Domain 3 and 6 elements in Domain 4. For a detailed review of these elements see *Effective Supervision: Supporting the Art and Science of Teaching* (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Given that 41 of the 60 elements in the model are from Domain 1, the clear emphasis in the Marzano model is what occurs in the classroom—the strategies and behaviors teachers use to enhance student achievement. This emphasis differentiates it from some other teacher evaluation models. Teacher status and growth can be assessed in each component of the model in a manner that is consistent with the Florida DOE guidelines.

The Research Base from Which the Model Was Developed

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

Experimental/Control Studies

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

To date over 300 experimental/control studies have been conducted. Those studies involved over 14,000 students, 300 teachers, across 38 schools in 14 districts. The average effect size for strategies addressed in the studies was .42 with some studies reporting effect sizes of 2.00 and higher. An average effect size of .42 is

associated with a 16 percentile point gain in student achievement. Stated differently: on the average, when teachers use the classroom strategies and behaviors in the Marzano Evaluation Model, their typical student achievement increased by 16 percentile points. However, great gains (i.e., those associated with an effect size of 2.00) can be realized if specific strategies are use in specific ways.

Correlational Studies

As mentioned above, correlational studies are the most common approach to examining the validity of an evaluation model. Such studies have been, and continue to be conducted, on various elements of the Marzano Evaluation Model. For example, such study was recently conducted in the state of Oklahoma as a part of their examination of elements that are related to student achievement in K-12 schools (see *What Works in Oklahoma Schools: Phase I Report* and *What Works in Oklahoma School: Phase II Report*, by Marzano Research Laboratory, 2010 and 2011 respectively). Those studies involved 59 schools, 117 teachers and over 13,000 K-12 students. Collectively, those reports indicate positive relationships with various elements of the Marzano Evaluation Model across the domains. Specific emphasis was placed on Domain 1 particularly in the Phase II report. Using state mathematics and reading test data, 96% of the 82 correlations (i.e., 41 correlations for mathematics and 41 for reading) were found to be positive with some as high as .40 and greater. A .40 correlation translates to an effect size (i.e., standardized mean difference) of .87 which is associated with a 31 percentile point gain in student achievement. These studies also aggregated data across the nine design questions in Domain 1. All correlations were positive for this aggregated data. Seven of those correlations ranged from .33 to .40. These correlations translate into effect sizes of .70 and higher. High correlations such as these were also reported for the total number of Domain 1 strategies teachers used in a school. Specifically the number of Domain 1 strategies teachers used in school had a .35 correlation with reaching proficiency and a .26 correlation with mathematics proficiency.

Technology Studies

Another unique aspect of the research conducted on the model is that its effects have been examined in the context of technology. For example, a two year study was conducted to determine (in part) the relationship between selected elements from Domain 1 and the effectiveness of interactive whiteboards in enhancing student achievement (see *Final Report: A Second Year Evaluation Study of Promethean Activ Classroom* by Haystead and Marzano, 2010). In all, 131 experimental/control studies were conducted across the spectrum of grade levels. Selected elements of Domain 1 were correlated with the effect sizes for use of the interactive white boards. All correlations for Domain 1 elements were positive with some as high as .70. This implies that the effectiveness of the interactive whiteboards as used in these 131 studies was greatly enhanced by the use of Domain 1 strategies.

Summary

In summary, the Marzano Evaluation Model was designed using literally thousands of studies conducted over the past five or more decades and published in books that have been widely used by K-12 educators. In addition, experimental/control studies have been conducted that establish more direct causal linkages with enhanced student achievement that can be made with other types of data analysis. Correlation studies (the more typical approach to examining the viability of a model) have also been conducted indicating positive correlations between the elements of the model and student mathematics and reading achievement. Finally, the model has been studied as to its effects on the use of technology (i.e., interactive whiteboards) and found it to be highly correlated with the effectiveness of that technology.

References

- Haystead, M. W. & Marzano, R.J. (2010) Final Report: A Second Year Evaluation Study of Promethean ActivClassroom. Englewood, CO: Marzano Research Laboratory (marzanoresearch.com)
 - Haystead, M. W. & Marzano, R.J. (2010). Meta-Analytic Synthesis of Studies Conducted at Marzano Research Laboratory on instructional Strategies. Englewood, CO: Marzano Research Laboratory (marzanoresearch.com)
 - Marzano, R.J. (2003). What works in schools. Alexandria, VA: ASCD
 - Marzano, R. J. (2006). Classroom assessment and grading that work. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
 - Marzano, R.J. (2007). The art and science of teaching. Alexandria, VA: ASCD
 - Marzano, R. J., Frontier, T., & Livingston, D. (2011). Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching. Alexandria VA: ASCD
 - Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). Classroom instruction that works. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
-
- Marzano, R.J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J. (2003). Classroom management that works. Alexandria, VA: ASCD
 - Marzano Research Laboratory. (2010) What Works in Oklahoma Schools: Phase I Report. Englewood, CO: Marzano Research Laboratory (marzanoresearch.com)
 - Marzano Research Laboratory. (2011) What Works in Oklahoma Schools: Phase II Report. Englewood, CO: Marzano Research Laboratory (marzanoresearch.com)

6. District Evaluation Procedures

An annual review of the evaluation system will be performed by a focus group, including principals and teachers. This group will review and revise the evaluation system on an annual basis to ensure the maximum impact on the professional growth of teachers and the academic performance of all students.

The focus group will examine factors which may include:

- Trends in ratings within each domain;
- Correlations among school grades/student achievement data and teacher evaluation scores;
- Alignment of professional development needs and IPLPs to evaluations;
- Data pointing to consistency in professional development implementation across teacher groups;
- Measures used for Student Achievement scores;
- Score ranges used by system;
- Inter-rater reliability
- Development needs for district assessments; and
- The adherence of the overall system to the research model and the original design elements.

Transitioning to the redeveloped Performance Evaluation System requires educating personnel on the components of the system as well as the criteria and procedures on which they will be evaluated. Faculty members are provided with all observation instruments and the performance appraisal instrument. The overview workshop and the Performance Evaluation System training will be mandatory for all new hires. A review will be held for existing faculty to review possible changes to the plan during a designated professional development day each year.

Compliance Confirmations

The district is in compliance with all procedures in accordance with s. 1012.34(3)(c), F.S., such as:

- the evaluator will submit a written report of the evaluation to the district school superintendent for the purpose of reviewing the employee's contract [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(g)1., F.A.C.].
- the evaluator will submit the written report to the employee no later than 10 days after the evaluation takes place [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(g)2., F.A.C.].
- The evaluator will discuss the written evaluation report with the employee [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(g)3., F.A.C.].
- 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.].

The district is in compliance with the requirements outlined in s. 1012.34(4), F.S. [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(h), F.A.C.]. The district superintendent will notify the Department of Education of any instructional personnel who receives two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations and will notify the Department of any instructional personnel who has been given written notice by the district of intent to terminate or not renew their employment, as outlined in s. 1012.34(5), F.S. [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(i), F.A.C.].

7. District Self-Monitoring

All principals, district staff and assistant principals responsible for observations and evaluations have been trained in Marzano's observation and feedback protocol. Subsequent initial training opportunities for new administrators and personnel with other educational roles will be offered periodically either by the district or on a regional basis by the North East Florida Educational Consortium (NEFEC).

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

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

Teachers may receive observations from educators with various instructional roles. Supporting continuous progress in instructional growth will generate input from numerous sources. Once an observation is completed the teacher will receive immediate feedback from the observer in the form of an automatic email. The teacher can then log into the iObservation data base and review their observation. The teachers are also able to communicate with the observer through the data base conference tool.

For evaluation purposes, teachers will be in one of two categories: Category I, one year of service; and Category II, two or more years of service.

Teachers new to the district will be placed in category I for the first year. If rehired, the teacher will then be placed in category II. Newly hired teachers will be formally evaluated two times each year (mid-year and end of the year summative evaluation).

For first year teachers, the frequency of observations as reflected in Table 1 provides an opportunity for ongoing feedback and support that informs opportunities for professional growth and provides a means of gathering sufficient evidence to determine the effectiveness of new teachers as they transition from pre-service programs into their professional teaching experience. These observations provide multiple opportunities for teacher reflection as well as professional growth through the planning, observation and reflection conference process.

All formal observations of first year teachers will include a review of data appropriate to the Design Question focus for that observation. This may include but is not limited to:

- Curriculum-based measures;
- Grade distributions;
- Mastery checklists;
- Student work samples; and
- Discipline data.

Feedback for first year teachers will include pre and post observations conferences for all formal observations as well as other written feedback.

School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are generated annually and are aligned to the district strategic improvement plan. Principals are responsible for monitoring SIP goal progress and present a mid-year and end of the year progress report to the board. The district requires formalized progress monitoring by principals every nine weeks to assess improvement and assist teachers in adjusting instruction based on data results to better meet student need. Teacher observation data based on the research of Dr. Robert Marzano is also analyzed to in order to adjust the instructional practice of the teachers in order to meet student needs. Teachers are able to access current student data through Google Docs worksheets and Google Classroom. Simply stated, district and school improvement plans use data to establish learning goal outcomes for students. These same data are used to measure teacher effectiveness and inform decisions about classroom practice, staffing, and professional development needs. Instructional evaluation results will be used to identify both challenge areas and possible solutions to be addressed in school and district improvement plans.

Directions:

The district shall provide a description of its process for annually monitoring its evaluation system. The district self-monitoring shall determine the following:

- Evaluators' understanding of the proper use of evaluation criteria and procedures, including evaluator accuracy and inter-rater reliability; [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(j)1., F.A.C.]
- Evaluators provide necessary and timely feedback to employees being evaluated; [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(j)2., F.A.C.]
- Evaluators follow district policies and procedures in the implementation of evaluation system(s); [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(j)3., F.A.C.]
- Use of evaluation data to identify individual professional development; [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(j)4., F.A.C.]
- Use of evaluation data to inform school and district improvement plans [Rule 6A-5.030(2)(j)5., F.A.C.]

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 classroom teachers of students for courses assessed by statewide, standardized assessments:

- Documented that VAM results comprise at least one-third of the evaluation.
- For teachers assigned a combination of courses that are associated with the statewide, standardized assessments and that are not, the portion of the evaluation that is comprised of the VAM results is identified, and the VAM results are given proportional weight according to a methodology selected by the district.

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.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment #1: Summative Evaluation Form

Attachment #2: Policies 6.81

Attachment #3: Individual Professional Learning Plan

Attachment #4: Website information