



EVERY STUDENT
◊ PREPARED FOR SUCCESS ◊

2014-2015

Gresham-Barlow School District Educator Professional Growth and Evaluation Handbook



Introduction:

The Professional Growth and Evaluation System was developed collaboratively by the Gresham-Barlow Education Association and the Gresham-Barlow School District to meet the requirements of Oregon SB 290, the "Oregon ESEA Waiver", and the current collective bargaining agreement between the Gresham-Barlow School District and the East County Bargaining Council.

Recognition:

The Gresham-Barlow School District extends its appreciation to the following licensed staff who have been instrumental in developing the Professional Growth and Evaluation System. This handbook and the associated resources contained in the appendices and others distributed to schools emerged from numerous planning and discussion sessions held during the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 school years. The District is indebted to the committee members for their development of the system which contributed to the adoption of this handbook.

Jean Black-Groulx, Educator, North Gresham Grade School

Mark Jacobsen, Educator, Gresham High School

Eric Neiwert, Educator, Gordon Russell Middle School

Anna Powers, Educator, East Gresham Elementary School

Tom Urbanowicz, Educator, Gresham High School

Tim Collins, Assistant Principal, Sam Barlow High School

Randy Bryant, Executive Director, Human Resources

Jason Bhear, Assistant Principal, Gresham High School

Teri Pitts, Program Director, Student Support Services

Nancy Torbert, Principal, Kelly Creek Elementary School

The following documents were as a resource for the development of the Gresham-Barlow School District Educator Professional Growth and Evaluation Handbook:

Bend-La Pine School District Licensed Professional Development and Evaluation Handbook

David Douglas School District Certified Employees Professional Development and Evaluation Process Manual

Salem-Keizer School District Licensed Staff Assessment and Evaluation Handbook

Oregon Framework for Educator and Administrator Evaluation and Support Systems

Gresham-Barlow School District recognizes the diversity and worth of all individuals and groups. It is the policy of this district and the board of education that there will be no discrimination or harassment of individuals or groups based on race, color, gender, marital status, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, religion, national origin, age, disability, Veteran's status, or genetic information in any educational programs, activities or employment. Gresham-Barlow provides equal access to individuals with disabilities.

Persons having questions about equal opportunity and nondiscrimination should contact:

- School administrator at your local school
- If the complaint is against the school administrator or is unresolved, contact Deputy Superintendent James Hiu at 503-261-4577
- Section 504 Coordinator, Carl Smith, at 503-261-4650
- Title II Coordinator, Deputy Superintendent Teresa Ketelsen at 503-261-4597
- Title IX Coordinator, April Olson, at 503-261-4580
- Telephone access numbers for hearing and/or visually impaired individuals at: <http://www.oregonrelay.com/relaynumbers.html>

Grievance Procedure

The Gresham-Barlow School District has a grievance process in place. This process (including procedures, forms and timelines) can be found in School Board Policy KL and KL-AR, which are available on the links below or at any school or district office upon request. The goals of the process is to provide prompt and equitable resolution of student, employee, parent or patron's allegations of discrimination. The process begins with a written complaint and includes informal and formal conversations, discussion with district employees involved and an investigation if necessary. Any decision by district personnel may be appealed. Levels of appeal begin with the school administrator and, if necessary, may be taken to the district superintendent or designee, the local school board and ultimately the Superintendent of Public Instruction at the Oregon Department of Education.

Any person who feels he or she has been a victim of or witnessed discrimination should contact:

- School administrator at your local school
- If the complaint is against the school administrator or is unresolved, contact Deputy Superintendent James Hiu at 503-261-4577
- Section 504 Coordinator, Carl Smith, at 503-261-4650
- Title II Coordinator, Deputy Superintendent Teresa Ketelsen at 503-261-4597
- Title IX Coordinator, April Olson, at 503-261-4580

Table of Contents

Section 1: Overview	1
Professional Growth and Evaluation Goals and Beliefs	2
Required Elements in Oregon’s Teacher Evaluation and Support System	2
Standards of Professional Practice	3
Differentiated Performance Levels	4
Multiple Measures	5
Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle for Teacher Evaluations	5
Steps in an Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle	6
Aligned Professional Learning	7
The GBSD Matrix for Summative Evaluations for Educators	8
Statewide Components of the Oregon Matrix	9
Y-Axis	9
X-Axis	9
Scoring Student Learning and Growth Goals	10
Final Summative Performance Level and Professional Growth Paths	10
Inquiry Processes	11
 Section 2: GBSD Licensed Evaluation System	 13
Contract Status Timeline	14
Contract Educator Evaluation Flowchart	15
Contract Educator Improvement Cycle Flowchart	16
Probationary Status and Temporary Educators Timeline	17
Probationary Educator Evaluation Flowchart	18
Probationary Educator Improvement Cycle Flowchart	19
Self-Reflection	20
Goal Setting	20
Categories of Measures for SLG Goals	20
Requirements for SLG Goals	21
Formal Observation Process	22
Mini-Observation Process	23
Educator Improvement Cycle	23
 Section 3: Forms and Documents	 25
Self-Reflection Form	26
Licensed Student Growth and Professional Goals	28
Pre-Conference for Formal Observation	32
Observation Feedback Form (Mini and Formal)	33
Post Conference for Formal Observation	34
Summative Evaluation Form	35
Matrix Summative Rating Form	38

Guided Support Plan	39
Program of Assistance for Improvement	42
Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards Rubric	45
Domain I: Planning and Preparation	46
Domain II: Classroom Environment	52
Domain III: Instruction	57
Domain IV: Professional Responsibility	62
SMART Goal Process, Step-by-Step	68
Log of Professional Development Activities	69
Educator Evaluation System Glossary of Terms	70
GBSD Evaluation: Quick Start Guide	72

SECTION 1

Overview

Professional Growth and Evaluation Goals and Beliefs

The ultimate goal of evaluation systems is to improve instruction and ensure equitable outcomes where all students, regardless of background, are ready for college, careers and engaged citizenship by ensuring the following outcomes:


- Improved student learning at all schools and for all students
- Effective educators in every classroom
- Reducing achievement gaps between the highest and lowest performing student groups, while increasing achievement and success for every student
- Continuous professional growth for educators throughout their careers

Evaluation should be a process that is cooperative and continuous, using an approach that is systematic, objective, and evidence-based. With a focus on professional growth, the GBSD Educator Professional Growth and Evaluation system will promote the following:

- Excellence in teaching and learning;
- Educator reflection on instructional practices;
- Collaboration with colleagues;
- Student academic growth;
- Quality professional development;
- Open communication about teaching practices;
- Recognition of strengths;
- Support toward professional growth.

Required Elements in Oregon’s Educator Evaluation and Support System

Educator evaluation and support system in all Oregon school districts must include the following five elements Described in the *Oregon Framework for Educator Evaluation and Support Systems*:



These five required elements defined below establish the parameters for local evaluation and support systems. The Oregon Framework describes the state criteria for each of these elements. Districts must align their systems to these elements but have local flexibility in their design and implementation. Local systems must meet or exceed the state criteria for evaluation and support systems.

- 1. Standards of Professional Practice:** The state adopted the INTASC Model Core Teaching Standards that define what educators should know and be able to do to ensure that every student is ready for college, careers and engaged citizenship in today's world.

2. **Differentiated Performance Levels:** Educator performances on the standards of professional practice are measured on four performance levels. ODE has provided district-approved, research-based rubrics aligned to the state adopted INTASC standards, one of which was Charlotte Danielson's *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument 2011 Edition*.
3. **Multiple Measures:** Multiple sources of data are used to measure educator performance on the standards of professional practice. Evaluators look at evidence from three categories: professional practice, professional responsibilities, and student learning and growth.
4. **Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle:** Educators are evaluated on a regular cycle of continuous improvement that includes self-reflection, goal setting, observations, formative assessment and summative evaluation. **The Oregon Matrix Model** is used for the summative evaluation. The matrix model combines measures for professional practice (PP) and professional responsibilities (PR) and student learning and growth (SLG). The Y-axis represents the performance level for PP/PR, and the X-axis represents the performance level for SLG. The educators' Professional Growth Plan and overall summative performance level are determined by the intersection of the Y- and X-axes. Student Learning and Growth accounts for 20% (with inquiry process) of the educator's summative evaluation.
5. **Aligned Professional Learning:** Relevant professional learning opportunities to improve professional practice and impact on student learning are aligned to the educator's evaluation and his/her need for professional growth.

Standards of Professional Practice:

GBSD Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards

The Gresham-Barlow School District adopted Charlotte Danielson's *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument 2011 Edition* as its model of core teaching standards, which is fully aligned with the state adopted INTASC standards. These professional standards outline what educators should know and be able to do to ensure every student is ready for college, careers and engaged citizenship. This framework is divided into the following four domains that encompass effective instruction:

- I. Planning and Preparation
- II. The Classroom Environment
- III. Instruction
- IV. Professional Responsibilities

Each of the domains can be further broken down into additional research-based performance standards that define best practice in the teaching profession. Though not every performance standard applies to every licensed position in the Gresham-Barlow School District, all licensed positions are encompassed by the four domains. The performance standards are as follows:

I. Planning and Preparation

- a. Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy
- b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students
- c. Setting Instructional Outcomes
- d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources
- e. Designing Coherent Instruction
- f. Designing Students Assessments

II. The Classroom Environment

- a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
- b. Establishing a Culture for Learning
- c. Managing Classroom Procedures
- d. Managing Student Behavior
- e. Organizing Physical Space

III. Instruction

- a. Communicating with Students
- b. Questioning and Discussion Techniques
- c. Engaging Students in Learning
- d. Using Assessment in Learning
- e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

IV. Professional Responsibilities

- a. Reflecting on Teaching
- b. Maintaining Accurate Records
- c. Communicating with Families
- d. Participating in a Professional Community
- e. Growing and Developing Professionally
- f. Showing Professionalism

Differentiated Performance Levels:

As required by the state of Oregon, educator performances on the GBSD Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards are measured on the four performance levels described in the table below.

GBSD Evaluation Rating Scale	
Performance Levels	Definitions of Performance as Applied to Standards of Professional Practice
1	Does not meet standards; performs below the expectations for good performance under this standard; requires direct intervention and support to improve practice
2	Making sufficient progress toward meeting this standard; meets expectations for good performance most of the time and shows continuous improvement; expected improvement through focused professional learning and growth plan
3	Consistently meets expectations for good performance under this standard; demonstrates effective practices and impact on student learning; continues to improve professional practice through ongoing professional learning
4	Consistently exceeds expectations for good performance under this standard; demonstrates highly effective practices and impact on student learning; continued expansion of expertise through professional learning and leadership opportunities

Multiple Measures:

A comprehensive evaluation system must include a variety of evidenced-based measures to evaluate an educator's performance and effectiveness, based on standards of professional practice (i.e. INTASC). Multiple measures provide a more comprehensive view of the educator's practice and contribution to student growth. Multiple measures provide multiple data sources. Due to the complex nature of the teaching practice, a single measure does not provide sufficient evidence to evaluate performance. When combined, multiple measures provide a body of evidence that informs the educator's evaluation resulting in a more accurate and valid judgment about performance and professional growth needs.

Oregon's educator evaluation systems must include measures from the following three components:

- Professional Practice (Danielson Domains 1-3)
- Professional Responsibilities (Danielson Domain 4), and
- Student Learning and Growth (Student Learning and Growth Rubric)

Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle for Educator Evaluations

Educator evaluation systems are based on a cycle of continuous professional growth and learning. An effective process is collaborative and provides ongoing opportunities for relevant feedback and meaningful professional conversations. The focus is on improving educator effectiveness.

Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle



Steps in an Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle:

Step 1: Self-Reflection

The first step of an evaluation system is self-reflection. The educator reflects on and assesses his/her professional practice using the GBSD Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards Rubric. Additionally, the educator analyzes the learning and growth of his/her students in preparation for goal setting. As outlined in the timelines and flowcharts, educators will complete the self-reflection form.

Step 2: Goal Setting *(Student growth goals and professional goals)*

Based on the Self-Reflection, the educator identifies goals aligned with the Standards of Professional Practice that encompass **both** practice and impact on student learning. The educator sets one professional practice goal and two student learning and growth goals. SMART goals and/or learning targets are used as a tool for effective goal setting. Student Learning and Growth Goals may be developed as a team, (i.e. Data Team, Grade Level Team, Department Team).

Step 3: Observation and Collection of Evidence *(Multiple Measures)*

The educator and evaluator collect evidence using multiple measures regarding student learning and growth, professional practice, professional responsibilities, and student learning to inform progress throughout the process of evaluation. Documentation of evidence and artifacts shall occur on the Observation Feedback form. At a minimum, 4 observations (completed at various times throughout the year) will be provided as evidence.

Examples of Evidence and Artifacts

Professional Practice Related to Standards	Multiple Measures of Student Learning & Growth	Professional Responsibilities Related to Standards
<p>Artifacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Educator-developed unit assessments• Lesson Plans• Data analysis• Etc. <p>Observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Notes/feedback from observations (inside/outside classrooms)• IEP meetings• Assemblies• Staff meetings• Counselor meetings• Performances• Art shows• Data teams• Etc.	<p>Artifacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Student work (quizzes, tasks, presentations, etc.)• Portfolios• Performance assessments (including arts, vocational, health and wellness)• Interim assessments• State or district assessments• Etc.	<p>Artifacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Student and staff surveys• Meeting notes• Parent/educator communication• Etc.

Step 4: Formative Assessment/Evaluation (*Analysis of evidence, Professional conversations, and Professional growth*)

The evaluator and educator review the educator's progress toward individual or team goals and/or performance against standards. This step includes three interdependent and critical parts: analysis of evidence, professional conversations, and professional growth. Both the educator and the observer analyze the evidence leading to a collaborative professional conversation. Feedback through professional conversations promotes awareness of growth that has occurred, and highlights professional growth needs. These conversations help the educator make adjustments in his/her practice and select relevant professional learning opportunities.

Step 5: Summative Evaluation

This step is the culmination of multiple formative observations, reflections, professional conversations, artifacts of evidence, etc. The evaluator assesses the educator's performance using the GBSD Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards Rubric and Student Growth Goal Rubric. As required by the State of Oregon, educators will be rated on a scale of 1-4 using the Oregon Matrix for Summative Evaluations.

Frequency of Evaluations

The evaluation cycle is an ongoing process throughout an educator's career. The cycle begins with a review of completed Self-Reflection and culminates in a Summative Evaluation. The Summative Evaluation is the springboard that leads into a new cycle. The Summative Evaluation occurs on a cycle determined by the educator's contract status:

- Probationary/Temporary educators: one-year cycle
- Contract educators: two-year cycle

Aligned Professional Learning

The focus of the evaluation system is improving professional practice and student learning. To that end, linking evaluations with high quality professional learning is key. Aligned evaluation systems inform educators of strengths and weaknesses and provide opportunities to make informed decisions regarding individual professional growth. High quality professional learning is sustained and focused and relevant to the educator's goals and needs. All educators must have opportunities for professional growth to meet their needs, not only those whose evaluation ratings do not meet the standard. All educators will be required to keep track of their learning using the Log of Professional Development Activities. This log must be submitted to Human Resources prior to licensure renewal.

Professional Growth opportunities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Action Research
- Portfolios
- Mentoring
- Videotape/Audiotape Analysis
- Reflective Journal
- In-Service/Workshop
- Staff Development Project
- Original/Self-Designed Project
- College Courses

The GBSD Matrix for Summative Evaluations for Educators

Beginning in the 2014-2015 school year, all districts will use the Oregon Matrix Model for their summative evaluations. In the Oregon Matrix, Professional Practice (PP) and Professional Responsibilities (PR) intersects with Student Learning and Growth (SLG) culminating in a Professional Growth Plan and summative performance level. When there is a discrepancy between the PP/PR level and SLG level, further inquiry is triggered to explore and understand the reasons for the discrepancy in order to then determine the Professional Growth Plan and corresponding summative performance level.

Y-AXIS: combined Rating on Professional Practice and Professional Responsibilities (PP/PR)	LEVEL 4 (Highest)	COLLEGIALPATH With focus on SLG Goals *SLG INQUIRY NEEDED 3	FACILITATIVE or COLLEGIALPATH With focus on SLG Goals Determined post Inquiry *SLG INQUIRY NEEDED 3 or 4	FACILITATIVE PATH Educator leads development of Professional Growth Plan 4	FACILITATIVE PATH Educator leads development of Professional Growth Plan 4
	LEVEL 3	COLLEGIAL or CONSULTINGPATH With focus on SLG Goals Determined post Inquiry *SLG INQUIRY NEEDED 2 or 3	COLLEGIALPATH With focus on SLG Goals 3	COLLEGIALPATH Educator and evaluator collaboratively develop Professional Growth Plan 3	COLLEGIALPATH Educator and evaluator collaboratively develop Professional Growth Plan 3
	LEVEL 2	CONSULTINGPATH With focus on SLG Goals Evaluator consults with the educator and guides development of Professional Growth Plan 2	CONSULTINGPATH With focus on SLG Goals Evaluator consults with the educator and guides development of Professional Growth Plan 2	CONSULTINGPATH Evaluator consults with the educator and guides development of Professional Growth Plan 2	COLLEGIAL or CONSULTINGPATH Determined post inquiry *PP/PR INQUIRY NEEDED 2 or 3
	LEVEL 1 (Lowest)	DIRECTEDPATH With focus on SLG Goals Evaluator determines Professional Growth Plan 1	DIRECTEDPATH With focus on SLG Goals Evaluator determines Professional Growth Plan 1	CONSULTING or DIRECTEDPATH Determined post inquiry *PP/PR INQUIRY NEEDED 1 or 2	CONSULTINGPATH Evaluator consults with the educator and guides development of Professional Growth Plan *PP/PR INQUIRY NEEDED 2
X-AXIS: Rating on Student Learning and Growth					

*Ratings in these areas require an Inquiry Process in order to determine a Summative Performance Level and Professional Growth Plan

Statewide Components of the Oregon Matrix

How does an evaluator determine level 1-4 on the Y-axis and X-axis of the matrix and a final summative performance level at the end of an educator's evaluation cycle?

I. Y-Axis: Professional Practice and Professional Responsibilities (PP/PR)

First, the evaluator will need to determine the combined performance level for PP/PR based on data from the district's rubric. The evaluator will already have gauged the educator's performance on each standard/performance indicator on the rubric with four performance levels. The evaluator will then:

1. Add up all component scores to get the total points possible
2. Divide by the number of components (based on the # of components in the rubric);
3. Get a rating between 1 and 4 for PP/PR level:
4. Use the following thresholds to determine PP/PR Level:

3.6 -4.0 = 4 PP/PR

2.81-3.59=3 PP/PR

1.99-2.8 = 2 PP/PR*

< 1.99= 1PP/PR

*PP/PR Scoring Rule: If the educator scores two 1's in any PP/PR component and his/her average score falls between 1.99 -2.499, the educator's performance level cannot be rated above a 1.

5. Find the PP/PR performance level (1-4) on the Y-axis of the matrix.

II. X-Axis: Student Learning and Growth (SLG)

After the educator's PP/PR performance level is determined, their Professional Growth Plan and summative performance level is then found by looking at the educator's rating on SLG goals. The level of performance on SLG will be determined by scoring the SLG goals using the Oregon SLG Goal scoring rubric (see page 10). All educators will set two SLG goals annually. Educators on a two-year evaluation cycle will select two of the four goals collaboratively with their evaluator to be included in their summative evaluation. *Math and ELA teachers (grades 3-8 and 11) must use Category 1 assessments for one of the two goals.*

1. Score the SLG goals using the SLG Scoring Rubric;
2. Get a rating between 1 and 4 for SLG;
3. Use the thresholds below to determine SLG level;
4. Find the SLG performance level (1-4) on the X-Axis of the matrix.

Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
You must score: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 4 on both goals	You could score: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 3 on both goals, or• 3 on one goal & 4 on one goal, or• 4 on one goal & 2 on one goal	You could score: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 2 on both goals, or• 2 on one goal & 3 on one goal, or• 3 on one goal & 1 on one goal, or• 4 on one goal & 1 on one goal	You could score: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1 on both goals, or• 1 on one goal & 2 on one goal

III. Scoring Student Learning and Growth (SLG) Goals

SLG goals are detailed, measurable goals for student learning and growth developed collaboratively by educators and their evaluators. They are based on student learning needs identified by a review of students' baseline skills. SLG goals are aligned to standards and clearly describe specific learning targets students are expected to meet. Goals are rigorous, yet attainable. The following tools are used to score SLG goals to determine the educator's impact on SLG in the summative evaluation.

SLG Quality Review Checklist

Before SLG goals are used in educator evaluations, this checklist should be used in order to approve them. For an SLG goal to be approved, all criteria must be met.

Baseline Data	Yes	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is baseline data used to make data-driven decisions for the SLG goal, including the most recent student information from past assessments and/or pre-assessment results? 		
Student Learning and Growth Goals		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the SLG goal written as a "growth" goal vs. "achievement" goal? (i.e. growth goals measure student learning between two or more points in time and achievement goals measure student learning at only one point in time) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the SLG goal describe a "target" or expected growth for all students, tiered or differentiated as needed based on baseline data? 		
Rigor of Goals		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the goal address relevant and specific knowledge and skills aligned to the course curriculum based on state or national content standards? 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the SLG goal measurable and challenging, yet attainable? 		

SLG Scoring Rubric

This SLG scoring rubric is used for scoring individual SLG goals based on evidence submitted by the educator and supervisor/evaluator.

Level 4 (Highest)	This category applies when approximately 90% of students met their target(s) and approximately 25% of student exceeded their target(s). This category should only be selected when a substantial number of students surpassed the overall level of attainment established by the target(s). Goals are very rigorous yet attainable, and differentiated (as appropriate) for all students.
Level 3	This category applies when approximately 90% of students met their targets. Results within a few points, a few percentage points, or a few students on either side of the target(s) should be considered "met". The bar for this category should be high and it should only be selected when it is clear that all or almost all students met the overall level of attainment established by the target(s). Goals are rigorous yet attainable and differentiated (as appropriate) for all students.
Level 2	This category applies when 70-89% of student met their target(s), but those that missed the target missed by more than a few points, a few percentage points or a few students. Goals are attainable but might not be rigorous or differentiated (as appropriate) for all students.
Level 1	<p>This category applies when less than 70% of students meet the target(s). If a substantial proportion of students did not meet their target(s), the SLG was not met. Goals are attainable, but not rigorous.</p> <p>This category also applies when results are missing or incomplete.</p>

IV. Final Summative Performance Level and Professional Growth

Taking the performance levels for professional practice and professional responsibilities (PP/PR) and student learning and growth (SLG) find where the X-Axis intersect with the Y-Axis on the matrix. The PP/PR will then be compared to the SLG to determine the educator's Professional Growth Plan and overall summative performance level. The four types of Professional Growth Plans are defined as follows:

Facilitative Growth Path - The educator leads the conversation and with the evaluator chooses the focus of the Professional Growth Plan and professional goal(s) as the educator and evaluator collaborate on the plan/professional growth goal(s). If the educator had a SLG performance level 2, the plan/professional goal(s) must also include a focus on increasing the educator's overall aptitude in this measure.

Collegial Growth Path - The educator and evaluator collaboratively develop the educator's Professional Growth Plan/professional goal(s). If the educator had a SLG performance level 1 or 2, the plan/professional goal(s) must also include a focus on increasing the educator's overall aptitude in this measure.

Consultative Growth Path - The evaluator consults with the educator and uses the information gathered to inform the educator's Professional Growth Plan/professional goal(s). If the educator had a SLG performance level 1 or 2, the plan/professional goal(s) must also include a focus on increasing the educator's overall aptitude in this measure.

Directed Growth Path - The evaluator directs the educator's Professional Growth Plan/professional goal(s). This plan should involve a focus on the most important area(s) to improve educator performance. If the educator had a SLG performance level 1 or 2, the plan/professional goal(s) must also include a focus on increasing the educator's overall aptitude in this measure.

The local collaborative evaluation design team will ensure that the Professional Growth Plan resulting from the Matrix is included in the design of the professional growth and evaluation system. The Matrix Summative Rating is to be used for state reporting purposes as required by the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

V. Inquiry Processes

Student Learning and Growth Inquiry Process (SLG Inquiry):

In order to determine an educator's Professional Growth Plan and resulting summative performance level, the following must be initiated by the evaluator to determine the summative performance level. With the educator:

- Collaboratively examine student growth data in conjunction with other evidence including observation, artifacts and other student and teacher information based on classroom, school, school district and state-based tools and practices; etc.
- Collaboratively examine circumstances which may include one or more of the following: Goal setting process including assessment literacy; content and expectations; extent to which standards, curriculum and assessment are aligned, etc.

The evaluator then decides the respective Professional Growth Plan and if the summative performance level is a 2 or 3; or a 3 or 4.

Professional Practice and Professional Responsibility Inquiry Process (PP/PR Inquiry)

To determine an educator's Professional Growth Plan and resulting summative performance level, the following must be initiated by the evaluator to determine the summative performance level. With the educator:

- Re-examine evidence and artifacts and an outside evaluator (Supervisor, VP, other district administrator) may be called in
- Educator has the opportunity to provide additional evidence and/or schedule additional observations with focus on area of need
- Evaluator's supervisor is notified and inter-rater reliability protocols are revisited

The evaluator then decides the respective Professional Growth Plan and if the summative performance level is a 2 or 3, or a 3 or 4.

SECTION 2

The Gresham-Barlow School District Licensed Evaluation System

Gresham-Barlow School District

Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle Contract Status Timeline


The table below outlines year one and year two (summative) of the contract educators' Evaluation and Professional Growth cycle.

Completed by:	Contract Educator Milestones and Details
October 15	Initial Professional Growth/Reflection Conference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss Initial Self-Reflection • Discuss Student Growth and Learning Goals/Professional Growth Goal
January 31	Observations-Phase One: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of 2 mini-observations completed • All observations require written feedback and face-to-face conversations are encouraged • Observations that raise concerns require face-to-face feedback
February 15	Mid-Year Professional Growth/Reflection Conference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review progress toward Student Growth and Learning Goals/Professional Growth Goals • Discuss adjustments that need to be made to instructional strategies • Discuss additional support needed
June 1	Observations-Phase Two: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of 2 observations completed (2 mini-observations in year one; 1 mini & 1 formal in year two) • All observations require written feedback and face-to-face conversations are encouraged • Observations that raise concerns require face-to-face feedback • Summative Evaluation completed and given to contract educators who are in year two
Prior to the last student contact day of the school year	End-of-Year Professional Growth/Reflection Conference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review data for student growth and artifacts for professional practice (collected throughout the year) • Discuss, finalize, and sign the Licensed Student Growth and Professional Goals Form • Discuss, finalize, and sign the Summative Evaluation Form in year two


Notes:

1. Additional observations may be requested by an administrator or educator at any time.
2. Student Learning and Growth Goals may be developed as a team. (i.e. Data team, Grade Level, Department).
3. Mini-observations can occur inside or outside classrooms. (Example: IEP Meetings, Data team meetings, presentations, parent-educator conferences, activities, concerts, etc.).
4. There must be documented evidence for an educator to be ranked 1, 2, or 4 on a teaching standard.

Gresham-Barlow School District Contract Educator Evaluation Flowchart



Gresham-Barlow School District Contract Educator Improvement Cycle



* After successful completion of a program of assistance for improvement, if the same concerns occur, the evaluator may proceed directly to a program of assistance for improvement after notification of the Association and opportunity for their input.

* A Program of Assistance for Improvement needs to be implemented after an educator is non-extended in the first year of their contract.

Gresham-Barlow School District Evaluation and Professional Growth Cycle Probationary Status and Temporary Educators Timeline


The table below outlines the one year Evaluation and Professional Growth cycle for probationary and temporary educators who have worked 135 days or more.

Completed by:	Probationary and Temporary Educator Milestones and Details
October 15	Initial Professional Growth/Reflection Conference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and Explain Performance Evaluation Rubric to new staff Discuss Initial Self-Reflection Discuss Student Growth and Learning Goals/Professional Growth Goal
December 15	Observations - Phase One: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum of 2 observations completed (1 mini & 1 formal) All observations require written feedback and face-to-face conversations are encouraged Observations that raise concerns require face-to-face feedback
December 15	Mid-Year Professional Growth/Reflection Conference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review progress toward Student Growth and Learning Goals/Professional Growth Goal Discuss adjustments that need to be made to instructional strategies Discuss additional support needed
February 15	Observations - Phase Two: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum of 2 mini-observations completed All observations require feedback and face-to-face conversations are encouraged Observations that raise concerns require face-to face feedback PP & PR sections of Summative Evaluation Form completed and given to probationary educator
March 1	PP/PR Evaluation Conference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review progress toward Student Growth and Learning Goals/Professional Growth Goal Discuss and sign PP & PR sections of Summative Evaluation Form
June 1	Summative Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summative Evaluation completed and given to Probationary Educator
Prior to the last student contact day of the school year	End of Year Professional Growth/Reflection Conference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review data for student growth and artifacts for professional practice (collected throughout the year) Discuss, finalize, and sign the final Summative Evaluation Form and the Licensed Student Growth and Professional Goals Form Preview Professional Growth Path


Notes:

- Additional observations may be requested by an administrator or educator at any time.
- Student Learning and Growth Goals may be developed as a team (i.e. Data Teams, Grade, Department)
- Mini-observations can occur inside or outside classrooms (i.e. IEP meetings, Data Team meetings, presentation, parent-educator conferences, activities, concerts, etc.)
- There must be documented evidence for an educator to be ranked 1, 2, or 4 on a teaching standard.

Gresham-Barlow School District Probationary Educator Evaluation Flowchart



Gresham-Barlow School District Probationary Educator Improvement Cycle



Self-Reflection (see page 26)

The first step of an evaluation system is self-reflection. The educator reflects on and assesses his/her professional practice using the GBSD Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards Rubric. Additionally, the educator analyzes the learning and growth of his/her students in preparation for goal setting. As outlined in the timeline and flowcharts, educators will complete the self-reflection form.

Goal Setting (see page 28)

One professional growth goal will be established based on the self-reflection of professional practice. In addition, educators, in collaboration with their supervisor/evaluator, will set two student learning and growth goals. Student growth will be determined through a rigorous goal setting process and the use of multiple measures.

Educators in Tested Grades and Subjects

As a requirement of the ESEA Waiver, educators who teach in tested grades and subjects (ELA and Math, grades 3-8 and 11) must use a Category 1 state assessment for one of their SLG goals and measures from Category 2 or 1 for their second goal.

Educators in Non-Tested Grades and Subjects

Educators in non-tested grades and subjects may use measures from Category 2 for both of their goals. They may use Category 1 measures as an option.

Categories of Measures for SLG Goals

Category	Types of Measures	Guidance
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Oregon's state assessments<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ SMARTER Balanced (formerly OAKS)○ Extended Assessments¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Same assessment and administration guidelines are used statewide
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commercially developed assessments that include pre- and post-measures• Locally developed assessments that include pre- and post-measures• Results from proficiency-based assessment systems• Locally developed collections of evidence, i.e. portfolios of student work that include multiple types of projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Same assessment and administration guidelines are used district-wide or school-wide• Assessments meet state criteria²

¹ Used by special education educators who provide instruction in ELA or math for those students who take extended assessments

² ODE will provide state criteria

Student Learning and Growth Goal Setting Process

- Educators review baseline data and create goals that measure the learning of all students. Goals span a school year or complete course of study.
- In addition to collaborating with the evaluator(s), student learning and growth goals may be developed as a team.
- During the collaborative planning process, the educator and evaluator(s) ensure that quality goal setting occurs through a discussion of the rigor and rationale of each goal, appropriate research-based strategies, quality of evidence and standards addressed. The SMART goal (see page 68) process is used in the development of student growth goals (SMART = Specific; Measureable; Appropriate; Realistic; Time-bound).
- Educators meet with evaluator(s) to discuss progress for each goal mid-year and at the end of the year. Goals remain the same throughout the year, but strategies for attaining goals may be revised.
- Educators, along with their evaluator(s), reflect on the results and determine implications for future professional growth planning.

REQUIRED COMPONENTS FOR STUDENT LEARNING AND GROWTH GOALS (SLG)

1. **Content Standards/Skills** - A clear statement of the relevant content and skills students should know or be able to do at the end of the course/class. These should be specific state or national standards (a statement such as “Common Core State Standards in Math” is not specific enough). Includes a rationale for the importance of the selected content/standards.
2. **Context/Students** - Description of the demographics and learning needs of all students in the class or course. This should include as relevant: the number of students and their gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and any students with diverse learning needs (e.g., EL, IEP, 504 plans). For those educators who do not meet with students on a regular basis, including contact time (e.g., one 50-minute period per day, two, 90-minute blocks per week, etc.) provides additional context for the goals developed by the educator.
3. **Baseline Data** - Provides information about the students’ current performance at the start of course/class. It is generally the most recent data available and can include the prior year’s assessment scores or grades, results from a beginning of the year benchmark assessment, a pre-test, or other evidence of student’s learning. Determine students’ strengths and areas of weaknesses that inform the goal. Data is attached to the goal template.
4. **Student learning and Growth Goal (Targets)** - Describes rigorous yet realistic growth goals or targets for student achievement that are developmentally appropriate. The targets should be rigorous yet attainable. The target can be tiered for specific students in the class/course to allow all students to demonstrate growth. Includes a rationale for the expected growth and how the target is appropriate and rigorous for students.
5. **Rationale** - provides a detailed description of the reasons for selecting this specific area for

a goal. Includes a discussion of baseline data as well as current practice within the school and/or classroom.

6. **Assessments** - Describes how student learning and growth will be measured. In Oregon, two categories of assessments are used for SLG goals. Assessments must be aligned to state or national standards and meet state criteria.
7. **Strategies** - Describes the instructional strategies the educator will use relevant to learning specific content and skills to accomplish the goal. These strategies can be adjusted throughout the year based on data about student progress.
8. **Professional Learning and Support** - Opportunity for the educator to identify areas of additional learning and support needed to meet student learning and growth goals. Self-reflection and identification of professional learning needs can help focus efforts to provide meaningful professional learning opportunities to educators.

Formal Observation Process (see pages 32-34)

The purpose of the formal observation is to provide formative feedback on meeting proficiency on the GBSD Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards Rubric. Formal evaluations are required for contract educators in year two (minimum one) and annually for probationary educators (minimum one). The formal observation will include three steps: a pre-observation conference (see page 32), an observation (see page 33), and a post-observation conference (see page 34). Components of these three steps are as follows:

I. Pre-Observation Conference

- a. The evaluator and educator meet to discuss the observation. The data collection to be used during the observation will be identified and mutually understood by the evaluator and educator. The Pre-Observation form is to be completed by the educator prior to the Pre-Conference.

II. Observation

- a. During the classroom observation, the evaluator will collect specific data based on the four Domains in the rubric where applicable.
- b. The length of observation will be no less than a cohesive portion of an instructional period. This will be determined during the Formal Pre-Conference discussion between the educator and evaluator.

III. Formal Post-observation Form

- a. This form is intended to be completed by the educator being observed. The Post-Observation Conference will focus on the data collected by the evaluator and the input from the educator regarding the items on the Formal Post-Observation Form.

IV. Post-Observation Conference

- a. As soon as possible after the observation, an Observation Feedback Form will be completed and a conference will be scheduled. During the conference the evaluator and educator will discuss the data. From this evidence, areas of recognition and /or improvement may be established, and the date and time of the next observation may be set.

Mini-Observation Process

I. Observation

- a. Mini-observations are classroom visits and professional observations (such as meetings, events and conferences) lasting a minimum of 10 minutes. The evaluator will collect specific evidence based on the standards in the GBSD Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards Rubric where applicable.
 - i. Contract educators (year two)/ probationary educators will have at least 3 mini-observations.
 - ii. Contract educators (year one) will have at least 4 mini-observations.
- b. During the classroom observation, the evaluator will collect specific data based on the four Domains in the rubric where applicable.

II. Observation Feedback Form

- a. This form is intended to provide information and evidence of standards. This should inform educators and evaluators on the collaborative process for improving instruction with the focus on evidence.

III. Feedback

- a. All observations require written feedback and all face-to-face conversations are encouraged.
- b. Observations that raise concerns require face-to-face feedback.

Educator Improvement Cycle

The Educator Improvement Cycle is a process to assist an educator in meeting the professional standards of teaching. Supervision should be supportive of the individual educator as he/she strives to meet the district's standards and position responsibilities.

This process recognizes that educators' growth needs vary and that evaluator(s) need to adjust their supervision to accommodate educators who are at different levels of professional development. In this process, educators are viewed as active constructors of their own knowledge about teaching and learning. This assumes that educators generate as well as consume knowledge that gives them a deeper understanding about the learning process. Evaluator(s) serve as collaborators in creating data and sharing information, which contribute to the educator's professional knowledge and learning.

The Improvement Cycle is designed to address and resolve problems or concerns in an educator's performance at the earliest possible stage. The process provides for intensifying the level of assistance should early efforts at improvement prove to be ineffective.

Performance Review

When concerns are noted the supervisor will initiate a Performance Review. During the performance review the supervisor will complete a review of the evaluation rubric in the areas of concern with the educator. Observation data will be collected and will be reviewed as part of this process.

Guided Support Plan (see page 39)

These plans are written for both probationary and contract educators. A guided support plan's purpose is to address concerns in the performance of an educator when the Performance Review process did not result in improvement and concerns still remain. The guided support plan will include specific concerns, goals and activities relating to the identified concerns.

Guided Support Plans may be developed at any time during a school year when a need is observed. If the deficiency is remedied within the timelines, the guided support plan will be considered completed, and the educator will return to the regular cycle of observations. If the educator is making progress but the deficiency is not remedied within the timelines, the educator's guided support plan may be extended. When a guided support plan has not been successfully completed, a probationary educator may be recommended for non-renewal; a contract educator may be placed on a program of assistance for improvement.

Program of Assistance for Improvement Plan (see page 42)

These plans are written solely for contract educators when a guided support plan has not been successful. A Program of Assistance for Improvement contains the following elements:

1. A statement of deficiencies;
2. Corrective steps the educator may pursue to correct the deficiencies;
3. Assistance which will be provided;
4. Assessment techniques by which the district will measure and determine whether the educator has sufficiently corrected the deficiencies;
5. The person(s) responsible for the evaluation;
6. The timelines involved; and
7. A statement that the educator may be dismissed or non-extended if deficiencies are not corrected.

If the deficiency is remedied within the timelines of the assistance plan, the plan will be considered completed and the educator will return to the regular cycle of observations. If the deficiency is not remedied within the timelines, then the educator's non-renewal, or dismissal may be recommended to the board. After successful completion of a program of assistance for improvement, if the same concerns occur, the evaluator may proceed directly to a program of assistance for improvement after notification to the Association and opportunity for input.

SECTION 3

Documents and Forms

Gresham-Barlow School District Self-Reflection Form

To be completed by the educator using the rubric prior to the Initial Professional Growth/Reflection Conference

Educator Name:	School:
Assignment:	Date:

Domain I: Planning & Preparation

	1	2	3	4
Standard 1a: Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy				
Standard 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students				
Standard 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes				
Standard 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources				
Standard 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction				
Standard 1f: Designing Student Assessment				
Comments:				

Domain II: Classroom Environment

	1	2	3	4
Standard 2a: Creating and Environment of Respect and Rapport				
Standard 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning				
Standard 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures				
Standard 2d: Managing Student Behavior				
Standard 2e: Organizing Physical Space				
Comments:				

Domain III: Instruction

	1	2	3	4
Standard 3a: Communicating with Students				
Standard 3b: Questioning and Discussion Techniques				
Standard 3c: Engaging Students in Learning				
Standard 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction				
Standard 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness				
Comments:				

Domain IV: Professional Responsibilities

	1	2	3	4
Standard 4a: Reflecting on Teaching				
Standard 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records				
Standard 4c: Communicating with Families				
Standard 4d: Participating in a Professional Community				
Standard 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally				
Standard 4f: Showing Professionalism				
Comments:				

Differentiated Performance Levels	
1	Does not meet standards
2	Making sufficient progress toward meeting standard
3	Consistently meets expectations for good performance
4	Consistently exceeds expectations for good performance

Gresham-Barlow School District Licensed Growth and Professional Goals

Name:	Date:
Assignment/Location:	License Expiration Date:

Initial Professional Growth/Reflection Conference	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Definition from the Oregon Framework</i></p> <p>Educators will establish at least two student learning and growth goals and select measures from the categories below: (See pg. 20 for further details)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Category 1: Oregon's State Assessments: SMARTER Balanced (formerly OAKS) and Extended Assessments Category 2: Commercially and locally developed assessments that include pre- and post-measures; results from proficiency-based assessment systems; locally developed collections of evidence, ie. portfolios of student work that include multiple types of performance <p>Educators in Tested Grades and Subjects: As a requirement of the ESEA Waiver, educators who teach in tested grades and subjects (ELA and Math, grades 3-8 and 11) must use a Category 1 state assessment for one of their SLG goals and measures from Category 2 or 1 for their second goal.</p> <p>Educators in Non-Tested Grades and Subjects Educators in non-tested grades and subjects may use measures from Category 2 for both of their goals. They may use Category 1 measures as an option.</p>	
	Student Growth Goal 1	
	Content Standards/Skills The goal is being written around which grade and standard?	
	Context/Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the characteristics or special learning circumstances of my class(es)? What are the demographics of my classroom? 	
	Baseline Data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the learning needs of my students? What are the assessments or evidence sources I will use? 	
	Student Growth Goal (Targets) Goal written in SMART format	
	Rationale Provides a detailed description of the reasons for selecting this specific area for a goal; includes a discussion of baseline data	
	Assessments Describes how student learning and growth will be measured	-
	Strategies What strategies will I incorporate into my methodology/professional practice?	

Initial Professional Growth/Reflection Conference continued	Professional Learning and Support Opportunity for the educator to identify areas of additional learning and support needed to meet student learning and growth goals	
	Student Growth Goal 2	
	Content Standards/Skills The goal is being written around which grade and standard?	
	Context/Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the characteristics or special learning circumstances of my class(es)? What are the demographics of my classroom? 	
	Baseline Data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the learning needs of my students? What are the assessments or evidence sources I will use 	
	Student Growth Goal (Targets) Goal written in SMART format	
	Rationale Provides a detailed description of the reasons for selecting this specific area for a goal; includes a discussion of baseline data	
	Assessments Describes how student learning and growth will be measured	
	Strategies What strategies will I incorporate into my methodology/professional practice?	
	Professional Learning and Support Opportunity for the educator to identify areas of additional learning and support needed to meet student learning and growth goals	

	Professional Growth Plan		Select one: Facilitative Collegial Consultative Directed		
	Professional Growth Goal				
	Rationale <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will achieving my professional growth goal improve student learning and engagement?(D3) • How has my self-reflection and assessment on Domains1-4 informed this goal? 				
	Strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What professional development will help me accomplish my SLG(D4) • How might I team with colleagues to successfully achieve my goal? (D4) 				
	Professional Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What resources and support do I need to meet my Professional Growth Goal? 				
Educator		Date	Evaluator		Date

Mid-Year Conference	Mid-Year Data Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What progress has been made? Attach supporting data. 			
	Strategy Modification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What adjustments need to be made to my instruction/strategies? 			
	Professional Growth Goals Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has my professional growth to date been relevant? How has my professional growth impacted student learning? Have my professional growth needs changed? If so, how? 			
	Specific Artifacts/Evidence			
	Educator Signature	Date	Evaluator Signature	Date
End-of-Year Conference	End-of-Year Data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What does the end-of-year data show? Attach data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal #1 % of students met _____ % exceeded _____ Goal #2 % of students met _____ % exceeded _____ 		
	Reflection on Results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, what worked, or what should be refined? 			
	Professional Growth Goal Implications <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can I use the results to support my future professional growth? 			
	Specific Artifacts/Evidence			
	Educator Signature	Date	Evaluator Signature	Date

Gresham-Barlow School District
Pre-Conference Form for Formal Observation

Educator:	Pre-Conference Date/Time:
Evaluator:	Observation Date/Time:
School:	Proposed Length of Observation:

Please provide the following information in preparation for the Observation:

- 1. Lesson Objective(s):** What do you want the students to learn? (1c)

- 2. Alignment to Standards:** What standard(s) does this lesson cover? (1a)

- 3. Lesson Format:** Explain/describe the sequence of instruction and activities for the lesson. (1e)

- 4. Engagement in Learning:** How will you engage students in the learning? (3c)

- 5. Differentiated Instruction:** How will you differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students? (1b)

- 6. Assessment:** How will you assess learning? (3d)

- 7. Specific Artifacts/Evidence (Include Aligned Standards):**

Gresham-Barlow School District Observation Feedback Form (Mini and Formal)

Educator:	Evaluator:		
Subject:	Period/Date:		
Observation Location:			
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Observation Type (Select one from each area): Unscheduled or Scheduled Mini or Formal Evaluator's Request or Educator's Request </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Length of Observation (Select one): 10-15minutes 16-20minutes 21-30minutes over 30 minutes </td> </tr> </table>		Observation Type (Select one from each area): Unscheduled or Scheduled Mini or Formal Evaluator's Request or Educator's Request	Length of Observation (Select one): 10-15minutes 16-20minutes 21-30minutes over 30 minutes
Observation Type (Select one from each area): Unscheduled or Scheduled Mini or Formal Evaluator's Request or Educator's Request	Length of Observation (Select one): 10-15minutes 16-20minutes 21-30minutes over 30 minutes		
Observation: <i>What did the educator and students say and do?</i>			
Aligned Indicators:			
*Concerns/Performance Below Level 3:			
Aligned Indicators:			
Follow-up Conversation: Date: _____ Comments:			
Specific Feedback/Questions to Educator: <i>(incorporate language from rubric, when possible)</i>			
Specific Artifacts/Evidence Observed:			
Educator Response/Questions:			

*Must document specific evidence and provide face-to-face feedback for observable action and/or behavior considered below Level 3

Gresham-Barlow School District Post Conference for Formal Observation
--

Educator:	Post-Conference Date/Time:
Evaluator(s):	Observation Date/Time:
School:	

Please complete the following prior to the post-observation conference.

- 1. In general, how successful was the lesson? Did students learn what you intended for them to learn? How do you know? (3d, 4a)**
- 2. What do student work samples reveal about the level of student engagement and understanding?(3c, 3d)**
- 3. Comment on your classroom procedures, student conduct, use of resources and physical space. To what extent did these contribute to student learning? (2c, 2d, 2e)**
- 4. Based on student learning of your objectives, what are your next steps? (1a, 1e)**
- 5. If you had a chance to teach this lesson again, what would you do differently? (4a)**
- 6. Specific Artifacts and Evidence(Include Aligned Standard):**

Gresham-Barlow School District Summative Evaluation Form

*To be completed by Evaluator for Probationary Educators by **February 15** - Contract Educators by **June 1**
The PP & PR sections need to be completed for Temporary and Probationary Educators by February 15*

Educator Name:	Evaluator(s):
School:	Assignment:
Contract Status:	
(Select status)	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; padding: 0 10px;"> Temporary Prob1 Prob2 Prob3 Contract </div>

Differentiated Performance Levels

- | |
|--|
| 1 - Does not meet standards |
| 2 - Making sufficient progress toward meeting standard |
| 3 - Consistently meets expectations for good performance |
| 4 - Consistently exceeds expectations for good performance |

Domain I: Planning & Preparation

	Performance Level
Standard 1a: Knowledge and Content and Pedagogy	
Standard 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	
Standard 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes	
Standard 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	
Standard 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction	
Standard 1f: Designing Student Assessments	
Comments	

Domain II: Classroom Environment

	Performance Level
Standard 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	
Standard 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning	
Standard 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures	
Standard 2d: Managing Student Behavior	
Standard 2e: Organizing Physical Space	
Comments	

Domain III: Instruction

	Performance Level
Standard 3a: Communicating with Students	
Standard 3b: Questioning and Discussion Techniques	
Standard 3c: Engaging Students in Learning	
Standard 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction	
Standard 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	
Comments	

Domain IV: Professional Responsibilities

	Performance Level
Standard 4a: Reflecting on Teaching	
Standard 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records	
Standard 4c: Communicating with Families	
Standard 4d: Participating in a Professional Community	
Standard 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally	
Standard 4f: Showing Professionalism	
Comments	

PP/PR Average Performance Level _____

(Sum of Standards ÷ 22)

PP/PR RATINGKEY

PP/PR Level _____

3.6 - 4.0	4
2.81 - 3.59	3
1.99 - 2.8	2
≤ 1.99	1

Educator SLG Scores/Rating

SLG Goals		Score
Goal 1		
Goal 2		
Comments:		
		Rating
SLG Rating		

SLG Rating Key

Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
You must score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 on both goals 	You could score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 on both goals, or 3 on one goal & 4 on one goal, or 4 on one goal & 2 on one goal 	You could score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 on both goals, or 2 on one goal & 3 on one goal, or 3 on one goal & 1 on one goal, or 4 on one goal & 1 on one goal 	You could score: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 on both goals, or 1 on one goal & 2 on one goal

Inquiry Process (If Needed)

Select Type of Inquiry:	SLG	PP/PR
Artifacts & Evidence:		
Evaluator's Final Matrix Rating: Select one:	1	2
Evaluator's Rationale:		

Matrix Summative Rating

Y-Axis PP/PR (Use Key) _____

X-Axis SLG Rating (Use Key) _____

Matrix Summative Rating _____

Professional Development Path _____

*The Matrix Summative Rating is to be used for state reporting purposes as required by the ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

Final Summative Performance Level - Evaluator Recommendations

Contract:

- ☐ Extend contract for new two-year term
- ☐ Do not extend contract
- ☐ Dismissal

Probationary:

- ☐ Renew one-year contract
- ☐ Do not renew contract

Temporary

- ☐ Due to temporary status, this contract is not renewed

The educator has attached comments to this conference form:

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

This Evaluation has been discussed between the evaluator(s) and educator.

Educator

Evaluator

Date

Gresham-Barlow School District Guided Support Plan

Date:	Assignment:
EducatorName:	Evaluator:
School/Building:	

Elements of a Guided Support Plan	
-----------------------------------	--

Statement of Concern(s)

<p><i>The specific area(s) of concern listed above relate to GBSD Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards Rubric</i></p>	

Goal(s) to Address Concern(s)

--

Activities to Address Concern(s)

--

Assistance and Monitoring

Criteria Used to Measure Progress

--

Estimated Timelines

Date:	Action:
Date:	Action:
Date:	Action:
Date:	Action:

The Person Responsible for Evaluation (if appropriate)

Principal, _____ has designated Assistant Principal, _____
as the supervisor of this Program of Assistance for Improvement.

Final Assessment

Prior to (Month, Day & Year), a conference will be held for final review of the Guided Support Plan. If the educator is making progress but the deficiency is not remedied within the timelines, the educator's guided support plan may be extended. When a guided support plan has not been successfully completed, a probationary educator may be recommended for non-renewal; a contract educator may be placed on a program of assistance for improvement.

Signatures:

Educator

Date

Principal

Date

Assistant Principal (if appointed)

Date

cc: _____, Executive Director of Human Resources

cc: _____, OEA Uniserv Field Representative

cc: Personnel File

Gresham-Barlow School District Program of Assistance for Improvement

Date:	Assignment:
Educator Name:	Administrator:
School/Building	

Elements of a Program of Assistance for Improvement

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statement of Area of Deficiency 2. General Statement of Corrective Steps 3. Corrective Steps to be Followed 4. Assistance and Monitoring | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Criteria for the Measurement of Program 6. Estimated Timelines 7. The Person(s) Responsible for Program 8. Final Assessment |
|--|---|

Statement of Deficiency

<i>The specific areas of deficiency listed above relate to the following Standards of Professional Teaching as written in the GBSD Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards Rubric</i>

General Statement of Corrective Steps

--

Corrective Steps to be Followed

--

Assistance and Monitoring

--

Criteria Used to Measure Progress

--

Estimated Timelines

Date:	Action:
Date:	Action:
Date:	Action:
Date:	Action:

The Person Responsible for Evaluation (if designated)

Principal, _____ has designated Assistant Principal, _____
as the supervisor of this Program of Assistance for Improvement.

Final Assessment

Prior to (Month, Day & Year), a summative evaluation conference will be held for final review of the Program of Assistance for Improvement. Failure to make satisfactory progress in the listed area(s) of deficiency could result in the continuation of this plan, non-extension of your contract or dismissal

Signatures:

Educator

Date

Principal

Date

Assistant Principal

Date

cc: _____, Executive Director of Human Resources

cc: _____, OEA Uniserv Field Representative

cc: Personnel File

Gresham-Barlow School District
Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards Rubric

Professional Practice and Professional Responsibilities based upon <i>The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument</i> <i>2011 Edition by Charlotte Danielson</i>	
Domain I: Planning & Preparation	Domain III: Instruction
Standard 1a: Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	Standard 3a: Communicating with Students
Standard 1b: Knowledge of Students	Standard 3b: Questioning and Discussion Techniques
Standard 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes	Standard 3c: Engaging Students in Learning
Standard 1d: Knowledge of Resources	Standard 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction
Standard 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction	Standard 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness
Standard 1f: Designing Student Assessments	
Domain II: The Classroom Environment	Domain IV: Professional Responsibilities
Standard 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	Standard 4a: Reflecting on Teaching
Standard 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning	Standard 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records
Standard 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures	Standard 4c: Communicating with Families
Standard 2d: Managing Student Behavior	Standard 4d: Participating in the Professional Community
Standard 2e: Organizing Physical Space	Standard 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally
	Standard 4f: Showing Professionalism

Domain I: Planning & Preparation

Standard 1a: Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy

Indicators include:

- Lesson and unit plans that reflect important concepts in the discipline
- Lesson and unit plans that accommodate prerequisite relationships among concepts and skills
- Clear and accurate classroom explanations
- Accurate answers to student questions
- Feedback to students that furthers learning
- Inter-disciplinary connections in plans and practice

Standard Descriptors:

Performance Levels			
1	2	3	4
<p>In planning and practice, educator makes content errors or does not correct errors made by students.</p> <p>Educator's plans and practice display little understanding of prerequisite relationships important to student's learning of the content.</p> <p>Educator displays little or no understanding of the range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student's learning of the content.</p>	<p>Educator is familiar with the important concepts in the discipline but displays lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another.</p> <p>Educator's plans and practice indicate some awareness of prerequisite relationships, although such knowledge may be inaccurate or incomplete.</p> <p>Educator's plans and practice reflect a limited range of pedagogical approaches to the discipline or to the students.</p>	<p>Educator displays solid knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and the ways they relate to one another.</p> <p>Educator's plans and practice reflect accurate understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts.</p> <p>Educator's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline.</p>	<p>Educator displays extensive knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and the ways they relate both to one another and to other disciplines.</p> <p>Educator's plans and practice reflect understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts and provide a link to necessary cognitive structures needed by students to ensure understanding.</p> <p>Educator's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline, anticipating student misconceptions.</p>

Standard 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students

Indicators include:

- Educator gathers formal and informal information about students for use in planning instruction
- Educator learns student interests and needs for use in planning
- Educator participation in community cultural events
- Educator-designed opportunities for families to share heritage
- Database of students with special needs

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
Educator demonstrates little or no understanding of how students learn and little knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs and does not seek such understanding.	Educator indicates the importance of understanding how students learn and the students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge about the class as a whole.	<p>Educator understands the active nature of student learning and attains information about levels of development for groups of students.</p> <p>The educator also purposefully seeks knowledge from several sources of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs and attains this knowledge about groups of students.</p>	Educator actively seeks knowledge of students' levels of development and their backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs from a variety of sources. This information is acquired for individual students.

Standard 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes

Indicators include:

- Outcomes of a challenging cognitive level
- Statements of student learning, not student activity
- Outcomes central to the discipline and related to those in other disciplines
- Permit assessment of student attainment
- Differentiated for students of varied ability

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>Outcomes represent low expectations for students and lack of rigor, and not all of them reflect important learning in the discipline.</p> <p>Outcomes are stated as activities rather than as student learning.</p> <p>Outcomes reflect only one type of learning and only one discipline or strand and are suitable for only some students.</p>	<p>Outcomes represent moderately high expectations and rigor.</p> <p>Some (outcomes) reflect important learning in the discipline and consist of a combination of outcomes and activities.</p> <p>Outcomes reflect several types of learning, but educator has made no attempt at coordination or integration.</p> <p>Most of the outcomes are suitable for most of the students in the class in accordance with global assessments of student learning.</p>	<p>Most outcomes represent rigorous and important learning in the discipline.</p> <p>All the instructional outcomes are clear, are written in the form of student learning, and suggest viable methods of assessment.</p> <p>Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and opportunities for coordination.</p> <p>Outcomes take into account the varying needs of groups of students.</p>	<p>All outcomes represent rigorous and important learning in the discipline.</p> <p>The outcomes are clear, are written in the form of student learning, and permit viable methods of assessment.</p> <p>Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and, where appropriate, represent opportunities for both coordination and integration.</p> <p>Outcomes take into account the varying needs of individual students.</p>

Standard 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources**Indicators include:**

- District provided materials
- Range of texts
- Guest speakers
- Internet resources
- Materials provided by professional organizations
- Educator continuing professional education courses or professional groups
- Community resources

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
Educator is unaware of school or district resources for classroom use, for the expansion of his or her own knowledge, or for students.	Educator displays awareness of school or district resources available for classroom use, for the expansion of his or her own knowledge, and for students, but no knowledge of resources available more broadly.	Educator displays awareness of resources available for classroom use, for the expansion of his or her own knowledge, and for students (not only through the school and district, but also through sources external to the school and on the Internet).	Educator displays extensive knowledge of resources for classroom use, for the expansion of his or her own knowledge, and for students (not only through the school and district, but also in the community, through professional organizations and universities, and on the Internet).

Standard 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction

Indicators include:

- Lessons that support instructional outcomes and reflect important concepts
- Instructional maps that indicate relationships to prior learning
- Activities that represent high-level thinking
- Opportunities for student choice
- The use of varied resources
- Thoughtfully planned learning groups
- Structured lesson plan

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>The series of learning experiences is poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes and does not represent a coherent structure.</p> <p>The activities are not designed to engage students in active intellectual activity and have unrealistic time allocations.</p> <p>Instructional groups do not support the instructional outcomes and offer no variety.</p>	<p>Some of the learning activities and materials are suitable to the instructional outcomes and represent a moderate cognitive challenge, but with no differentiation for different students. Instructional groups partially support the instructional outcomes, with an effort by the educator at providing some variety.</p> <p>The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure; the progression of activities is uneven, with most time allocations reasonable.</p>	<p>Educator coordinates knowledge of content, of students, and of resources, to design a series of learning experiences aligned to instructional outcomes and suitable to groups of students.</p> <p>The learning activities have reasonable time allocations; they represent significant cognitive challenge, with some differentiation for different groups of students.</p> <p>The lesson or unit has a clear structure, with appropriate and varied use of instructional groups.</p>	<p>Plans represent the coordination of in-depth content knowledge, understanding of different students' needs, and available resources (including technology), resulting in a series of learning activities designed to engage students in high-level cognitive activity.</p> <p>Learning activities are differentiated appropriately for individual learners. Instructional groups are varied appropriately with some opportunity for student choice.</p> <p>The lesson's or unit's structure is clear and allows for different pathways according to diverse student needs.</p>

Standard 1f: Designing Student Assessments

Indicators include:

- Lesson plans indicate correspondence between assessments and instructional outcomes
- Assessment types are suitable to the style of outcome
- Variety of performance opportunities for students
- Modified assessments are available for individual students as needed
- Expectations clearly written with descriptors for each level of performance
- Formative assessments are designed to inform minute-to-minute decision-making by the educator during instruction

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
Assessment procedures are not congruent with instructional outcomes; the proposed approach contains no criteria or standards. Educator has no plan to incorporate formative assessment in the lesson or unit, nor any plan to use assessment results in designing future instruction.	Some of the instructional outcomes are assessed through the proposed approach, but others are not. Assessment criteria and standards have been developed, but they are not clear. Approach to the use of formative assessment is rudimentary, including only some of the instructional outcomes. Educator intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for the class as a whole.	Educator's plan for student assessment is aligned with the instructional outcomes; assessment methodologies may have been adapted for groups of students. Assessment criteria and standards are clear. Educator has a well-developed strategy for using formative assessment and has designed particular approaches to be used. Educator intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for groups of students.	Educator's plan for student assessment is fully aligned with the instructional outcomes and has clear criteria and standards that show evidence of student contribution to their development. Assessment methodologies have been adapted for individual students, as needed. The approach to using formative assessment is well designed and includes student as well as educator use of the assessment information. Educator intends to use assessment results to plan future instruction for individual students.

Domain II: Classroom Environment

Standard 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport

Indicators include:

- Respectful talk and turn taking
- Respect for students' background and lives outside of the classroom
- Educator and student body language
- Physical proximity
- Warmth and caring
- Politeness
- Encouragement
- Active listening
- Fairness

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the educator and students and among students, are mostly negative, inappropriate, or insensitive to students' ages, cultural backgrounds, and developmental levels. Interactions are characterized by sarcasm, put-downs, or conflict.</p> <p>Educator does not deal with disrespectful behavior.</p>	<p>Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the educator and students and among students, are generally appropriate, but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, and disregard for students' ages, cultures, and developmental levels.</p> <p>Educator attempts to respond to disrespectful behavior, with uneven results. The net result of the interactions is neutral, conveying neither warmth nor conflict.</p>	<p>Educator-student interactions are friendly and demonstrate general caring and respect. Such interactions are appropriate to the ages of the students.</p> <p>Educator responds successfully to disrespectful behavior among students. The net result of the interactions is polite and respectful, but impersonal.</p>	<p>Educator-student interactions are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring and sensitivity to students as individuals.</p> <p>The net result of interactions is that of connections with students as individuals.</p>

Standard 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning**Indicators include:**

- Belief in the value of the work
- Expectations are high and supported through both verbal and nonverbal behaviors
- Quality is expected and recognized
- Effort and persistence are expected and recognized
- Confidence in ability is evidenced by educator and students language and behaviors
- Expectation for all students to participate

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>The classroom culture is characterized by a lack of educator or student commitment to learning and/or little or no investment of student energy into the task at hand. Hard work is not expected or valued.</p> <p>High expectations for learning are reserved for a few students.</p>	<p>The classroom culture is characterized by little commitment to learning by the educator.</p> <p>The educator conveys that student success is the result of natural ability rather than hard work; high expectations for learning are reserved for those students thought to have a natural aptitude for the subject.</p>	<p>The classroom culture is a cognitively busy place where learning is valued by all, with high expectations for learning being the norm for most students.</p> <p>The educator conveys that with hard work students can be successful.</p> <p>Classroom interactions support learning and hard work.</p>	<p>The classroom culture is a cognitively vibrant place, characterized by a shared belief in the importance of learning.</p> <p>The educator conveys high expectations for learning by all students and insists on hard work.</p>

Standard 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures

Indicators include:

- Smooth functioning of all routines
- Little or no loss of instructional time
- Students playing an important role in carrying out the routines
- Students know what to do, where to move

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>Much instructional time is lost through inefficient classroom routines and procedures.</p> <p>There is little or no evidence that the educator is managing instructional groups, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies effectively.</p> <p>There is little evidence that students know or follow established routines.</p>	<p>Some instructional time is lost through only partially effective classroom routines and procedures.</p> <p>The educator's management of instructional groups, transitions, and/or the handling of materials and supplies is inconsistent, the result being some disruption of learning.</p> <p>With regular guidance and prompting, students follow established routines.</p>	<p>There is little loss of instructional time because of effective classroom routines and procedures.</p> <p>The educator's management of instructional groups and the handling of materials and supplies are consistently successful.</p> <p>With minimal guidance and prompting, students follow established classroom routines.</p>	<p>Instructional time is maximized because of efficient classroom routines and procedures.</p> <p>Students contribute to the management of instructional groups, transitions, and the handling of materials and supplies.</p> <p>Routines are well understood and may be initiated by students.</p>

Standard 2d: Managing Student Behavior

Indicators include:

- Clear standards of conduct, possibly posted, and possibly referred to during a lesson
- Absence of acrimony between educator and students concerning behavior
- Educator awareness of student conduct
- Preventive action when needed by the educator
- Fairness
- Absence of misbehavior
- Reinforcement of positive behavior

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>There appear to be no established standards of conduct and little or no educator monitoring of student behavior.</p> <p>Students challenge the standards of conduct.</p> <p>Response to students' misbehavior is repressive or disrespectful of student dignity.</p>	<p>Standards of conduct appear to have been established, but their implementation is inconsistent.</p> <p>Educator tries, with uneven results, to monitor student behavior and respond to student misbehavior.</p> <p>There is inconsistent implementation of the standards of conduct.</p>	<p>Student behavior is generally appropriate.</p> <p>The educator monitors student behavior against established standards of conduct.</p> <p>Educator response to student misbehavior is consistent, proportionate, respectful to students, and effective.</p>	<p>Student behavior is entirely appropriate.</p> <p>Students take an active role in monitoring their own behavior and that of other students against standards of conduct.</p> <p>Educators' monitoring of student behavior is subtle and preventive.</p> <p>Educator's response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs and respects students' dignity.</p>

Standard 2e: Organizing Physical Space

Indicators include:

- Pleasant, inviting atmosphere
- Safe environment
- Accessibility for all students
- Furniture arrangement suitable for the learning activities
- Effective use of physical resources, including computer technology, by both educator and students

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>The physical environment is unsafe, or many students don't have access to learning resources.</p> <p>There is poor coordination between the lesson activities and the arrangement of furniture and resources, including computer technology.</p>	<p>The classroom is safe, and essential learning is accessible to most students.</p> <p>The educator's use of physical resources, including computer technology, is moderately effective.</p> <p>Educator makes some attempt to modify the physical arrangement to suit learning activities, with partial success.</p>	<p>The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; educator ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities.</p> <p>Educator makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology.</p>	<p>The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students, including those with special needs.</p> <p>Educator makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology. The educator ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities.</p> <p>Students contribute to the use or adaptation of the physical environment to advance learning.</p>

Domain III: Instruction

Standard 3a: Communicating with Students

Indicators include:

- Clarity of lesson purpose
- Clear directions and procedures specific to the lesson activities
- Absence of content errors and clear explanations of concepts
- Students understand the content
- Correct and imaginative use of language

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>The instructional purpose of the lesson is unclear to students, and the directions and procedures are confusing.</p> <p>The educator's explanation of the content contains major errors.</p> <p>The educator's spoken or written language contains errors of grammar or syntax.</p> <p>The educator's vocabulary is inappropriate, vague, or used incorrectly, leaving students confused.</p>	<p>The educator's attempt to explain the instructional purpose has only limited success, and/or directions and procedures must be clarified after initial student confusion.</p> <p>The educator's explanation of the content may contain minor errors; some portions are clear; other portions are difficult to follow.</p> <p>The educator's explanation consists of a monologue, with no invitation to the students for intellectual engagement.</p> <p>Educator's spoken language is correct; however, his or her vocabulary is limited, or not fully appropriate to the students' ages or backgrounds.</p>	<p>The educator clearly communicates instructional purpose of the lesson, including where it is situated within broader learning, and explains procedures and directions clearly.</p> <p>Educator's explanation of content is well scaffolded clear and accurate, and connects with students' knowledge and experience.</p> <p>During the explanation of content, the educator invites student intellectual engagement.</p> <p>Educator's spoken and written language is clear and correct and uses vocabulary appropriate to the students' ages and interests.</p>	<p>The educator links the instructional purpose of the lesson to student interests; the directions and procedures are clear and anticipate possible student misunderstanding.</p> <p>The educator's explanation of content is thorough and clear, developing conceptual understanding through artful scaffolding and connecting with students' interests.</p> <p>Students contribute to extending the content and help explain concepts to their classmates.</p> <p>The educator's spoken and written language is expressive, and the educator finds opportunities to extend students' vocabularies.</p>

Standard 3b: Questioning and Discussion Techniques

Indicators include:

- Questions of high cognitive challenge, formulated by both students and educator
- Questions with multiple correct answers, or multiple approaches even when there is a single correct response
- Effective use of student responses and ideas
- Discussion with the educator stepping out of the central, mediating role
- High levels of student participation in discussion

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>Educator's questions are of low cognitive challenge, require single correct responses, and are asked in rapid succession.</p> <p>Interaction between educator and students is predominantly recitation style, with the educator mediating all questions and answers.</p> <p>A few students dominate the discussion.</p>	<p>Educator's questions lead students through a single path of inquiry, with answers seemingly determined in advance.</p> <p>Alternatively, the educator attempts to frame some questions designed to promote student thinking and understanding, but only a few students are involved.</p> <p>Educator attempts to engage all students in the discussion and to encourage them to respond to one another, but with uneven results.</p>	<p>Although the educator may use some low-level questions, he or she asks the students questions designed to promote thinking and understanding.</p> <p>Educator creates a genuine discussion among students, providing adequate time for students to respond and stepping aside when appropriate.</p> <p>Educator successfully engages most students in the discussion, employing a range of strategies to ensure that most students are heard.</p>	<p>Educator uses a variety or series of questions or prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high-level thinking and discourse, and promote meta-cognition.</p> <p>Students formulate many questions, initiate topics, and make unsolicited contributions.</p> <p>Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discussion.</p>

Standard 3c: Engaging Students in Learning

Indicators include:

- Activities aligned with the goals of the lesson
- Student enthusiasm, interest, thinking, problem-solving, etc
- Learning tasks that require high-level student thinking and are aligned with lesson objectives
- Students highly motivated to work on all tasks and are persistent even when the tasks are challenging
- Students actively “working,” rather than watching while their educator “works.”
- Suitable pacing of the lesson: neither dragging nor rushed, with time for closure and student reflection

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>The learning tasks and activities, materials, resources, instructional groups and technology are poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes or require only rote responses.</p> <p>The pace of the lesson is too slow or too rushed.</p> <p>Few students are intellectually engaged or interested.</p>	<p>The learning tasks and activities are partially aligned with the instructional outcomes but require only minimal thinking by students, allowing most to be passive or merely compliant.</p> <p>The pacing of the lesson may not provide students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.</p>	<p>The learning tasks and activities are aligned with the instructional outcomes and designed to challenge student thinking, the result being that most students display active intellectual engagement with important and challenging content and are supported in that engagement by educator scaffolding.</p> <p>The pacing of the lesson is appropriate, providing most students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.</p>	<p>Virtually all students are intellectually engaged in challenging content through well-designed learning tasks and suitable scaffolding by the educator and fully aligned with the instructional outcomes.</p> <p>In addition, there is evidence of some student initiation of inquiry and of student contribution to the exploration of important content.</p> <p>The pacing of the lesson provides students the time needed to intellectually engage with and reflect upon their learning and to consolidate their understanding.</p> <p>Students may have some choice in how they complete tasks and may serve as resources for one another.</p>

Standard 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction

Indicators include:

- Educator paying close attention to evidence of student understanding
- Educator posing specifically-created questions to elicit evidence of student understanding
- Educator circulating to monitor student learning and to offer feedback
- Students assessing their own work against established criteria
- Educator adjusting instruction in response to evidence of student understanding (or lack of it)

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>There is little or no assessment or monitoring of student learning; feedback is absent or of poor quality.</p> <p>Students do not appear to be aware of the assessment criteria and do not engage in self-assessment.</p>	<p>Assessment is used sporadically by educator and/or students to support instruction through some monitoring of progress in learning.</p> <p>Feedback to students is general, students appear to be only partially aware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work, and few assess their own work.</p> <p>Questions, prompts, and assessments are rarely used to diagnose evidence of learning.</p>	<p>Assessment is used regularly by educator and/or students during the lesson through monitoring of learning progress and results in accurate, specific feedback that advances learning.</p> <p>Students appear to be aware of the assessment criteria; some of them engage in self-assessment.</p> <p>Questions, prompts and assessments are used to diagnose evidence of learning.</p>	<p>Assessment is fully integrated into instruction through extensive use of formative assessment.</p> <p>Students appear to be aware of, and there is some evidence that they have contributed to, the assessment criteria.</p> <p>Students self-assess and monitor their progress.</p> <p>A variety of feedback, from both their educator and their peers, is accurate, specific, and advances learning.</p> <p>Questions, prompts and assessments are used regularly to diagnose evidence of learning by individual students.</p>

Standard 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness**Indicators include:**

- Incorporation of student interests and events of the day into a lesson
- Visible adjustment in the face of student lack of understanding
- Educator seizing on a “teachable moment”

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>Educator adheres to the instruction plan in spite of evidence of poor student understanding or lack of interest.</p> <p>Educator ignores student questions; when students experience difficulty, the educator blames the students or their home environment.</p>	<p>Educator attempts to modify the lesson when needed and to respond to student questions and interests, with moderate success.</p> <p>Educator accepts responsibility for student success but has only a limited repertoire of strategies to draw upon.</p>	<p>Educator promotes the successful learning of all students, making minor adjustments as needed to instruction plans and accommodating student questions, needs, and interests.</p> <p>Drawing on a broad repertoire of strategies, the educator persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning.</p>	<p>Educator seizes an opportunity to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous event or student interests, or successfully adjusts and differentiates instruction to address individual student misunderstandings.</p> <p>Educator persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help, using an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies and soliciting additional resources from the school or community.</p>

Domain IV: Professional Responsibilities

Standard 4a: Reflecting on Teaching

Indicators include:

- Accurate reflections on a lesson
- Citations of adjustments to practice, drawing on a repertoire of strategies

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>Educator does not know whether a lesson was effective or achieved its instructional outcomes, or he/she profoundly misjudges the success of a lesson.</p> <p>Educator has no suggestions for how a lesson could be improved.</p>	<p>Educator has a generally accurate impression of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which instructional outcomes were met.</p> <p>Educator makes general suggestions about how a lesson could be improved.</p>	<p>Educator makes an accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes and can cite general references to support the judgment.</p> <p>Educator makes a few specific suggestions of what could be tried another time the lesson is taught.</p>	<p>Educator makes a thoughtful and accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes, citing many specific examples from the lesson and weighing the relative strengths of each.</p> <p>Drawing on an extensive repertoire of skills, educator offers specific alternative actions, complete with the probable success of different courses of action.</p>

Standard 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records**Indicators include:**

- Routines and systems that track student completion of assignments
- Systems of information regarding student progress against instructional outcomes
- Processes of maintaining accurate non-instructional records

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>Educator's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments and student progress in learning is nonexistent or in disarray.</p> <p>Educator's records for non-instructional activities are in disarray, resulting in errors and confusion.</p>	<p>Educator's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments and student progress in learning is rudimentary and only partially effective.</p> <p>Educator's records for non-instructional activities are adequate but require frequent monitoring to avoid errors.</p>	<p>Educator's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and non-instructional records is fully effective.</p>	<p>Educator's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments, student progress in learning, and non-instructional records is fully effective.</p> <p>Students contribute information and participate in maintaining the records.</p>

Standard 4c: Communicating with Families

Indicators include:

- Frequent and culturally appropriate information sent home regarding the instructional program, and student progress
- Two-way communication between the educator and families
- Frequent opportunities for families to engage in the learning process

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>Educator communication with families about the instructional program or about individual students is sporadic or culturally inappropriate.</p> <p>Educator makes no attempt to engage families in the instructional program.</p>	<p>Educator makes sporadic attempts to communicate with families about the instructional program and about the progress of individual students but does not attempt to engage families in the instructional program.</p> <p>Communications are one-way and not always appropriate to the cultural norms of those families.</p>	<p>Educator communicates frequently with families about the instructional program and conveys information about individual student progress.</p> <p>Educator makes some attempts to engage families in the instructional program.</p> <p>Information to families is conveyed in a culturally appropriate manner.</p>	<p>Educator's communication with families is frequent and sensitive to cultural traditions, with students contributing to the communication.</p> <p>Response to family concerns is handled with professional and cultural sensitivity.</p> <p>Educator's efforts to engage families in the instructional program are frequent and successful.</p>

Standard 4d: Participating in a Professional Community

Indicators include:

- Regular educator participation with colleagues to share and plan for student success
- Regular educator participation in professional courses or communities that emphasize improving practice
- Regular educator participation in school initiatives
- Regular educator participation and support of community initiatives

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
Educators avoids relationships with colleagues. Educator avoids participation in a professional culture of inquiry, resisting opportunities to become involved.	Educator maintains superficial relationships with colleagues and is reluctant to collaborate and work cooperatively. Educator becomes involved in the school's culture of professional inquiry when invited to do so.	Educator maintains cordial relationships with colleagues that are characterized by mutual support and cooperation. Educator actively participates in a culture of professional inquiry.	Relationships with colleagues are characterized by mutual support and cooperation, with the educator taking initiative in assuming leadership among the faculty. Educator takes a leadership role in promoting a culture of professional inquiry.

Standard 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally

Indicators include:

- Frequent educator attendance in courses and workshops; regular academic reading
- Participation in learning networks with colleagues; feedback freely shared
- Participation in professional organizations supporting academic inquiry

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>Educator engages in no professional development activities to enhance knowledge or skill.</p> <p>Educator resists feedback on teaching performance from either supervisors or more experienced colleagues.</p> <p>Educator makes no effort to share knowledge with others or to assume professional responsibilities.</p>	<p>Educator participates in professional activities to a limited extent when they are convenient.</p> <p>Educator accepts, with some reluctance, feedback on teaching performance from both administrator/evaluators and colleagues.</p> <p>Educator finds limited ways to contribute to the profession.</p>	<p>Educator seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill.</p> <p>Educator welcomes feedback from colleagues—either when made by administrator/evaluators or when opportunities arise through professional collaboration.</p> <p>Educator participates actively in assisting other educators.</p>	<p>Educator seeks out opportunities for professional development and makes a systematic effort to conduct action research.</p> <p>Educator seeks out feedback on teaching from both administrator/evaluators and colleagues.</p> <p>Educator initiates important activities to contribute to the profession.</p>

Standard 4f: Showing Professionalism


Indicators include:

- Educator has a reputation as someone who can be trusted and is often sought as a sounding board
- During committee or planning work, educator frequently reminds participants that the students are the utmost priority
- Educator will support students, even in the face of difficult situations or conflicting policies
- Educator challenges existing practice in order to put students first
- Educator consistently fulfills school district mandates regarding policies and procedures

Standard Descriptors:

1	2	3	4
<p>Educator is not alert to students' needs and contributes to school practices that result in some students being ill-served by the school.</p> <p>Educator does not comply with school and district regulations.</p>	<p>Educator attempts, though inconsistently, to serve students. Educator does not knowingly contribute to some students' being ill-served by the school.</p> <p>Educator's decisions and recommendations are based on limited but genuinely professional considerations.</p> <p>Educator complies minimally with school and district regulations, doing just enough to get by.</p>	<p>Educator is active in serving students, working to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to succeed.</p> <p>Educator maintains an open mind in team or departmental decision making.</p> <p>Educator complies fully with school and district regulations.</p>	<p>Educator is highly proactive in serving students, seeking out resources when needed. Educator makes a concerted effort to challenge negative attitudes or practices to ensure that all students, particularly those traditionally underserved, are honored in the school.</p> <p>Educator takes a leadership role in team or departmental decision-making and helps ensure that such decisions are based on the highest professional standards.</p> <p>Educator complies fully with school and district regulations, taking a leadership role with colleagues.</p>

STEP-BY-STEP SMART GOAL PROCESS



Gresham-Barlow School District

Log of Professional Development Activities

Please complete this log to document all professional development. This log will be used to help plan your on-going professional development, and must be submitted to Human Resources prior to license renewal.

Educator's Name: _____

Account#: _____

Activity Name	Date Completed	Standards	# of PDUs

Total Number of PDUs =

*Standards for Professional Learning:

List the number of the appropriate standard(s)

- 1=Learning Communities
- 2=Leadership
- 3=Resources
- 4=Data
- 5=Learning Designs
- 6 =Implementation
- 7=Outcomes

Notes:

One clock hour=one PDU
 One quarter hour of college credit
 =20 PDUs
 One semester hour of college credit
 =30 PDUs

PDUs required for renewal:

75 for final 3-year licenses
 125 for final 5-year licenses
 30 for Subs and Restricted Subs
 (by 2015)

***TSPC - Standards for Professional Learning ORS342**

Gresham-Barlow School District Educator Evaluation System Glossary of Terms

Conference: It is understood that accurately evaluating an educator's performance is more than observing an educator in the classroom. Information about the standards can be obtained through conversations and conferences with educators. A conference between the evaluator(s) and the educator takes place several times during the year to discuss lessons, activities, and progress on goals. Evaluators evaluate based on the adopted standards when completing the Observations Feedback form, the evaluation of teaching evidence and artifacts, and conferencing related to the Student Growth and Learning and Professional Goals.

Contract Educator: Any educator that has completed three successful years as a Probationary educator in the Gresham-Barlow School District. Contract educators by state law have a two-year contract with the district that is up for renewal annually by the school board.

Formal Observation: A Formal Observation is a scheduled classroom visit that includes a Pre-Observation, Observation, and Post-Observation process. Probationary educators are formally observed at least once a year. Contract educators will be formally observed every two (2) years. Additional observations may be requested by an administrator or educator at any time.

Gresham-Barlow Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards: Gresham-Barlow has adopted Charlotte Danielson's *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument 2011 Edition* as its model of core teaching standards. These professional standards outline what educators should know and be able to do to ensure every student is ready for college, careers and engaged citizenship.

Guided Support Plan: When an educator enters the Improvement Cycle because they need additional support in order to address areas of concern, they will work with their evaluator(s) to set goals and identify activities that will address those areas.

Mini-Observation: A Mini-observation is usually an unscheduled classroom or workplace visit by an evaluator(s) that includes the Observation Feedback Form. Evaluators are expected and encouraged to frequently be in classrooms on an informal basis. Data from informal observations are used to help determine an educator's performance. Additional observations may be requested by an administrator or educator at any time.

Multiple Measures: A variety of evidence-based measures to evaluate educator performance and effectiveness. To provide a balanced view of an educator's performance will include: (A) Professional Practice, (B) Professional Responsibilities, and (C) Student Learning and Growth.

Performance Levels: Performance levels are used throughout this evaluation system. Levels used to rate educators on the standards are based on a 1-4 scale. It is important to realize this system defines how to evaluate educators according to the Gresham-Barlow School District Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards. In addition, determinations about educator performance can also be made according to state law, and there are incidents when state law would supersede this evaluation system.

The descriptors for the performance levels are as follows:

- 1: Does not meet standards; performs below the expectations for good performance under this standard; requires direct intervention and support to improve practice

- 2:** Making sufficient progress toward meeting this standard; meets expectations for good performance most of the time and shows continuous improvement; expected improvement through focused professional learning and growth plan
- 3:** Consistently meets expectations for good performance under this standard; demonstrates effective practices and impact on student learning; continues to improve professional practice through ongoing professional learning
- 4:** Consistently exceeds expectations for good performance under this standard; demonstrates highly effective practices and impact on student learning; continued expansion of expertise through professional learning and leadership opportunities

Probationary Educator: Any educator in their first three years of teaching in any district in Oregon, regardless of prior experience in another school district.

Program of Assistance for Improvement: These plans are written solely for contract educators when a guided support plan has not been successful. The Program of Assistance is formal and involves the District and Association. If an educator does not improve through the Program of Assistance, it could result in the continuation of this plan, the non-renewal or non-extension of their contract, or dismissal.

Self-Reflection: The educator reflects and assesses his/her professional practice using the Gresham-Barlow School District Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards Rubric and uses it to establish their professional growth goal. Self-Reflection is done by all licensed staff.

Senate Bill 290: Legislation that mandates a new evaluation system for every district.

SMART Goal: Specific, Measureable, Action Oriented, Rigorous, Realistic, Results-Focused, Timed and Tracked.

Student Learning and Growth Goals: Educators collaborate with evaluator(s) to establish two student learning goals. The goals should reflect student's progress toward proficiency or mastery of academic standards, cognitive skills, academic behaviors and transitional skills.

Summative Evaluation: The evaluator(s) completes the Summative Evaluation by evaluating an educator's performance on the Gresham-Barlow School District Professional Growth and Evaluation Standards Rubric and the Student Learning and Growth Goals. Extended definitions on all of the standards including indicators can be found on the rubric pages of this manual.

GBSD Evaluation: Quick Start Guide

		<i>What do I do?</i>	<i>When?</i>
Step 1	<p><i>Self-Reflection</i></p> <p><i>Form: GBSD Licensed Self- Reflection Form; page 26</i></p>	<p><i>Analyze your own professional practice and the learning and growth of your students in preparation for goal setting.</i></p>	<p><i>Contract: prior to the October meeting with your evaluator</i></p> <p><i>Probationary/Temporary: Prior to the October meeting with your evaluator</i></p>
Step 2	<p><i>Goal Setting</i></p> <p><i>Form: GBSD Licensed Student Growth and Professional Goals Form; page 28</i></p>	<p><i>Meet with your evaluator to set both professional practice and student learning goals</i></p>	<p><i>Contract: by October 15</i></p> <p><i>Probationary/Temporary: by October 15</i></p>
Step 3	<p><i>Observation and Collection of Evidence</i></p> <p><i>Form: GBSD Pre-Conference for Formal Observation Form; page 32</i></p> <p><i>Form: GBSD Observations Feedback Form; page 33</i></p> <p><i>Form: GBSD Post Conference for Formal Observation Form; page 34</i></p>	<p><i>You and your evaluator collect evidence of your professional practice, professional responsibilities and student learning.</i></p>	<p><i>Contract: Contract observation prior to June 1</i></p> <p><i>Probationary/Temporary: last observation prior to February 15</i></p>
Step 4	<p><i>Formative Assessment/Evaluation</i></p>	<p><i>Meet with your evaluator to review your performance against the standards and your students' progress toward your goals, and make adjustments as needed.</i></p>	<p><i>Contract: throughout the school year with your mid-year meeting by February 15th</i></p> <p><i>Probationary/Temporary: throughout the school year with your mid-year meeting by December 15</i></p>
Step 5	<p><i>Summative Evaluation</i></p> <p><i>Form: GBSD Summative Evaluation Form Page: 35</i></p>	<p><i>Your evaluator assesses your performance against the standards of practice and your attainment of your goals.</i></p>	<p><i>Contract, Probationary, and Temporary: by June 1</i></p> <p><i>Probationary/Temporary: PP/PR sections by February 15</i></p>

