

<b>DESCRIPTOR TERM:</b>  <b>Personnel and Employment</b>	<b>Millard District Policy</b> <b>File Code: 4400</b>  <b>Approved: 12-12-24</b>
--	---

## **EDUCATOR EVALUATIONS**

### **A. Purpose**

The purpose of the Millard School District Educator Evaluation System is to promote the professional growth of educators and ensure the best possible instruction and learning outcomes for students. This is accomplished by reinforcing teaching strengths and establishing goals for improvement in conjunction with the educator's plan for professional development.

### **B. Definitions**

1. **Administrator** means an individual in a position who holds an appropriate license issued by the State Board of Education and who supervises educators.
2. **Career Educator** means a licensed educator of the Millard School District who has a reasonable expectation of continued employment under the policies of the Board.
3. **Certified Evaluator** means an educator who has been trained in evaluating teacher performance and has demonstrated competency in using an educator evaluation tool to rate educator performance according to established standards.
4. **Committee** means the Millard School District's Educator Evaluation Program Committee.
5. **Educator** means an individual employed by the Millard School District who is required to hold a professional license issued by the State Board of Education, except:
  - a. a superintendent and the business administrator, or
  - b. an individual who:
    - i. works fewer than three hours per day; or
    - ii. is hired for less than half of the school year.

6. **Educator Effectiveness Rating** is ~~an annual~~ a designation given to educators (highly effective; effective; emerging or minimally effective; or not effective) based on multiple lines of evidence such as self-evaluation, student and parent input, peer observation, supervisor observations, professional growth, student achievement, and other indicators of instructional improvement.
7. **Evaluator** means a person who is responsible for an educator's overall evaluation, including: professional performance; student academic growth; stakeholder input; and other indicators of professional improvement.
8. **Formative Evaluation** means a planned, ongoing process which allows educators to engage in reflection and growth of professional skills as related to the Utah Effective Teaching Standards (UETS)
9. **Plan of Assistance** is a written document identifying a career educator's specific area(s) of unsatisfactory performance and detailing recommendations and strategies for improvement that includes: specific, measurable, and actionable deficiencies; the available resources that will be provided for improvement, including a mentor; and a recommended course of action that will improve the career educator's performance.
10. **Probationary Educator** means an educator employed by the Millard School District who, under board policy, has been advised by the district that the educator's performance is unsatisfactory.
11. **Provisional Educator** means an educator employed by the Millard School District who has not achieved status as a career educator within the district.
12. **Summative Evaluations** means an evaluation conducted by a supervisor that summarizes an educator's performance during an evaluation cycle that is used to make decisions or ratings of performance and that may inform decisions related to the educator's salary, continued employment, personnel assignment, transfer, or dismissal.
13. **Summative Evaluation Rating** means a rating of an educator's performance that assigns one of four levels, which are:
  - a. highly effective,
  - b. effective,
  - c. emerging or minimally effective,

- d. not effective, which has a numeric equivalent of 0. This is also what is meant by “unsatisfactory performance.”
- 14. **Performance** means the combination of an educator’s professionalism consistent with:
  - a. The Utah Effective Educator Standards (R277-330),
  - b. Student academic growth, and
  - c. Continued professional growth as an educator.
- 15. **Unsatisfactory Performance** means a deficiency in performing work tasks, which may be:
  - a. due to insufficient or undeveloped skills, lack of knowledge or aptitude, poor attitude, or insufficient effort; and
  - b. remediated through training, study, mentoring, practice or greater effort.
- 16. **Chronically Absent** means a student who was enrolled in the District for at least 60 calendar days and missed 10% or more days of instruction (whether the absence was excused or not).
- 17. **Academic Growth** means demonstration of student learning through formative assessment measures identified by the District, school, or educator within the school year.
- 18. **Continued Professional Growth** means incremental measures of improvement relevant to the Utah Effective Educator Standards.
- 19. **Observation** means a formal or informal visit made by an administrator to an educator’s classroom for the purpose of gathering formative information, providing feedback for growth, and informing decisions related to the educator’s summative evaluation.
- 20. **Valid and Reliable Measurement Tools** means an instrument that has proved consistent over time and uses non-subjective criteria that require minimal interpretation.

[Utah Code § 53G-11-501 \(2024\)](#)

[Utah Admin. Rules R277-323-2 \(July 8, 2024\)](#)

### **C. Educator Evaluation Program Committee**

- 1. To develop, support, monitor, and maintain an educator evaluation program, the board shall establish a committee comprised of an equal number of classroom teachers, parents, and administrators.

- a. Nominees for educator representatives shall be voted upon by the district's classroom teachers and a list of those individuals nominated shall be given to the board.
  - b. Nominees for parent representatives shall be submitted by community councils within the district.
  - c. Nominees for administrator representatives shall be voted upon by the district's administrators and a list of those individuals nominated shall be given to the board.
2. The board shall appoint committee members from the nomination lists.
3. The board shall:
  - a. adopt or adapt an evaluation program for educators based on a model developed by the Utah State Board of Education;  
  
or
  - b. creates its own evaluation program.
4. The evaluation program developed by the committee must comply with the requirements of Utah Code Title 53G, Chapter 11, Part 5 and rules adopted by the State Board of Education.

[Utah Code § 53G-11-520 \(2024\)](#)

[Utah Admin. Rules R277-323-3\(1\), \(8\) \(August 30, 2024\)](#)

5. The evaluation program developed by the committee must comply with the requirements of the Public Education Human Resource Management Act and rules adopted by the Utah State Board of Education.

[Utah Code § 53G-11-506 \(2019\)](#)

[Utah Code § 53G-11-520 \(2024\)](#)

[Utah Admin. Rules R277-323-3\(1\), \(8\) \(August 30, 2024\)](#)

#### **D. Educator Evaluation System**

Millard School District's Educator Evaluation System, adopted by the board in consultation with the Educator Evaluation Program Committee shall be a reliable and valid educator evaluation program that evaluates educators based on educator professional standards established by the Utah State Board of Education and includes:

1. an annual evaluation of all provisional, probationary, and career educators, including formative and summative evaluations on the cycle established in the evaluation program;
2. four differentiated levels of performance;
3. multiple lines of evidence in evaluation, including:
  - a. self-evaluation of performance in relation to the Utah Effective Educator Standards;
  - b. student and parent input;
  - c. results of multiple observations done with tools aligned to the Utah Effective Educator Standards;
  - d. evidence of student academic growth as specified by the District;
  - e. other indicators of professional improvement as specified by the District;
4. a summative evaluation that differentiates among the four levels of performance.
5. a reasonable number of peer observations.
6. feedback to administrators from teachers, including input on the effectiveness of the administrator evaluating employee performance in a school for which the administrator has responsibility or within the District.
7. that the educator evaluation system may not use end-of-level student assessment scores and may not use the data of a student that is chronically absent.

[Utah Code § 53G-11-507 \(2019\)](#)  
[Utah Code § 53G-11-520\(9\), \(10\) \(2024\)](#)  
[Utah Admin. Rules R277-323-3\(3\), \(5\), \(6\) \(July 8, 2024\)](#)
8. a process for an educator to contribute additional information to inform the educator's evaluation at several intervals throughout the process;
9. measures for an educator's professional performance whenever the educator is working in a professional capacity with students, parents, colleagues, or community members;
10. a process for an evaluator to give an educator specific, measurable, actionable, and written direction regarding a needed improvement and recommended course of action;

11. a process for an educator to request a review of the educator's evaluation (see Section G of this policy);
12. a requirement that the evaluation of provisional and probationary educators occur at least twice each year, and an annual evaluation of all career educators;
13. an ensured valid evaluation system by providing professional development opportunities to all evaluators of licensed educators to:
  - a. maintain and improve an evaluator's abilities;
  - b. give the evaluator an opportunity to demonstrate his/her abilities to rate an educator in accordance with the Utah Effective Teaching Standards and/or the Utah Educational Leadership Standards;

[Utah Code Ann. § 53G-11-507 \(2020\)](#)

**E. Evaluation System Reliability**

1. Educator evaluations must be performed by certified raters and shall maintain high standards of rater accuracy. To that end, the District shall:
  - a. identify criteria for use in assigning evaluation ratings;
  - b. provide professional development opportunities to all evaluators of licensed educators to:
    - i. assure evaluators understand the Utah Effective Educator Standards;
    - ii. improve proficiency in recognizing the criteria used in assigning evaluation ratings; and
    - iii. give the evaluator an opportunity to demonstrate the ability to rate an educator in accordance with the Utah Effective Educator Standards;
  - c. designate qualified raters as certified;
  - d. assure that educators are rated by a certified evaluator; and
  - e. establish a process for a certified evaluator to maintain the evaluator's skills.

[Utah Admin. Rules R277-323-4 \(July 8, 2024\)](#)

**F. Educator Evaluation Procedures**

1. As part of the district's evaluation procedures, all educators must:
  - a. Complete an annual self-assessment. Based on this self-assessment, educators shall establish a professional growth plan for the year. Goals will be reviewed with the administrator periodically throughout the school year and reviewed in a summative end-of-the-year annual interview.
  - b. Participate in the annual observation process.
    - i. The district uses the "Utah Teaching Observation Tool" developed from the "Utah Effective Teaching Standards" for teacher evaluation. The "Utah Educational Leadership Observation Tool" patterned after the "Utah Effective Leadership Standards" is utilized for administrative evaluation.
    - ii. All observations are conducted by principals, the principal's designee, the employee's immediate supervisor, or another person who has direct knowledge of the employee's duties and performance (superintendent, director, etc.). All observations are performed by certified raters.
    - iii. Summative observations occur semi-annually for provisional and probationary educators. At least two 30-60 minute formal observations are conducted annually. There must be at least twenty (20) school days in between the two observations.
    - iv. Periodic Evaluations - the District shall have an evaluation program that provides systematic and fair evaluations of educators of the District. Evaluations of educators shall occur annually. If the District establishes an alternative educator evaluation program as permitted under Utah Code § 53G-11-520, the program shall include an annual formative evaluation of each educator and shall include a summative evaluation for each educator that occurs at least once every four years. Otherwise, all educators will receive formative evaluations each year and a summative evaluation each year. Such evaluations may be considered by the Board prior to any Board action concerning the individual's employment.

[Utah Code § 53G-11-507\(1\)\(a\) \(2024\) Utah Code § 53G-11-520\(9\)\(a\) \(2024\)](#)

[Utah Admin. Rules R277-323-3\(3\), \(4\) \(August 30, 2024\)](#)

- v. The evaluator responsible for administering an educator's formal summative evaluation shall meet with the educator to review the Utah Teaching Observation Tool ratings within fifteen (15) calendar days of the final observation, and no later than March 2<sup>nd</sup> of the school year. The evaluator shall:
  - 1. allow the educator to make written response to any part of the evaluation and attach the educator's response to the evaluation; and
  - 2. following any revisions of the written evaluation made after the discussion:
    - a. give a copy of the written evaluation and attachments to the educator; and
    - b. file the evaluation and any related reports or documents in the educator's evaluation personnel file located at the district office. A copy may be retained by the building level administrator.
- vi. The district utilizes multiple tools and multiple observations at appropriate intervals to collect data for formative observations which are conducted annually for all educators.
- vii. The evaluator may share the results of informal formative observations with the educator via e-mail, brief conversations etc. A formal debriefing meeting is not required.
- viii. At the option of the educator or evaluator, the observation process may be conducted more often than the time frames listed above require.
- c. Meet annually with their administrator to review the year's observations and the educator's effectiveness rating results. The educator effectiveness rating results are a compilation of:



- i. the data derived from the instructional effectiveness observation tools (both formative and summative) mentioned above;
  - ii. student academic growth measures which must include the following three components:
    - a. learning goals measuring long-term outcomes linked to the appropriate specific content knowledge and skills from the Utah Core Standards;
    - b. assessments, with the exception of end-of-level student assessments; and
    - c. targets for incremental monitoring of student growth; and
  - iii. stakeholder input for educators, principals, and administrators, including ~~annual~~ input from students and parents.
    - a. Stakeholder input for principals and administrators shall include input from teachers and support professionals.
    - b. Educators shall be given an opportunity to respond to stakeholder input. The educator's response shall be considered as part of the educator's final rating.
2. In addition to the evaluation procedures listed above, all provisional educators, and all educators (regardless of their licensure level) in their first three years of teaching in the Millard School District, will participate in district new educator orientation programs for a minimum of three years. These educators shall:
- a. attend educator induction meetings;
  - b. work with a trained mentor;
  - c. re-apply annually (for a minimum of three years) if they wish to be considered for continued employment. This shall be done on or before March 1<sup>st</sup>; and
  - d. obtain the recommendation of school and district administration for continued employment or license advancement. Notification from the school district shall be made at least 60 calendar days prior to the end of the

educator's contract (June 30<sup>th</sup>) as to whether they will be offered a contract for a subsequent term of employment.

**NOTE:** A third-year provisional educator who has not successfully completed the requirements listed above, and whose contract is renewed shall be placed on probation and shall not be advanced on the salary schedule until all requirements are satisfied.

## **G. Evaluation Reviews**

A career educator who is not satisfied with the educator effectiveness rating may request a review of the rating in writing within fifteen (15) calendar days after the date of the meeting wherein the rating was received. The request is made to the district superintendent.

1. The review shall be conducted by a certified rater:
  - a. with experience evaluating educators; and
  - b. not employed by the school district; and
  - c. in accordance with the Utah Effective Teacher and Educational Leadership Standards.
2. The certified rater shall review:
  - a. the school district's educator evaluation policies and procedures;
  - b. the evaluation process conducted for the educator; and
  - c. the evaluation data from the professional performance, student growth, and stakeholder input components.
3. The certified rater shall report his/her recommendations in writing to the school district's superintendent for action.
4. The school district shall determine if the initial educator evaluation was issued in accordance with:
  - a. the school district's educator evaluation policies;
  - b. the requirement of the performance standards;
  - c. Public Education Human Resource Management Act ([Title 53G, Chapter 11](#));

- d. Public Educator Evaluation Requirements (PEER) - [Rule R277-531](#); and
  - e. District Educator Evaluation Systems – [Rule R277-533](#) (this policy).
5. Nothing in this section prevents the educator and/or superintendent (or the superintendent's designee) from agreeing to another method of review.

[Utah Code Ann. § 53G-11-508 \(2020\)](#)

#### **H. Addressing Deficiencies and Providing a Plan of Assistance**

If either a provisional or career educator receives an educator effectiveness rating of not effective (numeric rating of “0”), their performance will be deemed unsatisfactory. In addition, if a career educator receives a rating of minimally effective (numeric rating of “1”) and is not in the first year of a new assignment, including a new subject, grade level, or school, his/her performance will be deemed unsatisfactory.

- 1. The evaluator shall give an educator whose performance is unsatisfactory or in need of improvement a written document clearly identifying a plan of assistance that includes:
  - a. specific, measurable, and actionable deficiencies; and
  - b. the available resources that will be provided for improvement, including a mentor; and
  - c. a recommended course of action that will improve the educator's performance.
- 2. The educator is responsible for improving his or her performance, including using any resources identified by the District, and demonstrating acceptable levels of improvement in the designated areas of deficiencies. Failure to make improvement may result in probation or termination.
- 3. Subsections (1)(b), (1)(c), and (2) above do not apply if the educator's unsatisfactory performance was documented for the same deficiency within the previous three (3) years and a plan of assistance was implemented, as provided in Subsections E and J of Policy 4440 - Orderly School Termination Procedures.

[Utah Code Ann. § 53G-11-512 \(2020\)](#)

**I. Restriction On Salary Adjustments**

1. An educator who has received an unsatisfactory rating (Not Effective) on the educator's three most recent evaluations (either formative or summative) is not eligible for a bonus under Utah Code § 53F-2-405.

[Utah Code § 53F-2-405\(4\)\(c\) \(2024\)](#)  
[Utah Admin. Rules R277-110-3\(1\)\(e\) \(August 30, 2024\)](#)

2. A career educator who receives a "Not Effective" rating, will have another Summative Evaluation within 6 months following the designation of "Not Effective".
  - a. the educator is provisional; or
  - b. is a career educator in the first year of his/her assignment, including a new subject, grade level, or school.

**J. Evaluation Data**

1. Utah State Board of Education rules shall ensure the privacy and protection of individual evaluation data.
2. The school district shall maintain confidential records of the educator effectiveness components of individual educators. The Utah State Board of Education may monitor the district's system for maintaining confidential records.
3. Written and/or electronic copies of the various educator effectiveness components, together with written responses, documents, and reports shall be filed in the educator's evaluation personnel file. These records are housed at the district office. Evaluations will be retained five years beyond the educator's term of employment. All records shall then be destroyed.

[Utah Code Ann. § 53G-11-511 \(2020\)](#)