

DESCRIPTOR TERM: Personnel and Employment	Millard District Policy File Code: 4400 Approved: 08-08-19
----------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

EDUCATOR EVALUATIONS

A. Purpose

The Millard School District recognizes that the quality of public education can be improved and enhanced by systematic, fair, and competent evaluation of public educators and remediation of those whose performance is unsatisfactory. The desired purposes of evaluation are to: (1) promote the professional growth of the educator; and (2) identify and encourage quality instruction in order to improve student achievement.

B. Definitions

1. **Administrator** means an individual in a position that requires an educator license with an administrative area of concentration or a letter of authorization, who supervises educators.
2. **Board** refers to the Millard School District Board of Education.
3. **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.
4. **Certified Rater** means an educator who has been trained in evaluating teacher performance and has demonstrated competency in using a teacher evaluation tool to rate teacher effectiveness. The rater conducts observations of educators related to the educator's evaluation.
5. **Committee** means the Millard School District's Educator Evaluation Program Committee.
6. **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.
- 7. **Educator Effectiveness Rating** is an annual 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.
- 8. **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.
- 9. **Formative Evaluation**, sometimes referred to as informal observation, means evaluations that provide educators with feedback on how to improve their performance.
- 10. **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.
- 11. **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.
- 12. **Provisional Educator** means an educator employed by the Millard School District who has not achieved status as a career educator within the district.
- 13. **Summative Evaluations**, sometimes referred to as formal observations, are evaluations that are used to make decisions or ratings of educator performance and may inform decisions on salary, confirmed employment, personnel assignments, transfers, or dismissals.
- 14. **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.
15. **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 Ann. § 53G-11-501 \(2020\)](#)

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 educator representatives, parents, and administrators.
 - a. Nominees for educator representatives shall be voted upon by the district's educators 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 adopt an educator evaluation program in consultation with the Educator Evaluation Program Committee. The committee may:
 - 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 the Public Education Human Resource Management Act and rules adopted by the Utah State Board of Education.

[Utah Code § 53G-11-506 \(2019\)](#)

D. Mentor for Provisional Educator

1. The principal or immediate supervisor of a provisional educator shall assign a mentor who has received training or will receive training in mentoring educators as a mentor to the provisional educator.
2. Where possible, the mentor shall be a career educator who performs substantially the same duties as the provisional educator and has at least three years of educational experience.
3. The mentor shall assist the provisional educator to become effective and competent in the teaching profession and school system but may not serve as an evaluator of the provisional educator.
4. An educator who is assigned as a mentor may receive compensation for those services in addition to the educator's regular salary.

[Utah Code Ann. § 53G-11-509 \(2020\)](#)

[Utah Administrative Rules R277-308-2\(2\) April 8, 2021](#)

[Utah Administrative Rules R277-308-2\(3\) April 8, 2021](#)

E. Educator Evaluation System

Millard School District's Educator Evaluation System, adopted by the board in consultation with the Educator Evaluation Program Committee:

1. includes four differentiated levels of performance; namely:
 - a. highly effective, which has a numeric equivalent of 3;
 - b. effective, which has a numeric equivalent of 2;
 - c. emerging or minimally effective, which have a numeric equivalent of 1; and
 - d. not effective, which has a numeric equivalent of 0.
2. uses multiple lines of evidence in evaluation, including:
 - a. professional performance, as documented through evaluator observation utilizing the Utah Teaching Observation Tool and the Utah Educational Leadership Observation Tool, both of which incorporate educator professional standards established by the Utah State Board of Education;

- b. student academic growth;
- c. stakeholder input; and
- d. other indicators of professional improvement such as:
 - (1) self-evaluation;
 - (2) peer observation;
 - (3) evidence of professional growth; and
 - (4) indicators of instructional improvement.
- 3. requires a minimum of one beginning-of-year, one mid-year, and one end-of-year conference between an educator and an evaluator;
- 4. provides a process for an educator to contribute additional information to inform the educator's evaluation at several intervals throughout the process;
- 5. measures an educator's professional performance whenever the educator is working in a professional capacity with students, parents, colleagues, or community members;
- 6. provides a process for an educator to:
 - a. analyze stakeholder input;
 - b. analyze data related to performance; and
 - c. develop appropriate responses to the information;
- 7. provides a procedure for the educator to review, analyze, and develop appropriate responses to evaluator rating calculations;
- 8. includes a process for an evaluator to give an educator specific, measurable, actionable, and written direction regarding a needed improvement and recommended course of action;
- 9. provides a process for an educator to request a review of the educator's evaluation (see Section G of this policy);
- 10. utilizes the state-developed Utah Model Educator Evaluator System, a reliable and valid evaluation program consistent with generally accepted professional standards for personnel evaluation systems;

11. requires the evaluation of provisional and probationary educators at least twice each year, and the annual evaluation of all career educators;
12. ensures a 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;
13. establishes a school district rater-reliability plan, which:
 - a. requires all evaluators to become state-certified in the evaluation process, using the Utah Teaching Observation Tool;
 - b. requires all evaluators to keep their certification current through recertification efforts, etc.
 - c. offers the evaluator opportunities to improve his/her skills through instruction and practice in order to maintain a high standard of rater accuracy; and
 - d. assures that all educators are evaluated by certified evaluators.

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

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.
 - (1) 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.

- (2) 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.
- (3) Summative observations occur semi-annually for provisional and probationary educators. At least two 30-60 minute formal observations are conducted annually (one prior to November 15th and one prior to February 15th). There must be at least twenty (20) school days in between the two observations. In addition, at least four shorter, informal, formative observations are completed on an annual basis during a provisional teacher’s first three years in the district.
- (4) Summative observations occur once every five years for career educators (unless data or evidence indicates need for greater frequency). At least two 30-60 minute formal observations are conducted during a career educator’s summative year (one prior to November 15th and one prior to February 15th). There must be at least twenty (20) school days in between the two observations.
- (5) 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 2nd of the school year. The evaluator shall:
 - (a) allow the educator to make written response to any part of the evaluation and attach the educator’s response to the evaluation; and
 - (b) following any revisions of the written evaluation made after the discussion:
 - i. give a copy of the written evaluation and attachments to the educator; and

- ii. 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.
- (6) The district utilizes multiple tools and multiple observations at appropriate intervals to collect data for formative observations which are conducted annually for all educators. The district requires at least four formative observations per year neither for educators who are neither provisional nor in their summative observation year.
- (7) 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.
- (8) 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:
 - (1) the data derived from the instructional effectiveness observation tools (both formative and summative) mentioned above;
 - (2) student academic growth measures which must include the following three components:
 - i. learning goals measuring long-term outcomes linked to the appropriate specific content knowledge and skills from the Utah Core Standards;
 - ii. assessments, with the exception of end-of-level student assessments; and
 - iii. targets for incremental monitoring of student growth; and
 - (3) stakeholder input for educators, principals, and administrators, including annual input from students and parents.

- i Stakeholder input for principals and administrators shall include input from teachers and support professionals.
 - ii 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. achieve a passing score on the both the Content Praxis and Principles of Learning and Teaching exam (Level 1 License holders only);
 - d. successfully satisfy an administrative review (Level 1 License holders only);
 - e. 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 1st; and
 - f. 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 30th) 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 4170 - Orderly School Termination Procedures.

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

I. **Computing the Annual Summative Rating**

1. An educator’s annual summative rating is based on the following:
 - a. Actual observations of the educator’s performance; and
 - b. Educator, evaluator, student academic growth, or other stakeholder data gathered, calculated, or observed that is aligned with approved standards and rubrics (end-of-level assessment scores may not be used in educator evaluation).

2. The school district shall report summative scores annually for all educators using the following approved terminology for reporting:
 - a. Highly Effective 3;
 - b. Effective 2;
 - c. Minimally or Emerging Effective 1; and
 - d. Not Effective 0.
3. If an evaluator rates an educator's performance within the minimal or emerging effective category (numeric rating of "1"), the rater shall:
 - a. Designate an educator as emerging effective (numeric rating of "1") if:
 - (1) the educator holds a Level 1 license;
 - (2) is being served by the school district's Entry Years Enhancement (EYE) program; or
 - (3) the educator holds a Level 2 license and received a new or different teaching or leadership assignment within the current school year.
 - b. Designate an educator as minimally effective (numeric rating of "1") if the educator:
 - (1) holds a Level 2 license; and
 - (2) is teaching or leading in a familiar assignment.

J. Eligibility Guidelines for Educator Wage Increases

1. An educator may not advance a step or a lane on the adopted salary schedule if the educator's rating on the most recent evaluation is at the lowest level, "not effective" (numeric rating of "0").
 - 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.

2. In either of the above scenarios, the educator may not advance a step or a lane on the adopted salary schedule if the educator's rating is at the lowest level, or "not effective" (numeric rating of "0").

K. Evaluation Data

1. Millard School District shall report to the Utah State Board of Education, on or before June 30, an annual summative rating for each educator delineated by one of the four rating categories; namely (Highly Effective, Effective, Emerging or Minimally Effective, or Not Effective).
2. The data shall be separately reported for the following educator classifications:
 - a. administrators;
 - b. teachers; and
 - c. educators other than administrators or teachers.
3. Utah State Board of Education rules shall ensure the privacy and protection of individual evaluation data.
4. 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.
5. 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 \(2020\)](#)