

Clover Park School District

Teacher Evaluation Pilot 2007- 10

A committee consisting of 4 teachers, 4 principals, CPEA President, Soundview Representative, administrator for human resources, assistant superintendent for schools K-12, and director of employment services was convened on 11/29/07.

Two questions were addressed to begin the process.

1. What are the desired exit behaviors for students, teachers, and administrators?
2. What do we believe about the teacher evaluation process, or what is the committee's philosophical base that is foundational to the process?

The committee used *Enhancing Professional Practice, A Framework for Teaching*, by Charlotte Danielson for the ongoing work. Other districts were contacted and their evaluations were reviewed for content and format, strengths and weaknesses.

The Pilot Evaluation was drafted and training occurred in August of 2008 with buildings conducting teacher training in September.

In the 1st year of implementation the committee met on a quarterly basis and at the end of that school year created a survey to review the effectiveness of the pilot evaluation. The survey went out to all participants and principals. Participation was voluntary for veteran teachers and required for all teachers new to the district. In the 2008-09 school year 79 secondary and 78 elementary teachers participated, for a total of 157.

The committee reconvened in August of 2009 to review the data and amend the pilot evaluation based on the findings from the survey. The pilot evaluation form was updated (adding a new rating column for "emerging") and training was again provided in August and September of 2009. Teachers who worked on the committee presented to their colleagues this time – which resulted in greater understanding and participation in the pilot. In the current year we have 315 teachers being evaluated on this tool – 130 secondary and 185 elementary. This is approximately 44% of eligible staff.

The committee continues to meet on an as needed basis. Another survey will be conducted at the end of 2009 -10 school year.

Clover Park School District

Teacher Evaluation Pilot

2008-2009 HANDBOOK

TEACHER EVALUATION PILOT HANDBOOK

What is the background to the new teacher evaluation process?

The evaluation process is the result of a collaborative effort and contractual agreement between the Clover Park Education Association (CPEA) and Clover Park School District (CPSD). A letter of agreement between CPEA and CPSD was signed on September 23, 2008 which provides for a pilot of these new procedures in the 2008-2009 school year. A copy of this letter is included in the appendix.

The Teacher Evaluation Committee includes three teachers along with the CPEA Chairperson and the UniServ representative. District representatives include an Assistant Superintendent, the Administrator for Human Resources, administrators from each level and the Director of Employment Services.

The mission of the teacher evaluation committee is to create an evaluation process that guides professional growth, which in-turn informs instructional practices and results in improved student achievement.

What is the rationale for the new process?

The evaluation process is intended to:

- Celebrate/honor professional growth (collaborative experience between teachers and principals).
- Be a clear process/criteria that is uniform and transparent (documentation, timeline, common language).
- Be manageable and succinct.
- Create a climate of trust (communication, documentation).
- Provide accountability and support (documentation, alignment with standards, professional development).
- Develop a collaborative teacher/principal relationship.

Current research in effective instructional practices and evaluation were used in the development of the performance rubrics, evaluation tools and process. The Teacher Evaluation Committee has drawn on the expertise of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Washington State Professional Certification Standards and A Framework for Teaching: Enhancing Professional Practice by Charlotte Danielson.

What are the guiding principles and beliefs within the evaluation process?

It is the belief of the Joint CPEA/CPSD Teacher Evaluation Committee that the evaluation process should be authentic and reflective of the actual work of staff. It provides an opportunity for a positive reflective process that would result in professional growth. The process will improve teaching and learning through analytical review of performance through goal setting, collections of observation data, other classroom-based evidence and professional discussions of teacher performance throughout the school year between teachers and principals/assistant principals.

The evaluation process will help improve and inform our teaching craft and practice. We believe the process should be self-reflective and aimed at improvement. It is based on professional trust and collaboration. This process recognizes the complexities of good teaching and the value of good professional practice, and finally, it allows for multiple forms of assessment in documenting competency and growth.

As with any major initiative, the collective professional trust among everyone in the system is paramount to the success of the process and outcomes. Striving to develop and create conditions that will foster

such professional trust is the responsibility of everyone in the system. We all have the opportunity to grow together, professionally.

The Teacher Evaluation Committee will continue to monitor the implementation and consider modifications that should be made. This is a work-in-progress and we encourage and will solicit feedback throughout the process. For this pilot stage of the process, feedback was gathered from teachers and administrators regarding the rubric, tools, and process. This feedback is reflected in the following sections which describe further details and procedures.

Who are the staff members that will use the new model in 2008-09?

By letter of agreement, new teachers hired for the 2008-09 school year and teacher volunteers hired before the 2008-09 school year will participate in this pilot. Consistent with current CPEA contract provisions, principals may request that the normal (existing) evaluation process be used with any teacher they supervise.

Teacher volunteers are invited to consult with their principals regarding their interest. Principals will be asked for a final list of approved teacher volunteers and new teachers early in September 2008.

Will there be staff development for the new model?

In-service will be provided to all principals and all teachers in preparation for the new process. Components of the training will include a review of the Teaching Continuum and an overview of this handbook including evaluation forms and data collection tools. Training will be ongoing at each site based on teacher and administrator needs.

What are the categories in the new evaluation?

Classroom Teacher

EVALUATION/PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT Criteria and Critical Elements

- 1. Classroom Environment:** Teacher creates a classroom environment that is safe, inviting, respectful, culturally and developmentally appropriate.
- 2. Classroom Management/Student Discipline:** Teacher creates and manages classroom procedures, communicates clear expectations, and encourages appropriate behavior in the educational setting that is in alignment with a school-wide plan.
- 3. Intentional Planning and Design:** There is clear evidence that the teacher carefully designs and plans instruction that addresses national, state and district standards (e.g. GLEs, Frameworks, etc.) and student needs.
- 4. Ongoing Relevant Assessment for Learning:** Teacher develops various methods to assess student performance and utilizes the data as part of the instructional process.
- 5. Instructional Practices:** Teacher uses a repertoire of instructional practices that align with national, state and district standards (e.g. GLEs, Frameworks, etc.) that result in student learning.
- 6. Professional development and responsibilities:** Teacher demonstrates professionalism, continual commitment to professional growth and improved student learning.

EVALUATION PROCESS

The normal procedures for the Pilot "Long Form" evaluation process will be utilized following section 6.4 (Evaluation Process) of the CPEA/CPSD negotiated agreement. Section 6.4 includes:

6.4.1 Long Form Process.

6.4.1.1 All employees will be evaluated annually.

6.4.1.2 A staff meeting will be scheduled prior to the beginning of the formal evaluation process in order to inform employees about the evaluation instruments, to inform employees about the evaluation process, and to answer questions regarding the evaluation system.

6.4.1.3 Employees shall be notified by November 1 who is responsible for the employees' evaluation.

6.4.1.4 Unsatisfactory evaluation rating and appropriate comments shall be recorded and explained to the affected employee.

6.4.1.5 No employee in the certificated employee bargaining unit shall evaluate any other employee in the bargaining unit, unless otherwise provided.

6.4.1.6 There shall be separate evaluation instruments for classroom teachers and for educational staff associates.

6.4.1.7 Observations:

- a. Prior to a scheduled formal observation, an individual pre-conference may be held.
- b. All employees newly employed by the District shall be observed within the first ninety (90) calendar days of the commencement of their employment for a period of not less than thirty (30) minutes.
- c. The employee will be informed in writing within five (5) working days of any information gained through an informal observation that might negatively affect their evaluations.
- d. Upon completion of the observation, the employee shall be provided with a copy of the observation report form and any attachments within three (3) workdays of the observation.
- e. A post-observation conference will be held after each observation if the observed employee has areas of concern as seen by the observer or if the employee requests such a meeting.

The new Teacher Evaluation Process is intended for use with newly hired teachers and teacher volunteers during the 2008-09 school year. It is not intended for use with non classroom teachers.

This model will adhere to all legal requirements related to the evaluation of teachers in Washington State. RCW 28A.405.100 requires principals/designees to evaluate all classroom teachers and certificated support personnel annually. During each school year teachers/certificated support personnel shall be observed at least twice in the performance of their assigned duties. Total observation time for each individual for each school year shall not be less than 60 minutes. In addition, new teachers/certificated support personnel shall be observed at least once for a total observation time of 30 minutes during the first 90 calendar days of their employment period.

Recommended Pilot Observation and Evaluation Timelines

Since the mission of the teacher evaluation committee is "to create an evaluation process that guides professional growth, which in turn informs instructional practices and results in improved student achievement" timely feedback and communication is critical.

Therefore, while the timelines indicated above (in the evaluation process section) are the legally and contractually required timelines, the Evaluation Committee strongly recommends:

1. That the first observation be completed by the end of the 1st semester.
2. That immediate feedback be provided to staff when concerns regarding teaching performance arise.

3. That, whenever possible staff be given an adequate amount of time to respond to observation feedback prior to the completion of the final evaluation.

How will this plan be monitored, evaluated, modified, and considered for future years?

This evaluation pilot will be monitored and evaluated as follows:

- The teacher evaluation pilot will be a standing agenda item at CPEA Labor-Management meetings scheduled monthly throughout the 2008-09 school year. Issues, questions, concerns, celebrations, etc. will be invited by both CPEA and administrative representatives attending these meetings.
- Both CPEA and CPSD will invite ongoing feedback from staff regarding the pilot through formal and informal means throughout the year. This may include staff meetings, CPEA meetings, administrative meetings, surveys, etc. CPEA and CPSD have agreed that all feedback gathered about this program will be shared at CPEA Labor-Management meetings in a timely fashion to facilitate open discussion, problem-solving, and common understanding. Any information regarding the pilot at the CPEA Labor-Management meeting will be provided to the Teacher Evaluation Committee for inclusion in their discussions and planning as noted above.
- The Teacher Evaluation Committee will meet quarterly to review input gathered from stake holders during the year and will make necessary adjustments to the process and/or tools. The May 2009 committee meeting will focus on finalizing changes to this new teacher evaluation program resulting in a recommendation for the 2009-2010 school year. Mutual consideration of this recommendation will be completed by June 1, 2009.

**CLOVER PARK SCHOOL DISTRICT
TEACHER EVALUATION/OBSERVATION FORM (PILOT)**

Name: _____ Location: _____ Date: _____

Assignment: _____ School Year: _____

Evaluation Type: 90 Day Annual Observation Other

This evaluation is based upon verified information and/or direct observation. The observations occurred on the following dates & times:

Date: _____ Time: _____ Date: _____ Time: _____ Date: _____ Time: _____ Date: _____ Time: _____

A teacher evaluation system should give teachers useful feedback on classroom needs, the opportunity to learn new teaching techniques, an opportunity to reflect on their own practices, and counsel from principals on how to make beneficial changes in their classrooms. Evaluators are encouraged to consider a variety of teaching skills and evaluate on the "whole-person" concept. Post-observation conferences are intended to give teachers feedback on their strengths and areas that can serve as a focus of growth activities. This evaluation tool encourages teachers and evaluators to consider using several sources of information about a teacher's performance, so they can make a more accurate assessment.

ELIGIBILITY:

1. **YEAR 1** – All new teaching staff to the district are required to be involved with the teacher evaluation pilot. Volunteers in each building are encouraged to be involved in the pilot up to 20% of the teaching staff in the building.
2. **YEAR 2** – All newly hired staff for the second year of the agreement are required to be a part of the teacher evaluation pilot. Staff hired during the first year of the agreement will also be involved in the second year of the pilot. Finally, volunteers in the building who want to be involved with the pilot (or want to continue from year one) will be allowed up to a maximum of 60% of the teaching staff in the building.
3. **YEAR 3** – All staff newly hired to the district for the third year of the agreement will be involved with the teacher evaluation pilot. New staff hired in the first or second year of the agreement will continue with the teacher evaluation pilot. Finally, volunteers in the building up to 100% of the staff will be allowed to be involved with the pilot.
4. Staff volunteering to be part of the teacher evaluation pilot will be included by mutual agreement between the teacher and building principal.
5. Current staff volunteering to be part of the teacher evaluation pilot may opt out after their first year in the model.
6. Staff for whom there are concerns regarding their current teacher performance will not be allowed to be involved with the pilot of the new teacher evaluation system

This teacher's overall performance has been: Undeveloped/Doesn't Meet Expectations , Emerging/Meets Expectations , Proficient/Meets Expectations , Distinguished/Exceeds Expectations , for the evaluation period covered by this report.

If Undeveloped/Doesn't Meet Expectations please summarize:

Name of Evaluator: _____ Evaluator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

My signature below indicates that I have read and received a copy of this evaluation/observation. (Note: Employee's signature indicates only that he/she has read and has received a copy of the evaluation, not necessarily that he/she agrees with the content. Employee comments may be attached.)

Name of Teacher: _____ Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name of Administrator: _____ Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

1. Classroom Environment: Teacher creates a classroom environment that is safe, inviting, respectful, culturally and developmentally appropriate.

Element	Undeveloped/Doesn't Meet Expectations	Emerging/ Meets Expectations	Proficient/Meets Expectations	Distinguished/Exceeds Expectations
Teacher respect for differences	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher interactions are inappropriate to students' culture, gender and individual differences.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher is inconsistent or unaware of the effects of his/her interactions with students regarding culture, gender and individual differences	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher interactions are appropriate to student's culture, gender and individual differences.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher and student interactions are appropriate to students' culture, gender and individual differences and are proactively taught.
Teacher interaction with students	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher interaction is disrespectful, abusive or demeaning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher is inconsistent when addressing students' disrespectful behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher interacts respectfully with students and addresses students' disrespectful behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher demonstrates genuine caring and respect for individual students and elicits student respect for teacher and other students.
Safety and accessibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom is unsafe.	<input type="checkbox"/> The classroom is safe but the physical arrangement does not support student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom is safe and the physical arrangement of the room supports student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom is structured so that students can safely utilize and access the classroom structures and resources independently to support learning.

Current level of performance: Undeveloped Emerging Proficient Distinguished

If undeveloped, emerging or distinguished please explain/provide examples:

Comments:

2. Classroom Management/Student Discipline: Teacher creates and manages classroom procedures, communicates clear expectations, and encourages appropriate behavior in the educational setting that is in alignment with a school-wide plan.

Element	Undeveloped/Doesn't Meet Expectations	Emerging/ Meets Expectations	Proficient/Meets Expectations	Distinguished/Exceeds Expectations
Management of practices/routines	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher has not established management practices/routines. This results in a loss of instructional time and/or precipitates off-task or disruptive behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher has attempted to establish management practices and routines; however, transitions are inconsistent and/or directions are somewhat unclear or difficult to follow.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher establishes management practices/routines that allow for smooth transitions with clear directions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher establishes management practices/routines where students assume responsibility for handling materials and smooth transitions.
Redirecting student behavior	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher is ineffective in redirecting student behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher uses a limited number of strategies to redirect student behavior and/or is inconsistent in redirecting students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher uses a variety of strategies to redirect student behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher facilitates students' ability to demonstrate responsibility for managing their own behavior.
Response to student misbehavior	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher responds to misbehavior inappropriately and/or demonstrates disrespect for students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher is not consistently aware of or does not respond appropriately to misbehavior.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher responds to misbehavior in an appropriate manner that demonstrates respect for students and is normally effective.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher creates an environment where students monitor their own behavior, and the teacher is sensitive to students' individual needs.

Current level of performance: Undeveloped Emerging Proficient Distinguished

If undeveloped, emerging or distinguished please explain/provide examples:

Comments:

3. Intentional Planning and Design as required by state and district curriculum: There is clear evidence that the teacher carefully designs and plans instruction that addresses national, state and district standards (e.g. GLEs, Frameworks, etc.) and student needs.

Element	Undeveloped/Doesn't Meet Expectations	Emerging/ Meets Expectations	Proficient/Meets Expectations	Distinguished/Exceeds Expectations
Lesson and unit structures	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's lesson or unit has no connection to the major concept and learning targets.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher attempts to design units with lessons/activities connected to the major concept/ideas, but some lessons/activities appear to have no connection.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher designs units with lessons/activities connected to the major concept/ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher designs the lesson or unit in which the structure is clear and allows for a variety of pathways according to student needs. Time allocations are reasonable and allow time for student reflection.
Learning Activities	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher does not select or consider learning activities that are relevant to instructional goals. They do not follow an organized progression, are not connected and/or do not reflect academic standards.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher attempts to select learning activities that are relevant to instructional goals. Progression of activities in a unit is sometimes inconsistent, with activities that show limited connections. Lessons tend to reflect appropriate standards.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher selects learning activities that are relevant to instructional goals. Progression of activities in a unit is smooth, with activities that are connected and reflect appropriate standards.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher selects learning activities that are highly relevant to instructional goals. Students can express to others how their work is related to instructional goals and to the unit as a whole.
Instructional materials and resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher selects materials and resources, which do not support instructional goals or engage students in meaningful learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher occasionally selects materials and resources (including appropriate technology), which support instructional goals, but only offer students limited engagement in the learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher selects materials and resources (including appropriate technology), which support instructional goals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher selects from a variety of materials and resources, which support instructional goals and engage students in meaningful learning. There is evidence of student participation in selecting or adapting materials.
Instructional groups	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher has not designed instructional groups to support the instructional goals and offers no variety.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher attempts to design instructional groups to support the instructional goals; however, groups are not well organized and/or tasks are not clearly defined or explained.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher designs instructional groups, which are varied as appropriate to the needs of students. Tasks for groups and group members are well organized.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher designs instructional groups, which are varied and allow for student choice in selecting different patterns of instructional groups.
Assessment criteria	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment criteria and expectations are not clear and/or have not been communicated to students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment criteria and expectations are clear, and have been clearly communicated to students, but the results are not communicated to students and /or are not used to plan further instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> Assessment criteria and expectations are clear, have been clearly communicated to students, and are used to plan for individuals and groups of students.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher creates continuous awareness and understanding on the part of students as to how well they are meeting the established criteria. Students contribute to the development of the criteria and expectations.

Current level of performance: Undeveloped Emerging Proficient Distinguished

If undeveloped, emerging or distinguished please explain/provide examples:

Comments:

4. Ongoing Relevant Assessment for Learning: Teacher develops various methods to assess student performance and utilizes the data as part of the instructional process.

Element	Undeveloped/Doesn't Meet Expectations	Emerging/ Meets Expectations	Proficient/Meets Expectations	Distinguished/Exceeds Expectations
Use of assessment data	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher does not use assessment results for planning or to differentiate instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher uses assessment results to plan for the class as a whole and rarely differentiates instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher uses assessment results to plan for the class as a whole and sometimes differentiates instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher includes students in all aspects of the learning process including assessment and planning. The teacher has a large repertoire of skills that he/she uses to differentiate instruction.
Use of formative and/or summative assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher does not use varied forms of assessment to inform instruction and does not provide feedback to students about their learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher inconsistently uses formative and/or summative assessments to inform instruction and to provide feedback to students about their learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher uses a variety of formative assessments to inform instruction and to provide feedback to students about their learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher uses a wide variety of assessment tools, which allow students to help create some assessment tools and/or generate scoring criteria.
Assessment of student work	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher does not evaluate student work as an integral part of the assessment system.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher evaluates student work, but is unclear or unsure of how it may (or may not) reflect student learning of the lesson/unit goals within the assessment system.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher uses assessment for evaluating student work to determine if it reflects the lesson/unit goals and student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher works with colleagues to examine student work as an integral part of an assessment system.

Current level of performance: Undeveloped Emerging Proficient Distinguished

If undeveloped, emerging or distinguished please explain/provide examples:

Comments:

5. Instructional Practices: Teacher uses a repertoire of instructional practices that align with national, state and district standards (e.g. GLEs, Frameworks, etc.) that result in student learning.

Element	Undeveloped/Doesn't Meet Expectations	Emerging/ Meets Expectations	Proficient/Meets Expectations	Distinguished/Exceeds Expectations
Expectations for learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's learning objectives are not evident, directions are absent or confusing and teacher does not check for understanding.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher states learning objectives, and attempts to give clear directions, but is inconsistent when checking for understanding.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher states learning objectives, gives clear directions, and consistently checks for understanding.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's lesson objectives and activities allow students to make connections outside the classroom.
Student engagement	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's instructional practice does not allow students the opportunity to adequately practice and reinforce their learning in order to retain it.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's instructional practices allow for some reinforcement and retention of learning. Time allocations tend to be too much or too little, causing some wasted instructional time.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's instructional practices allow for reinforcement and retention of learning. Time allocations are reasonable.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher allows students to be actively engaged in the activities and assignments in their exploration of content. Students initiate or adapt activities and projects to enhance understanding.
Quality of questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher rarely asks questions of students during instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's questions sometimes probe for depth of understanding; however, the larger percent of them are used for recall and/or right or wrong answers. Teacher offers minimal opportunity for higher-order questioning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's questions probe for depth of understanding and elicit reflection from all students. Adequate time is available for students to respond.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher allows students to assume responsibility for the discussion by formulating questions, which ensure that all student voices are heard.
Differentiated instruction	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher does not attempt to differentiate instruction to meet students' needs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher attempts to differentiate instruction for some learners, and provides some appropriate accommodations, with a limited variety of intervention strategies.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher persists in seeking approaches for all learners and uses a variety of instructional strategies including appropriate accommodations and applies intervention strategies as needed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher includes student input for determining their most effective approach for students who need help and uses an extensive repertoire of strategies and additional resources.
Use of technology	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher chooses to not use available technology to support learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher attempts to integrate available technology into instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher integrates available technology into instruction.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher stays abreast of evolving technology and designs learning experiences for students' utilization of these resources.

For Future Implementation:

Cultural diversity	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's instruction does not reflect awareness of diverse cultures	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's instruction demonstrates limited awareness and respect of diverse cultures	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's instruction demonstrates awareness and respect of diverse cultures	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher's instruction facilitates students' development of awareness and respect of diverse cultures.
---------------------------	---	---	---	--

Current level of performance: Undeveloped Emerging Proficient Distinguished

If undeveloped, emerging or distinguished please explain/provide examples:

Comments:

6. Professional development and responsibilities: Teacher demonstrates professionalism, continual commitment to professional growth and improved student learning.

Element	Undeveloped/Doesn't Meet Expectations	Emerging/ Meets Expectations	Proficient/Meets Expectations	Distinguished/Exceeds Expectations
Knowledge of curriculum content	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher makes content errors and/or does not address students' misconceptions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher displays solid content knowledge but makes only limited connections within the content and/or with other content areas.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher displays solid content knowledge and makes connections within the content or with other content areas.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher displays extensive content knowledge and makes connections within the content and with other content areas. Teacher demonstrates continuing pursuit of such knowledge.
Use of professional development	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher does not apply professional development to enhance content knowledge and teaching skill to remain current in subject matter, educational theory and practice.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher inconsistently applies professional development to enhance content knowledge and teaching skill to remain current in subject matter, educational theory and practice.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher consistently applies professional development to enhance content knowledge and teaching skill to remain current in subject matter, educational theory and practice.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher contributes to the professional development of colleagues and is recognized by colleagues for expertise in current educational theory and practice.
Use of school/district curriculum	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher does not implement school and/or district curriculum.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher inconsistently implements school and/or district curriculum.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher consistently implements school and/or district curriculum.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher contributes to and/or collaborates with colleagues to implement and/or enhance the district curriculum.
Support for school/district plans	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher refuses to support the school improvement plan and district initiatives relevant to their position.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher attempts to support the school improvement plan and district initiatives relevant to their position.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher is collaborative and supports the school improvement plan and district initiatives relevant to their position.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher contributes to and/or provides leadership in collaboration with colleagues to implement the school improvement plan and district initiatives.
Maintaining accurate records	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher does not maintain accurate records and/or does not communicate progress to student and his/her family.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher inconsistently maintains accurate records and/or in communicating progress with the student and his/her family.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher maintains accurate records and consistently communicates progress with the student and his/her family in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher maintains accurate records and uses a variety of methods to communicate progress with the student and family.

Current level of performance:

Undeveloped

Emerging

Proficient

Distinguished

If undeveloped, emerging or distinguished please explain/provide examples:

Comments:

7. Special Contributions:

Comments: