

# MO DESE Effective Evaluation Implementation Rubric

| Principle 1: Performance of educators is measured against research-based, proven expectations and performance targets consistent with the improvement of student achievement. |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| Indicators  | Criteria  |   | Criteria met?  |
| Educator performance targets are research-based and proven.   | Policy Documents                                      | The district has adopted one of the following models or a model based on the state standards: the Missouri State Model, Danielson Model, Marzano Model, Network of Effective Educators (NEE/MU) Model   | <b>Fully Met</b> – using listed model or district model that meets all criteria  |
|   |   | If district is using a district developed model, or another model, the district: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cites research and theory used in developing performance targets in their evaluation documents.</li> <li>- has a crosswalk or alignment study that shows alignment between district standards and national or state teacher or leader standards.</li> <li>- has a crosswalk or alignment study that some of the performance targets have high effect sizes.</li> <li>- district documents demonstrate that a majority of the districts’ teacher and leader performance targets include links to student evidence</li> </ul>   | <b>Partially met</b> – using district model that meets the majority of criteria<br><br><b>Not met</b> – district model that does not meet the majority of criteria |
| Performance targets align to appropriate state and national standards.  | Practice Data from Surveys                            | The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The teacher/principal evaluation rubrics/growth guides clearly define what is expected of me as a teacher/principal. <i>(Teacher [Question 1a] and Principal [Question 1a] surveys)</i></li> <li>- The teacher/principal evaluation rubrics/growth guides are appropriate for my position. <i>(Teacher [Question 1c] and Principal [Question 1c] surveys)</i></li> <li>- The teacher evaluation system is fair to teachers in all classrooms, content and grade levels. <i>(Teacher survey [Question 1e])</i> I have improved my practice as a result of the teacher/principal evaluation system <i>(Teacher [Question 1g] and Principal [Question 1f] surveys)</i></li> <li>- The teacher evaluation rubrics/growth guides available to me are appropriate to all of the positions that I evaluate. <i>(Principal survey [Question 7b])</i></li> </ul> | <b>Fully Met</b> – meets all practice criteria   |
| Performance targets articulate essential practices.   |   |   | <b>Partially met</b> – meets the majority of practice criteria   |
| Performance targets are clearly articulated.  |   |   | <b>Not met</b> – does not meet the majority of practice criteria   |
| Performance targets of the educator link to improvements in student learning.   |   |   |  |
| <b>Overall Principle 1 Rating</b>   | <b>Fully Met</b> – meets policy and practice criteria | <b>Partially met</b> – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria  | <b>Does not meet</b> – does not meet policy nor practice criteria  |

**Principle 2: Multiple ratings are used to differentiate levels of educator performance.**

| Indicators   | Criteria  |   | Criteria met?   |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>Includes a minimum of 3 differentiated levels.</p> <p>Includes clear statements of performance at each level.</p> <p>Each level allows for discrete, independent, measurable performance targets.</p> <p>Each level appropriately describes practice.</p> <p>Levels provide clear direction for growth and development in practice.</p> | Policy Documents                                      | The district has adopted one of the following models or a model based on the state standards: the Missouri State Model, Danielson Model, Marzano Model, Network of Effective Educators (NEE/MU) Model   | <b>Fully Met</b> – using listed model or district model that meets all criteria |
|  |   | If district is using a district developed model, or another model, the model: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- includes rubrics or scoring guides include at least three levels.</li> <li>- includes rubrics or scoring guides that have a differentiated statement at each level.</li> <li>- includes rubrics or scoring guides that have a differentiated rating at each level.</li> <li>- includes rubrics or scoring guides that include a logical sequence of growth.</li> </ul>   | <b>Partially met</b> – using district model that meets the majority of criteria |
|  |   | <b>Not met</b> – district model that does not meet the majority of criteria   |   |
|  | Practice Data from Surveys                            | The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The teacher evaluation rubrics/scoring guides provide a clear path for improving teacher practice. <i>(Teacher [Question 1d], Principal [Question 7c] and District Administrator [Question 1b] surveys)</i></li> <li>- The principal evaluation rubrics/scoring guides provide a clear path for improving principal practice. <i>(Principal [Question 1d] and District Administrator [Question 3b] surveys)</i></li> <li>- The teacher evaluation rubrics/scoring guides clearly describe what teachers should know and do to earn each rating score. <i>(Teacher [Question 1b], Principal [Question 7a], and District Administrator [Question 1a] surveys)</i></li> <li>- The principal evaluation rubrics/scoring guides clearly describe what principals need to know and do to earn each rating score. <i>(Principal [Question 1b] and District Administrator [Question 3a] surveys)</i></li> </ul> | <b>Fully Met</b> – meets all practice criteria                                  |
|  |   |   | <b>Partially met</b> – meets the majority of practice criteria                  |
|  |   |   | <b>Not met</b> – does not meet the majority of practice criteria                |
| <b>Overall Principle 2 Rating</b>  | <b>Fully Met</b> – meets policy and practice criteria | <b>Partially met</b> – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria  | <b>Does not meet</b> – does not meet policy nor practice criteria               |

**Principle 3: A probationary period of adequate duration is provided to ensure sufficient induction and socialization through developmental support for new teachers and leaders.**

| Indicators   | Criteria   | Criteria met?  |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Includes required mentoring as a component of a comprehensive induction process.</p> <p>Complies with Missouri statute regarding the probationary period.</p> <p>Is informed by the state’s mentor standards.</p> | <p><b>Policy Documents</b></p> <p>District documents indicate that mentoring is required for new teachers and principals.</p> <p>District documents describe a mentor program that is aligned to the MO mentor standards. (2 years for teachers, 2 years for principals)</p> <p>District policies state that mentors will not share information about their mentee and the information will not be used for adverse job action purposes.</p> <p>District documents highlight essential practices for new educators (years 1-2) including, but not limited to, those practices identified by MO DESE in documents such as the Model Evaluation System.</p> <p>- AND/OR</p> <p>District documents highlight other practices for new teachers and provide a rationale for inclusion of these practices</p>  | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – district documents describe a mentoring system that meets all policy criteria</p> <p><b>Partially met</b> – district documents describe a mentoring system that meets the majority of policy criteria</p> <p><b>Not met</b> – district documents do not describe a mentoring system or less than the majority of policy criteria are met</p> |
|  | <p><b>Practice Data from Surveys</b></p> <p>The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The mentoring process is non-evaluative. <i>(Teacher [Question 12a] and Principal [Question 18a] surveys)</i></li> <li>- The professional development and training I receive throughout the school year is tailored to my specific needs as identified in my evaluation. <i>(Teacher [Question 5f] and Principal [Question 18b] surveys)</i></li> <li>- The support I received from my mentor has helped me improve my practice. <i>(Teacher [Question 12b] and Principal [Question 18c] surveys)</i></li> <li>- My mentor provided me with the resources I needed to improve my practice. <i>(Teacher [Question 12c] and Principal [Question 18d] surveys)</i> My mentor provided effective support to me. <i>(Teacher [Question 12d] and Principal [Question 18e] surveys)</i></li> <li>- I had the resources needed to provide support to my mentee(s). <i>(Mentor survey [Question 1b])</i></li> <li>- I received the training needed to become an effective mentor. <i>(Mentor survey [Question 1a])</i></li> </ul> | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – meets all practice criteria</p>  |
|  | <p>Includes confidential, non-evaluative support linked to the district’s overall plan for professional development.</p> <p>Focuses on essential practices of particular significance for novice practitioners.</p>  |  |

**Principle 3: A probationary period of adequate duration is provided to ensure sufficient induction and socialization through developmental support for new teachers and leaders.**

| Indicators | Criteria   | Criteria met?   |
|------------|--|---|
|            | <p data-bbox="472 716 499 1016" style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Practice Data from Surveys</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The support I provided to my mentee(s) helped them to improve their practice. (<i>Mentor Survey [Question 1c]</i>)</li> <li>- I align mentor support to teacher needs identified in their evaluation. (<i>Principal survey [Question 13a]</i>)</li> <li>- I actively participate in identifying and assigning effective mentors. (<i>Principal survey [Question 13b]</i>)</li> <li>- My district has a comprehensive system for training effective mentors. (<i>Principal survey [Question 13c]</i>)</li> </ul> <p>The majority of mentors will report that they offered and the majority of teachers will report that they received the majority of the following experiences (6 or more)(<i>Teacher [Question 13] and Mentor [Question 3] surveys</i>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Frequent, targeted feedback</li> <li>- Opportunities to observe expert teachers</li> <li>- Assistance with developing strategies</li> <li>- A review of school and district expectations</li> <li>- Collaborative development of lesson plans</li> <li>- Collaborative look at student data</li> <li>- The development of a growth plan based on needs</li> <li>- Opportunities to self-reflect on practice</li> <li>- Setting of goals aimed at improving instruction</li> <li>- Modeling of effective teaching practices</li> </ul> <p>The majority of principals will report that they were offered the majority of the following experiences (6 or more) (<i>Principal survey [Question 19]</i>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Frequent, targeted feedback</li> <li>- Opportunities to observe expert leaders</li> <li>- Assistance with developing strategies</li> <li>- Collaborative look at student data</li> <li>- Suggestion of resources</li> <li>- Opportunities to self-reflect on practice</li> </ul> | <p><b>Partially met</b> – meets the majority of practice criteria</p> |

**Principle 3: A probationary period of adequate duration is provided to ensure sufficient induction and socialization through developmental support for new teachers and leaders.**

| Indicators                        | Criteria  |   | Criteria met?   |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                                   | Practice Data from Surveys                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Setting of goals aimed at improving instruction</li> <li>- Discussion of school personnel issues</li> <li>- Discussion of legal issues</li> <li>- Discussion of time management issues</li> <li>- Discussion of school budget</li> </ul> <p>100% of mentors report that they met with their mentee 6 or more times during the school year (<i>Mentor survey [Question 2]</i>).</p> <p>100% of principals report that they have an assigned mentor, <b>AND</b> they met with their mentor regularly this school year (<i>Principal survey [Question 17]</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 100% of new teachers report that they have a district or school assigned mentor <b>AND</b> they met with their mentor 6 or more times this school year (<i>Teacher survey [Question 11]</i>).</li> </ul> | <p><b>Not met</b> – does not meet the majority of practice criteria</p> |
| <b>Overall Principle 3 Rating</b> | <b>Fully Met</b> – meets policy and practice criteria | <b>Partially met</b> – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria  | <b>Does not meet</b> – does not meet policy nor practice criteria       |

**Principle 4: Measures of growth in student learning across two points in time are included as a significant contributing factor in the evaluation of professional practice at all levels.**

| Indicators  | Criteria                   |   | Criteria met?  |
|---|----------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Is a significant contributing component of the overall evaluation process</p> <p>Uses multiple measures of student performance, including both formative and summative assessments.</p>  | Policy Documents           | <p>The district is using the state-developed SLO process, or district documents indicate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- how student growth is calculated into the evaluation score and offers a justification for how it's a significant component.</li> <li>- that student growth must be based on two or more sources for determining student performance.</li> <li>- which possible measures of student growth could be included in evaluations, including district and school-determined assessments when state assessments are not available.</li> <li>- that student growth is defined as student learning across two points in time that measures should include multiple years of comparable data (of similar content and format).</li> <li>- which measures of student growth provide comparable data over years.</li> <li>- that state assessment data must be used as one of the measures of student growth for teachers in tested grades and subject areas.</li> <li>- there is an approval process for district or school assessments.</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – using the state-developed SLO process or district documents describe a system for incorporating student growth that meets all policy criteria</p> <p><b>Partially Met</b> – district documents describe a system for incorporating student growth that meets the majority of policy criteria</p> <p><b>Not met</b> – district documents do not describe a system for incorporating student growth or does not meet the majority of policy criteria</p> |
| <p>Includes multiple years of comparable student data.</p> <p>Highlights growth in student learning across two points in time as opposed to simple measures of status.</p> <p>Includes the state assessment where available and additional district and school determined common assessments.</p> | Practice Data from Surveys | <p>The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- My impact on student growth is a significant part of my evaluation. <i>(Teacher [Question 2b] and Principal [Question 2b] surveys)</i></li> <li>- I believe that the student growth measures used in my evaluation reflect my contribution to student learning. <i>(Teacher [Question 2a] and Principal [Question 2a] surveys)</i></li> <li>- My district has defined what it means for student growth to be a significant contributing component in our teacher evaluation system. <i>(Teacher [Question 2c], Principal [Question 2c] and District Administrator [Question 5b] surveys)</i> My district has defined what it means for student growth to be a significant contributing component in our principal evaluation system. <i>(Principal [Question 11a] and District Administrator [Question 5a] surveys)</i></li> <li>- Our district approves the student assessments that will be used in the teacher evaluation system to measure student growth for each content area and grade level. <i>(Principal [Question 11c] and District Administrator [Question 5d] surveys)</i></li> <li>- Our district approves the student assessments that will be used in the principal evaluation system to measure student growth. <i>(Principal [Question 2d] and District Administrator [Question 5c] surveys)</i></li> <li>-</li> </ul> | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – meets all practice criteria</p>  |

**Principle 4: Measures of growth in student learning across two points in time are included as a significant contributing factor in the evaluation of professional practice at all levels.**

| Indicators                        | Criteria  |   | Criteria met?   |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
|                                   | Practice Data from Surveys                            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In our district, accountability around growth measures is comparable across grade levels and content areas. (<i>Principal [Question 11b] and District Administrator [Question 5e] surveys</i>)</li> <br/> <li>The majority of respondents (teachers, principals, and district administrators) indicate that student growth in their district’s teacher evaluation system includes (<i>Teacher [Question 3], Principal [Question 12], and District Administrator [Question 6] surveys</i>):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multiple measures</li> <li>- Formative data</li> <li>- Summative data</li> <li>- Multiple years of comparable student data</li> <li>- State assessments (for grades/contents with state assessment data)</li> <li>- Additional district and school determined common assessment(s)</li> <li>- Student growth across two points in time</li> </ul> </li> <br/> <li>The majority of respondents (principals and district administrators) indicate that student growth in their district’s principal evaluation system includes (<i>Principal [Question 3] and District Administrator [Question 7] surveys</i>):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multiple measures</li> <li>- Formative data</li> <li>- Summative data</li> <li>- Multiple years of comparable student data</li> <li>- State assessments (for grades/contents with state assessment data)</li> <li>- Additional district and school determined common assessment(s)</li> <li>- Student growth across two points in time</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p><b>Partially met</b> – meets the majority of practice criteria</p> <hr/> <p><b>Not met</b> – does not meet the majority of practice criteria</p> |
| <b>Overall Principle 4 Rating</b> | <b>Fully Met</b> – meets policy and practice criteria | <b>Partially met</b> – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria  | <b>Does not meet</b> – does not meet policy nor practice criteria   |

**Principle 5: Ongoing, timely, deliberate and meaningful feedback is provided on performance relative to research-based targets.**

| Indicator   | Criteria                   |  | Criteria met?   |
|---|----------------------------|--|---|
| <p>Is delivered effectively and is meaningful to the improvement of practice</p> <p>Focuses on the impact of professional practice to increase student learning</p>   | Policy Documents           | <p>District documents (such as, feedback forms or observation forms) provide a framework to evaluators for providing effective feedback.</p>   | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – District documents describe a system of feedback meeting all criteria</p>           |
|   |                            | <p>District documents describe an observation feedback schedule in which feedback is offered at least once annually (either formally or informally).</p>   | <p><b>Partially met</b> – District documents describe a system of feedback, meeting only one criteria</p> |
|   |                            |  | <p><b>Not met</b> – District documents do not describe a system of feedback or no criteria were met</p>   |
| <p>Is offered at least once annually to everyone either formally, informally or both</p> <p>Is offered in close proximity to the data gathering process (i.e. observation, survey, artifact review, etc.)</p> <p>Occurs within the context of a professional, collaborative culture</p> | Practice Data from Surveys | <p>The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The feedback I received from my evaluator is given in the spirit of continuous improvement. (<i>Teacher [Question 5b] and Principal [Question 5d] surveys</i>)</li> <li>- The feedback I have received from my evaluator helped me to become a more effective teacher/principal. (<i>Teacher [Question 5c] and Principal [Question 5a] surveys</i>)</li> <li>- My evaluator’s feedback included specific strategies that I could use to improve my practice. (<i>Teacher [Question 5d] and Principal [Question 5b] surveys</i>)</li> <li>- I have used my evaluator’s feedback to improve my practice. (<i>Teacher [Question 5e] and Principal [Question 5c] surveys</i>)</li> <li>- The feedback I provide to teachers is linked to research based practices (<i>Principal [Question 7k] survey</i>)</li> <li>- Our evaluators provide feedback in the spirit of continuous improvement (<i>District Administrator [Question 1k] survey</i>)</li> <li>- I am evaluated on whether I provide feedback to teachers each year (<i>Principal [Question 1e] survey</i>)</li> <li>- My district holds principals accountable for providing feedback to each teacher each year (<i>District Administrator [Question 1j] survey</i>)</li> <li>- In general, my evaluator provides feedback within two working days (<i>Teacher [Question 6] and Principal [Question 6] surveys</i>)</li> <li>- The feedback I receive from my evaluator promotes a professional collaborative school culture. (<i>Teacher [Question 5a] survey</i>)</li> </ul> | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – meets all practice criteria</p>   |
|   |                            | <p><b>Partially met</b> – meets the majority of practice criteria</p>  |   |



**Principle 5: Ongoing, timely, deliberate and meaningful feedback is provided on performance relative to research-based targets.**

| Indicator                                | Criteria  |  | Criteria met?  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | <p>The majority of teachers and principals indicate that they have received feedback at least once from their evaluator during this school year. (<i>Teacher [Question 4] and Principal [Question 4] surveys</i>)</p> | <p>The majority of principals indicate that they provide feedback at least once per year to each teacher (<i>Principal Survey [Question 8]</i>)</p> <p>The majority of district administrators indicate that as an evaluator they provide feedback at least once per year to each principal. (<i>District Administrator survey [Question 4]</i>)</p> | <p><b>Not met</b> – does not meet the majority of practice criteria</p>  |
| <p><b>Overall Principle 5 Rating</b></p> | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – meets policy and practice criteria</p>  | <p><b>Partially met</b> – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria</p>  | <p><b>Does not meet</b> – does not meet policy nor practice criteria</p> |

**Principle 6: Standardized, periodic training is provided for evaluators to ensure reliability and accuracy**

| Indicator  | Criteria   |   | Criteria met?  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Evaluators demonstrate skills aligned to minimum quality assurance standards established by districts and/or state.</p> <p>Training includes conducting observations focused on the quality of instruction.</p>   | <b>Policy Documents</b>                                      | <p>District requires evaluators to use the components of the MOST System on a regular basis. If not, district requires evaluator training on a regular basis that includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- procedures for insuring inter-rater reliability</li> <li>- providing effective feedback</li> <li>- assessing student data</li> <li>- analyzing artifacts</li> <li>- interpreting survey information</li> <li>- opportunities for evaluators to demonstrate and practice evaluation skills including observations and providing feedback</li> </ul> | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – using the components of the MOST System or district documents describe a system of evaluator training meeting all criteria</p> |  |
|  |  | <p><b>Partially met</b> – District documents describe a system of training meeting the majority of criteria</p>   |  |  |
|  |  | <p><b>Not met</b> – District documents do not describe a system of training or less than a majority of criteria were met</p>  |  |  |
| <p>Assessing student data, analyzing artifacts, and interpreting survey information occur.</p> <p>Time for the effective delivery of meaningful feedback is incorporated.</p> <p>Training is offered both initially and periodically to those who evaluate educator performance.</p> | <b>Practice Data from Surveys</b>                            | <p>The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I have been assessed on my ability to reliably and accurately evaluate teachers. <i>(Principal survey [Question 9b])</i></li> <li>- My district provides standardized training on the teacher evaluation system for all evaluators. <i>(Principal [Question 9a] and District Administrator [Question 1i] surveys)</i></li> </ul>   | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – meets all practice criteria</p>  |  |
|  |  | <p>The following topics were included in principal training on the teacher evaluation system <i>(Principal [Question 10] and District Administrator [Question 2] surveys)</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o procedures for ensuring inter-rater reliability</li> <li>o providing effective feedback</li> <li>o assessing student data</li> <li>o analyzing artifacts</li> <li>o interpreting survey information</li> <li>o opportunities for evaluators to demonstrate and practice evaluation skills including observations and providing feedback</li> </ul>            | <p><b>Partially met</b> – meets the majority of practice criteria</p>  |  |
|  |  |   | <p><b>Not met</b> – does not meet the majority of practice criteria</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Overall Principle 6 Rating</b></p>   | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – meets policy and practice criteria</p> |   | <p><b>Partially met</b> – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria</p>  | <p><b>Does not meet</b> – does not meet policy nor practice criteria</p> |

**Principle 7: Evaluation results and data are used to inform decisions regarding personnel, employment determinations, and human resource policies such as promotion, retention, dismissal, induction, tenure, compensation, etc.**

| Indicator  | Criteria                   |  | Criteria met?   |
|--|----------------------------|--|---|
| <p>Guides district decisions regarding employment determinations</p> <p>Informs in particular those policies that impact the extent of student learning</p> <p>Empowers the district to recognize and utilize highly effective educators</p> <p>Informs district strategies for providing targeted interventions and support</p> | Policy Documents           | <p>District policies indicate that evaluation results are used for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- retention of high-quality staff</li> <li>- dismissal</li> <li>- tenure</li> <li>- where applicable, compensation increase</li> <li>- growth and improvement plans</li> <li>- planning and delivering professional development</li> <li>- recognizing or rewarding staff</li> </ul>  | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – District documents describe the use of evaluation results in employment policies meeting all criteria</p> |
|  |                            | <p><b>Partially met</b> – District documents describe the use of evaluation results in employment policies meeting the majority of criteria</p>  |   |
|  |                            | <p><b>Not met</b> – District documents do not describe the use of evaluation results in employment policies or no criteria were met</p>  |   |
|  | Practice Data from Surveys | <p>The majority of survey respondents on each survey agree or strongly agree with the following statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The teacher evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to make well informed personnel decisions. (<i>Principal [Question 7d] and District Administrator [Question 1c] surveys</i>)</li> <li>- The results from the teacher evaluation system are used within the district to inform comprehensive school improvement plans. (<i>District Administrator survey [Question 1e]</i>)</li> <li>- The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to inform our comprehensive school improvement plans. (<i>Principal survey [Question 7f]</i>)</li> <li>- The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to recognize or reward effective teachers. (<i>Teacher [Question 1f], Principal [Question 7h] and District Administrator [Question 1g] surveys</i>)</li> <li>- The results from the teacher evaluation system inform decisions on how to utilize highly effective teachers. (<i>Principal [Question 7g] and District Administrator [Question 1f] surveys</i>)</li> <li>- The teacher evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to offer professional development opportunities that are linked to faculty needs. (<i>Principal [Question 7e] and District Administrator [Question 1d] surveys</i>)</li> <li>- The results from the teacher evaluation system are used to inform decisions about providing targeted interventions and support (e.g., professional development, performance plans, etc.). (<i>Principal [Question 7i] and District Administrator [Question 1h] surveys</i>)</li> </ul> | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – meets all practice criteria</p>   |
|  |                            | <p><b>Partially met</b> – meets the majority of practice criteria</p>  |   |

|  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The principal evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to make well informed personnel decisions. <i>(District Administrator survey [Question 3c])</i></li> <li>- The principal evaluation system provides evaluators with the information they need to offer professional development opportunities that are linked to administrator needs. <i>(District Administrator survey [Question 3d])</i></li> <li>- The results from the principal evaluation system are used to inform district improvement efforts. <i>(District Administrator survey [Question 3e])</i></li> <li>- The results from the principal evaluation system are used to identify effective administrators. <i>(District Administrator survey [Question 3f])</i></li> <li>- The results from the principal evaluation system are used to recognize or reward effective administrators. <i>(District Administrator survey [Question 3g])</i></li> <li>- The results from the principal evaluation system are used to inform decisions about providing targeted interventions and support to administrators. <i>(District Administrator survey [Question 3h])</i></li> </ul> | <p><b>Not met</b> – does not meet the majority of practice criteria</p>                   |  |
| <p><b>Overall Principle 7 Rating</b></p> |  | <p><b>Fully Met</b> – meets policy and practice criteria</p>   | <p><b>Partially met</b> – meets or partially meets either policy or practice criteria</p> | <p><b>Does not meet</b> – does not meet policy nor practice criteria</p> |