Evaluation Instruments: Research Base, Authors and Training Plans
Comstock Park Public Schools

Introduction

Comstock Park Public Schools believes in the responsibility and importance of growing the skill sets and abilities of its certified staff to their fullest potential for our student's benefit. This document is designed to demonstrate to our parents, students, and community one way we seek to achieve that goal through our evaluation process. The three evaluation instruments will be used in our evaluation process:

Michigan Association of School Boards: Superintendent Evaluation
School Advance: Administrator Evaluation
Kent County Evaluation Model: Teacher Evaluation

For each of these three instruments, we will describe and/or provide access to the following:

a. The research base that supports the instrument
b. Identity the authors and provide the qualifications of the authors
c. Evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy
d. The evaluation frameworks and rubrics
e. A description of our process for conducting classroom observations, gathering evidence, completing evaluations, etc.
f. The training plan for educators and evaluators

Michigan Association of School Boards Superintendent Evaluation

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015). Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015. Reston, VA: Author.

The 2015 Standards are the result of an extensive process that took an in-depth look at the new education leadership landscape. It involved a thorough review of empirical research (see the Bibliography for a selection of supporting sources) and sought the input of researchers and more than 1,000 school and district leaders through surveys and focus groups to identify gaps among the 2008 Standards, the day-to-day work of education leaders and leadership demands of the future. The National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals and American Association of School Administrators were instrumental to this work. The public was also invited to comment on two drafts of the Standards, which contributed to the final product. The National Policy Board for Education Administration, a consortium of professional organizations committed to advancing school leadership (including those named above), has assumed leadership of the 2015 Standards in recognition of their significance to the profession and will be their steward going forward.

Midcontinent Research for Education and Learning (2006). School District Leadership That Works: The Effect of Superintendent Leadership on Student Achievement. Denver, CO: Author.

To determine the influence of district superintendents on student achievement and the characteristics of effective superintendents, McREL, a Denver-based education research organization, conducted a meta-analysis of research—a sophisticated research technique that combines data from separate studies into a single sample of research—on the influence of school district leaders on student performance. This study is the latest in a series of meta-analyses that McREL has conducted over the past several years to determine the characteristics of effective schools, leaders and teachers. This most recent meta-analysis examines findings from 27 studies conducted since 1970 that used rigorous, quantitative methods to study the influence of school district leaders on student achievement. Altogether, these studies involved 2,817 districts and the achievement scores of 3.4 million students, resulting in what McREL researchers believe to be the largest-ever quantitative examination of research on superintendents.

Authors

The Michigan Association of School Boards has served boards of education since its inception in 1949. In the decades since, MASB has worked hands-on with tens of thousands of school board members and superintendents throughout the state. Evaluation of the superintendent has been a key aspect of that work – MASB developed superintendent evaluation instruments and trained board members in their use nearly half a century before the requirements.

MASB staff and faculty involved in creating the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation Instrument Include:
• Rodney Green, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools (retired), East China
• Olga Holden, Ph.D., Director of Leadership Services (retired), MASB
• Donna Oser, CAE, Director of Executive Search and Leadership Development, MASB
• Debbie Stair, MNML, former school board member, Board Development Manager, MASB

New York Council of School Superintendents staff and leadership involved in creating the Council's Superintendent Model Evaluation (which significantly influenced MASB's instrument):
• Jacinda H. Conboy, Esq., New York State Council of School Superintendents
• Sharon L. Contreras, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools, Syracuse City SD
• Chad C. Groff, Superintendent of Schools
• Robert J. Reidy, Executive Director, New York State Council of School Superintendents
• Maria C. Rice, Superintendent of Schools, New Paltz CSD
• Dawn A. Santiago-Marullo, Ed.D., Superintendent of Schools, Victor CSD
• Randall W. Squier, CAS, Superintendent of Schools, Coxsackie-Athens CSD
• Kathryn Wegman, Superintendent of Schools (retired), Marion CSD

Validity

Validity refers to how well an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. Construct validity was established for the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument. Construct validity ensures the assessment is actually measuring superintendent performance. Validity was established using of a panel of experts familiar with the research base and work of the effective school superintendent. The experts examined the research, identified performance indicators for measure and refined the scale for measurement.
Panel members included:
• Rodney Green, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools (retired), Consultant, MASB
• Olga Holden, Ph.D., Director of Leadership Services (retired), MASB
• Mary Kerwin, former school board member, Senior Consultant, MASB
• Debbie Stair, MNML, former school board member, Board Development Manager, MASB

Efficacy

Efficacy refers to the capacity of the evaluation instrument to produce the desired or intended results. The MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument has three intended outcomes:
• To accurately assess the level of a superintendent's job performance
• To improve the superintendent's professional practice and impact on student learning
• To advance the goals of the school district

MASB will seek to establish efficacy of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument by surveying school board members and superintendents from a representative sample of school districts (see details below). An electronic survey instrument will be used to ascertain the extent to which:
• The district followed the prescribed process for conducting the evaluation, and
• The evaluation instrument and prescribed process supported the stated outcomes

Reliability

Reliability is the degree to which an evaluation instrument produces stable and consistent results. While there are several types of reliability, MASB will seek to establish the test-retest reliability of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument. Test-retest reliability is a measure of reliability obtained by administering the same instrument twice over a period of time to a group of individuals. To accomplish this, a representative sample of school districts using the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument will participate in a reliability study. A minimum of 15 school districts (with low board member turnover and no transition in the superintendency) will conduct an evaluation at the midpoint of their evaluation cycle (T1) and again at the end of their evaluation (T2). Scores from the two assessments will then be correlated in order to evaluate the test for reliability. A coefficient of 7.0 or higher will indicate acceptable stability.

Evaluation Rubric

The complete MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument
http://www.masb.org/Portals/0/Education_Community/Superintendents/MASBSuptEvaluation2016.pdf

Planning

At the beginning of the year in which the evaluation is to occur, the Board of Education and superintendent convene a meeting in public and agree upon the following items:
• Evaluation instrument
• Evaluation timeline and key dates
• Performance goals (if necessary beyond performance indicators outlined in rubric, district-wide improvement goals and student growth model)
• Appropriate benchmarks and checkpoints (formal and informal) throughout year
• Artifacts to be used to evidence superintendent performance
• Process for compiling the year-end evaluation
• Process and individual(s) responsible for conducting the evaluation conference with the superintendent
• Process and individual(s) responsible for establishing a performance improvement plan for the superintendent, if needed
• Process and individual(s) responsible for sharing the evaluation results with the community
Checkpoints: The Board of Education and superintendent meet at key points in the evaluation year as follows:
• Three months in – Informal update – Superintendent provides written update to the board. Board president shares with the superintendent any specific concerns/questions from the board.
• Six months in – Formal update – Superintendent provides update on progress along with available evidence prior to convening a meeting in public. Board president collects questions from the board and provides to superintendent prior to meeting. Board and superintendent discuss progress and make adjustments to course or goals, if needed.
• Nine months in – Informal update – Superintendent provides written update to the board. Board president shares with the superintendent any specific concerns/questions from the board.
• 11-12 months in – Formal evaluation – Superintendent conducts self-evaluation; presents portfolio with evidence to Board of Education (made available prior to meeting). Board members review portfolio prior to evaluation meeting; seek clarification as needed. Board president (or consultant) facilitates evaluation. Formal evaluation is adopted by Board of Education.
Evidence

Validity, reliability and efficacy of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument relies upon board members using evidence to score superintendent performance.
• Artifacts to serve as evidence of superintendent performance should be identified at the beginning of the evaluation cycle and mutually agreed upon by the Board of Education and the superintendent.

• Artifacts should be limited to only what is needed to inform scoring superintendent performance. Excessive artifacts cloud the evaluation process and waste precious time and resources.
• Boards of education and superintendents should establish when artifacts are to be provided, i.e., as they originate, at designated checkpoints, during self-evaluation, etc. A list of possible artifacts that may be used as evidence is provided at the end of each professional practice domain rubric. Appendix D of the evaluation instrument offers additional artifacts that may serve as evidence of performance.

Conducting the Formal Evaluation and Conference
Prior to meeting:
• Superintendent prepares self-evaluation, compiles evidence and provides to Board of Education.
• Board members seek clarity as needed regarding self-evaluation or evidence provided.
• Board of Education members receive blank evaluation instrument and make individual notes about their observations.
During meeting:
• Superintendent presents self-evaluation and evidence. Superintendent remains present throughout the meeting.
• Board president reviews with Board of Education superintendent's self-evaluation and evidence provided for each domain and facilitates conversation about performance.
• Score is assigned for each performance indicator via consensus of the Board of Education.
• Upon completion of all performance indicators within all domains, board president calculates overall professional practice score and identifies the correlating rating.
• Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to progress toward district-wide goals.
• Score is assigned for progress toward district-wide goals via consensus of Board of Education.
• Board president reviews with Board of Education evidence provided related to district's student growth model.
• Score is assigned for student growth via consensus of Board of Education.
• Board president calculates overall evaluation score based on professional practice, progress toward district-wide improvement goals and student growth ratings.
• Board president makes note of themes/trends identified by the Board of Education during the evaluation.
• Board president calls for vote to adopt completed year-end evaluation for superintendent.
• Superintendent notes his/her comments on evaluation.
• Board president and superintendent sign completed evaluation form.
After the meeting:
• Completed evaluation form reflects Board of Education's assessment of superintendent's performance.
• Board president works with superintendent to coordinate public statement about superintendent's performance.
Contingencies:
If a superintendent is rated as minimally effective or ineffective, the Board of Education must develop and require the superintendent to implement an improvement plan to

correct the deficiencies. The improvement plan must recommend professional development opportunities and other actions designed to improve the rating of the superintendent on his/her next annual evaluation.

If a superintendent is rated as highly effective on three consecutive annual evaluations, the Board of Education may choose to conduct an evaluation biennially instead of annually. However, if a superintendent is not rated as highly effective on one of these biennial evaluations, the superintendent must again be evaluated annually.

Developing an Individual Development Plan

Individual Development Plans are an excellent way of helping employees develop their skills. Boards of education should encourage superintendents to develop an IDP in order to foster professional development.

In the event that a superintendent receives a rating that is less than effective, the law requires the creation of an IDP. The following process is a framework for creating and implementing an IDP for the superintendent:
• During the evaluation conference, the Board of Education provides clear feedback to the superintendent in the domain(s) in which he/she received a less than effective rating.
• A committee of the Board of Education is established to support and monitor the superintendent's development.
• The superintendent drafts an IDP and presents it to the committee for feedback and approval. The IDP outlines clear growth objectives, as well as the training and development activities in which the superintendent will engage to accomplish objectives. The committee reviews, provides feedback and approves the IDP.
• The committee meets quarterly with the superintendent to monitor and discuss progress.
• The superintendent reports progress on his/her IDP with his/her self-evaluation prior to the formal annual evaluation.

MASB Superintendent Evaluation Instrument Assurances
http://www.masb.org/postingrequirements

The School Advance Model (Administrators)

The Research Base

"The six guiding principles for designing performance evaluation and feedback systems that support learning, growth, and adaptation were developed by Dr. Patricia Reeves and Dr. George Aramath, based on a two-year meta-analysis of the literature on performance assessment and feedback.

The administrator evaluation rubrics were developed by Dr. Reeves and Mrs. Patricia McNeill based on a one-year meta review of extant administrator evaluation instruments and research bases.

The work for both were significantly informed by the work of the Wallace Foundation, including two Michigan based Wallace Foundation grant projects focused on school level

leadership development. Dr. Reeves served on the grant faculty teams for both of these projects with the late Dr. Van Cooley and Dr. Jianping Shen of Western Michigan University.

Dr. Reeves and Mrs. McNeill are also experienced school administrators who each served for over two decades as school administrators in Michigan."

Source: http://www.goschooladvance.org/Research-and-Development
Authors

School Advance was created by Dr. Patricia Reeves and Mrs. Patricia McNeill., for full biographies, http://www.goschooladvance.org/Who-Created-School-ADvance

Dr. Patricia Reeves

Dr. Patricia Reeves is an Associate Professor of educational leadership, research, and evaluation in the College of Education and Human Development at Western Michigan University – Department of Educational Leadership, Research, and Technology. She also serves a contracted MASA Associate Executive Director for Administrator Certification and Development. Dr. Reeves joined the MASA team and the WMU faculty in 2005 with 19 years' experience as a K-12 assistant superintendent and superintendent. Prior to that, she was a Director of Instruction, a Gifted and Talented Program Specialist, a Reading Specialist, and a classroom teacher.

Dr. Reeves played a key role in researching state administrator credentialing systems, developing policy recommendations, drafting legislation, and working with the Michigan Department of Education to establish policies and rules for Michigan's Administrator credentialing system. Dr. Reeves' major contribution to this work was the conceptualization and design of Michigan's three-tiered administrator credentialing options and, specifically, the introduction of specialty and enhanced endorsements. In conjunction with her work at the policy and legislative level, Dr. Reeves also co-developed the Courageous Journey programs for superintendent specialty and enhanced endorsements and the MASA DISC system of developing, inducting, supporting, and credentialing K-12 district leaders.

Mrs. Patricia McNeill
* Executive Director, Michigan ASCD January 2010- July 2016
* Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum, Instruction + Professional Development – Holt Public Schools March 1997-December 2009
* Curriculum Director – Waverly Public Schools September 1992-March1997
* Staff Developer – Waverly Public Schools August 1984- September 1992
* Waverly High School Special Education (Learning Disabilities) Consultant * Sanilac Career Center Learning Specialist * Sandusky Schools Adult Education Teacher * Cooperative Pre-School Teacher * Harrison Elementary Special Education Teacher * Harrison Elementary 3rd Grade Teacher

Evidence of Reliability, Validity and Efficacy:
Source: http://www.goschooladvance.org/node/97

The School ADvance Administrator Evaluation System is based on Four Assumptions, which are grounded in the work of researchers in the field of educator performance evaluation:

- The ultimate goal of educator evaluation is to achieve better results for students by fostering improved effectiveness of teachers and leaders.
- New accountability requirements have enormous implications for administrators' expertise—and for the way they do business and spend their time.
- High-stakes accountability must be balanced with ongoing feedback and support for continuous improvement.
- Evaluation should not be something we do to people; rather, it should empower employees to take responsibility for their own learning, growth, and performance.

The School ADvance System holds to **Ten Core Values**, which we believe hold up through many perspectives—community, board, administrator, teacher, student. Those **Ten Core Values** are the following:

1. Growing capacity for better student results
2. Two-way dialogue and interaction
3. A grounding in research supported practice
4. Self-Assessment and reflective practice
5. Authentic feedback
6. Growth targets that really matter
7. Personal ownership
8. Context, conditions, and student characteristics
9. Multiple sources of data/evidence
10. Student results

Moreover, the developers have identified **six research-aligned principles** and critical elements that must be part of any comprehensive educator evaluation system for teachers and administrators.
As a result, the School ADvance Administrator Evaluation System is**:**

1. **Authentic**, using evidence-based practices to achieve better student outcomes
2. **Professional**, building personal commitment and efficacy for growth and improvement
3. **Purpose Driven**, focused on measurable improvement targets for student success
4. **Adaptive**, fostering self-assessment, reflective practice, action research, and innovative methods of improving student results
5. **Evidence Based,** data informed, using multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data tied to student achievement and evidence-based practice including achievement and observation data
6. **Inclusive**, serving all, with alignment between student, teacher, administrator, and district improvement goals

By incorporating these elements, School ADvance can assist teachers, administrators, and boards of education in answering the three important questions regarding their own work:

- *Where am I right now in my learning and performance?*
- *Where should I focus next to learn, grow, and improve?*

- *How should I proceed to reach that next level of performance?*
-

The Actual Evaluation Frameworks and Rubrics: School Advance
A request to review the actual rubrics can be made by clicking here.

Evaluation Process: Administrators

I. Self-Assessment: Using the School Advance Rubrics, the administrator self-assesses his/her performance

II. Goal Setting Conference: The building administrator and the evaluator meet in the beginning of the year to set performance goals for the upcoming school year.
   A. Connection to Self-Assessment: performance goals are individualized to the growth needs of the administrator.
   B. Connection to District Priorities: performance goals relate to and support district priorities.

III. Personal Growth Plan: a set of activities is designed to support the administrator's achievement of his/her goals.

IV. Establish Formative Performance Profile: the building administrator compiles evidence in an electronic portfolio.
   A. Evidence has connection to personal growth goals.
   B. Evidence has connection to district goals.

V. Mid-Year Conference: evaluator meets with the building administrator for a reflective conversation.
   A. Progress made on Personal Growth Plan and artifacts is collected and discussed.
   B. Barriers to progress being made on the Personal Growth Plan, if any, are explored.
   C. Any necessary alterations to the plan that are needed to support personal and/or district goals, if needed, are made.

VI. Update Formative Performance Profile: the building administrator adds to evidence in an electronic portfolio
   A. Evidence has connection to personal growth.
   B. Evidence has connection to district goals.

VII. End of year summative meeting
   A. Update Performance Profile (portfolio) and evaluate the connection to personal and district goals.
   B. Evaluator shares ratings from the summative rubric as well as overall rating.
   C. Dialogue on potential goals for the following year is initiated.

VIII. On-going dialogue: conversation and dialogue is an ongoing process between the evaluator and the building administrator, in addition to beginning, mid-year, and end of year conferences.

Training Plan

Administrators received training in the School Advance in the fall of 2016, and this will be revisited throughout the 16-17 school year. Our goal is to increase the administrator's understanding of the characteristics in the evaluation rubric at the minimally effective, effective, and highly effective levels and to align personal growth goal to the characteristics in the evaluation rubric.

School Advance Assurances
http://www.goschooladvance.org/sites/default/files/AssurancesDoc_Michigan_Users_2016_6.pdf?sid=402

Kent County Evaluation Model (Teachers)
The Kent County Evaluation Committee developed the Kent County Evaluation Model with a panel of respected educators from around the county which comprised of many hours of reading, research, and data management. The intent of the document was to not only comply with legislation changed to educator evaluation and compensation, but to improve student growth.
Kent County Evaluation Model –

Evidence

Validity, reliability and efficacy of the Kent County Wide Evaluation Instrument relies upon administrators using student data and evidence to score teacher performance. The Kent County Evaluation Instrument was developed with research, reviewed, and revised by a panel of committee members familiar with research and studies of effective teachers and measuring teaching performance. The experts on the Evaluation committee examined the research, identified performance indicators for measure and refined the scale for measurement. The Kent County Evaluation Instrument is intended to assess the level of teacher performance, improve the teacher's professional practice in impact on student learning, and to advance the professional goals of the school district. Kent County Human Resources Committee has reviewed the process with the county and sought feedback regarding the usage of the tool.

Evidence of Reliability, Validity and Efficacy:
The authors provide the following website where they list studies that support the reliability, validity and efficacy of The Framework:
https://www.danielsongroup.org/research/

Authors

Kent ISD and local agency staff and faculty involved in creating the Kent County Evaluation Instrument include:

- Christine Annese, Assistant Superintendent, Forest Hills Public Schools
- Brad Blazer, Teacher, Caledonia Public Schools
- Sarah Earnest, Assistant Superintendent, Wyoming Public Schools
- Russ Gerbers, Director of Technology, Kenowa Hills Public Schools
- Ryan Molenkamp, Teacher, Byron Center Public Schools

- Gordi Nickels, Superintendent, Sparta Public Schools
- Tony Silveri, Principal, Caledonia Public Schools

Kent Intermediate School District Evaluation Process: Summary

Kent ISD Teacher (Probationary)

Goal-Setting Forms and Conference: (Sept./Oct.)

- Teacher develops and submits draft IDP.
- Principal and teacher meet to finalize IDP.
- Principal may require teacher to complete a self-evaluation on the identified rubric.
- Teacher may submit Goal Setting Artifacts. This is optional.

Announced Observation (occurs two times): (Sept. – Apr.)

- Teacher completes and submits Pre-Observation Form online at least one school day prior to observation.
- Teacher provides lesson plan prior to observation.
- Teacher may upload other artifacts related to the lesson.
- Principal observes teacher.
- Teacher completes a Post Observation Form within 2 school days of classroom observation.
- Principal completes observation notes and assessment of the observation.
- Post-Observation Conference is held within 10 school days of classroom observation. (This may be held in conjunction with a quarterly data dialogue.)
- Teacher or principal may upload additional artifacts after completion of the lesson.

Unannounced Observation: (Sept. – Apr.)

- Principal observes teacher.
- Principal may require teacher to provide lesson plan during or after the observation.
- Principal completes observation notes and assessment of observation.
- Teacher or principal may upload additional artifacts related to the lesson.
- Post-Observation Conference is held within 10 school days of classroom observation. (This may be held in conjunction with a quarterly data dialogue.)

Mid-Year Forms and Conference: (Jan.)

- Teacher completes and submits Self Reflection of Goals.
- Teacher and principal meet to discuss teacher's progress on IDP. (This may be held in conjunction with a quarterly data dialogue.)
- Principal adds mid-year progress report on IDP and updated goals if needed.
- Teacher or principal may upload mid-year artifacts.

Evidence: (Sept. – Mar.)

- Teacher submits evidence to principal by April 1st. Evidence is submitted online.

Year-End Forms and Evidence: (Apr. – May)

- Teacher completes self-assessment of IDP by completing the Goal End Summary.
- Teacher or principal may upload year-end artifacts.
- Teacher completes pre and post testing data reports after Q1, Q2, and Q3. These are reviewed with the administrator at a quarterly data dialogue. The Q3 cumulative report determines the student growth score for the teacher evaluation.

Year-End Summative Evaluation (May)

- Teacher and principal meet to discuss final summative evaluation.
- Summative evaluation is electronically signed online.
- The evaluation rubric is followed.
- IDP or Professional Growth Goal is discussed/planned for the following year.

Kent ISD Teacher (Tenured)

Goal-Setting Forms and Conference (Sept./Oct.)

- Teacher enters Professional Goals online. The goals are set using input from the prior year evaluation.
- Principal and teacher meet to discuss Professional Goals.
- Principal may require teacher to complete a self-evaluation on the identified rubric.
- Teacher may submit Goal Setting Artifacts. This is optional.
- If a teacher has completed three consecutive years teaching at KISD with a Highly Effective rating, they may be off-cycle in evaluation and engage only in goal setting and monitoring for the year.

Announced Observation: (Sept. – Apr.)

- Teacher completes and submits Pre-Observation Form online at least one day prior to observation.
- Teacher provides lesson plan at least one day prior to observation.
- Teacher may upload other artifacts related to the lesson.
- Principal observes teacher.
- Teacher completes a Post Observation Form within 2 school days of classroom observation.
- Principal completes observation notes and assessment of the observation.
- Post-Observation Conference is held within 10 school days of classroom observation. (This may be held in conjunction with a quarterly data dialogue.)
- Teacher or principal may upload additional artifacts after completion of the lesson.

Unannounced Observation: (Sept. – Apr.)

- Principal observes teacher.
- Principal may require teacher to provide lesson plan during or after the observation.
- Principal completes observation notes and assessment of observation.
- Teacher or principal may upload additional artifacts related to the lesson.

- Post-Observation Conference is held within 10 school days of classroom observation. (This may be held in conjunction with a quarterly data dialogue.)

Evidence: (Sept. – Mar.)

- Teacher submits evidence to principal by April 1st. Evidence is submitted online.

Year-End Forms and Evidence: (Sept. – May.)

- Teacher completes self-assessment goals by completing the Goal End Summary.
- Teacher or principal may upload year-end artifacts.
- Teacher completes pre and post testing data reports after Q1, Q2, and Q3. These are reviewed with the administrator at a quarterly data dialogue. The Q3 cumulative report determines the student growth score for the teacher evaluation.

Year-End Summative Evaluation: (May)

- Teacher and principal meet to discuss final summative evaluation.
- Summative evaluation is electronically signed online.
- The evaluation rubric is followed.
- Professional Growth Goal is discussed/planned for the following year.

Training Plan

Teachers and Administrators will receive training in the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning Framework in the 2016-2017 school year for use in the 2017-2018 school year. Our goal is to increase the teacher's understanding of the characteristics in the evaluation rubric at the minimally effective, effective, and highly effective levels and to align personal growth goal to the characteristics in the evaluation rubric. 5D Teacher Evaluation Assurances
http://mymassp.com/5D_teacher_evaluation_postings_and_assurances