

## Appendix A: Steps for Completing the State Teacher Evaluation

**These appendices include the procedural steps for conducting a full State Teacher Evaluation in both the Professional Practices and Student Growth areas. The evaluator would use only those parts of the instrument appropriate and required for a specific evaluation year (ex. Student Growth, but not Professional Practices).**

The following Preliminary Steps are recommended, prior to using the State Teacher Evaluation Instrument:

1. Provide overview training of the evaluation system framework for teacher (state requirements, local/state models, connection to waiver application approved by MSDE, SLOs, SPI, Maryland Teacher and Principal Evaluation Guidebook)
2. Provide guidance on teacher SLOs as related to district master/strategic plans, school improvement plans, and complexity factors
3. Provide documentation in memorandum to individual teachers about the evaluation process and expectations that will be utilized (provides Due Process, opportunity to assimilate information and think about goals and SLOs, evaluation timeline, and describes formal visits). Include attachments on Professional Practice Standards, SLOs, process of formal visits – who, how often, types of visit.

TIMEFRAME	STEP	EVALUATOR ( Principal )	TEACHER
August  <i>(May begin at annual evaluation conference)</i>	<u>Pre-Planning</u> Investing in purposeful pre-planning is essential to insuring that the subsequent Initial Conference will be intentional, targeted, and data/information supported, with clear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review data, information, measurements, and teacher performance rating</li> </ul> Data, information, and measurements are used to describe the performance of the teacher, the status of a school and the effectiveness of the school’s instructional programs.  A variety of data will be used to initiate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review data, information, measurements, and teacher performance rating</li> </ul> Teachers need to be knowledgeable of and able to reference State publications on the topics of teacher evaluation which provide comprehensive information in

	<p>goals, measurable evidence, and mutual agreements. Advance preparation with regard to these expectations will significantly enhance the potential that the Initial Conference will be manageable in content and length and will elevate the likelihood for rich and objective conversation between the evaluator and the teacher</p>	<p>dialogue between the teacher and the principal throughout the school year. Quantitative, qualitative, archival, and anecdotal sources may include, but are not limited to the following examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most recent data streams of MSAs, HSAs, SPI ( GAP, Growth, Achievement, College and Career Readiness ), Individual Learning Plans</li> <li>• Local and/or National Standardized Assessments</li> <li>• Reading, Writing, and Mathematics measures,</li> <li>• Achievement of Grade Level or Course Objectives</li> <li>• Parent and/or student surveys</li> <li>• Benchmark assessments</li> <li>• Marking period grade distributions</li> <li>• Observation reports</li> <li>• Portfolios</li> </ul>	<p>substantial detail on the requirements and expectations as well as the content and processes of their evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attend and actively participate in the professional development activities on topics and issues related to the preliminary Information</li> </ul> <p>In addition to providing printed materials on the topic of teacher evaluation, both State and local education specialists may work with system leaders to help them to provide on-going professional development and resources to enhance teachers' understandings of evaluation content and processes. These sessions are available and may be requested based on a system's needs. Written materials, webinars, learning modules, and other electronic learning opportunities will be available to supplement face-to face meetings.</p>
--	---	---	--

			<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Self Assessment</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Revisit developmental needs and achievement targets identified in previous evaluation/s and observation reports</li></ul> <p>In the spirit of on-going, continuing growth, the teacher should consult her/his past evaluations noting levels of success and needs for further growth and development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identify priority needs in the School Improvement Plan that are to be reflected in classroom goals for the teacher. The school improvement plan provides important information regarding identifying targets, gathering evidence of growth, and establishing strategies for improvement.</li></ul>
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Craft SLOs (2 to 4)</li> </ul> <p>The teacher crafts preliminary SLOs utilizing the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objective summary statement</li> <li>2. Data review and baseline Evidence</li> <li>3. Student population</li> <li>4. Learning content</li> <li>5. Instructional interval</li> <li>6. Target</li> <li>7. Evidence of growth</li> <li>8. Strategies</li> <li>9. Professional development, resources, and support needed</li> </ol>
--	--	--	---

<i>August &amp; Sept.</i>	<p><u>Initial Conference</u></p> <p>The dialogue essential to an effective evaluation process that promotes the professional growth of the teacher is established in the Initial Conference. Here the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set Goals, Strategies, and Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)</li> </ul> <p>The initial conference will be held between the evaluator and the teacher being evaluated. At this time, the teacher and evaluator will discuss goals and objectives for student achievement as well as strategies to be utilized and supports the teacher will need, including professional development. Available student performance data will be reviewed. The teacher will provide preliminary SLOs for discussion and agreement.</p>
---------------------------	---	---

	<p>partners in this effort establish a conversation focused on the specific targets by which the teacher will be evaluated. More importantly, they are determining the kind and level of growth that is in the best interest of the students, school, and the community it serves. The Initial Conference establishes the parameters for all of the remaining steps in the evaluation process: the classroom visits, the mid-year conference, data analysis, and the end-of-year conference.</p>	<p>A conference for review of progress of the SLOs will be established. Classroom visits, their timing and focus will be discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Review Values for Professional Practice (50%) and Student Growth (50%) Sections <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Review the domains for Professional Practice and the means for determining domain scores within each section</li> <li>➤ Identify goals for each outcome and identify what evidence will be provided to measure each goal</li> <li>➤ Determine possible levels of goal accomplishment based on the evaluation rubric</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Identify resources, supports, and/or professional development that will be provided</li> <li>● Schedule formal classroom visits to observe Professional Practices</li> </ul>
<p>October - December</p>	<p><u>Classroom Visits (First semester)</u></p> <p>The direct formal and informal observation of the teacher are focused on collecting the evidence agreed upon</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Conduct formal and informal visits and provide written and face to face feedback (during first semester)</li> </ul> <p>The evaluator conducts at least two formal classroom observations per school year for each teacher but may conduct additional informal visits for teachers, especially those who are new to their district, school, the profession or who have received ratings below Effective. In dynamic learning communities, the respectful exchange of feedback is a natural element of the school culture. The spirit of open communication is intentional,</p>

	<p>in the Initial Conference. The principal's findings must provide constructive feedback both at the conclusion of the classroom visit and in the Mid-Year Conference.</p>	<p>and evaluators are frequent visitors offering constructive feedback to help teachers reflect on their performance and contribution to student achievement. The basic requirements for conducting classroom visits include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ At least one formal classroom visit per semester</li><li>➤ Written feedback is required after each classroom visit.</li></ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Feedback</u></p> <p>The goal of feedback is to help teachers to grow as educators. With this in mind, evaluators should be clear and direct, presenting their comments in a way that feels supportive and constructive. To the extent possible, feedback should be grounded in the component language found in the Professional Practice Outcomes</p> <p>Even the most effective teachers can improve and should receive constructive feedback. This does not, however, mean that evaluators need to identify an area for development every time they provide feedback. Some helpful hints on delivering and receiving feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Deliver feedback as soon as possible</li><li>➤ Use a warm and professional tone</li><li>➤ Be specific</li><li>➤ Present feedback without personal opinion</li><li>➤ Discuss next steps, including professional development and support</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Collect evidence for Professional Practice Outcomes and Annual Student Growth measures including data from school visits and data provided by the teacher. (It is helpful if the teacher provides examples based on Profession Practice Outcomes.)</li></ul>
--	---	--

		<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Artifact Collection and Review</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The focus of the artifact collection should be on quality rather than quantity.</li> <li>➤ All artifacts collected should be clearly connected to the performance measures of one or more of the components in the Professional Practice Outcomes.</li> <li>➤ One artifact could be used to demonstrate proficiency on more than one component of the rubric.</li> <li>➤ Teachers may submit brief notes or explanations for why certain artifacts have been submitted if they feel it may not be immediately clear to the evaluator.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Flexibility Factor</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Districts can decide the specific process for artifact collection and review, including what and how many artifacts will be collected.</li> <li>➤ Timelines may also be determined at the local level, but it is important to ensure expectations are clearly communicated to all teacher</li> </ul>
<p>January - February</p>	<p><u>Mid- Year Conference</u> Review, discussion and evaluation of both Student Growth and Professional Practice data occurs in this mid-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Review progress toward Student Growth and Professional Practice targets</li> <li>● For teachers not showing effective Professional Practice, appropriate resources, support, and professional development would be warranted</li> </ul>

	<p>year conference. In some instances, final conclusions may be possible in the areas of growth data. However, Professional Practice data is likely to be incomplete at this time. Mid-year corrections or adjustments to SLO targets and evidence may be appropriate based on unanticipated changes in the class, available new data, etc. Still, only tentative conclusions regarding the teacher's final evaluation are possible. More data remains to be collected during and perhaps after the next classroom visit.</p>	<p>at this time in order to promote those effective practices needing improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consider the nature of the progress and determine whether adjustments are warranted</li><li>• Make appropriate mid-year adjustments</li></ul>
--	---	--

<p>March - April</p>	<p><u>Classroom Visit</u> <u>(Second Semester)</u></p> <p>During this classroom visit, the evaluator's focus must be set on enhancing the data collected in the first visit and analyzed/discussed as part of the Mid-Year Conference. In addition, the evaluator needs to gather information on those Professional Practice Targets set in the Initial Conference and/or adjusted at the time of the Mid-Year Conference.</p>	<p>(See description of classroom visits, feedback, and artifacts collection above)</p>
<p>April - May</p>	<p><u>Data Analysis</u></p> <p>In the spirit of collegiality, the teacher is encouraged to begin the careful analysis of both Student Growth Data and Professional Practice Outcome Data/</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both the evaluator and teacher analyze data and evidence for achievement of Goals, Professional Practice Outcomes, and SLOs</li> <li>• For Student Growth Targets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Evaluate the most recent data streams and apply MSAs and SPI values to the Educator Effectiveness formula</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>Artifacts in preparation for the Evaluation Conference. Both the evaluator and the teacher should draw data-supported conclusions about the teacher's level of performance prior to the Evaluation Conference. Those conclusions must be based on the evidences that were agreed upon in the Initial Conference as well as the evidences that may have been adjusted in the Mid-Year Conference.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Grade the SLOs and apply the SLO values to the Educator Effectiveness formula</li> <li>• For Professional Practiced Targets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Evaluate Professional Practice using weights and rubric and apply the Total Score to Educator Effectiveness formula</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Using formula, calculate Educator Effectiveness Rating</li> <li>• Identify resources, supports, and/or professional development as may be required.</li> </ul>
<p>May-June (earlier for non-renewal situations)</p>	<p><u>Calculating Teacher Effectiveness</u></p> <p><u>Draft Evaluation</u></p>	<p>The Total Professional Practice and Student Growth Measures scores should be entered into the appropriate level of the teacher effectiveness rating calculation formula resulting in an Effectiveness Rating.</p> <p>Draft evaluation is written by the evaluator. It is provided to the teacher for review and input</p>

	<p><u>Evaluation Conference</u></p> <p>In a number of respects this conference brings closure to the teacher’s evaluation for it concludes with the calculation of the teacher’s annual evaluation. When done in the spirit of promoting the teacher’s professional growth, this conference also provides the starting point for the teacher’s future performance, the growth of the students in her/his care and the contributions to the improvement of the school.</p>	<p>The Evaluation Conference is conducted at the end of the school year. During this conference, the evaluator will review, discuss, and score the discuss the teacher’s SLOs (See Appendix B, <i>Student Growth Measures</i>, provided by MSDE (see Part 1), the Student Growth, and the Professional Practice portions of the Teacher Evaluation Instrument (see Appendix C).</p> <p>Ideally, during this meeting, upon reviewing the final draft evaluation, consensus will be reached regarding the final evaluation ratings and comments. However, if consensus cannot be reached, the evaluator will make the final decision and prepare the final evaluation. Preliminary goals for the following year are determined and , and final evaluation is provided to the teacher for signature.</p> <p>Note: For teachers who are continuing in the same assignment, it may be possible to conduct the Evaluation Conference and a portion of the next cycle’s Initial conference at the same time.</p>
	<p>Final Evaluation Signing, Appeals, &amp; Addendums</p>	<p>Following the Evaluation Conference and the writing of the final evaluation, the evaluator and teacher are to sign the “Teacher Evaluation: Effectiveness Rating” page. These signatures are an affirmation of process, not content. The teacher reserves the right to include addendums to the evaluation document and, where possible, appeal the Effectiveness Rating to a higher authority. Discussions pertaining to support, resources, and professional development would be appropriate at this time.</p>

## **Appendix B: Using SLOs in the State Teacher Evaluation**

This appendix includes the procedural information for completing the Student Learning Objective section of the State Teacher Evaluation Instrument. Included in this Appendix are 4 documents:

1. Student Learning Objectives (SLOs): Template for Teachers
2. Student Learning Objectives: Guiding Questions for Teachers to Write SLOs
3. Student Learning Objectives: Rubric for Approval of Teacher Written SLOs
4. Student Learning Objectives: Scoring Process for the Maryland Teacher Evaluation Model

All of these documents are available for downloading and copying at <http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/programs/tpe>.

**B1. Student Learning Objective (SLO)  
Template for Teachers**

Teacher's Name \_ \_\_\_\_\_ School \_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_

<i>SLO Component</i>	
<i>Objective Summary Statement</i>	<b>1. Summarize the long term academic goal for students.</b>
<i>Data Review &amp; Baseline Evidence</i>	<b>2. Describe and explain the process and information used to create this SLO.</b>
<i>Student Population</i>	<b>3. Describe and explain the student group(s) selected for this SLO.</b>
<i>Learning Content</i>	<b>4. Describe the specific content focus for this SLO.</b>
<i>Instructional Interval</i>	<b>5. Describe the instructional period for this SLO.</b>
<i>Target</i>	<b>6. Describe and explain the expectations for student growth for students included in this SLO.</b>
<i>Evidence of Growth</i>	<b>7. Describe what evidence will be used to determine student progress or growth.</b>
<i>Strategies</i>	<b>8. Describe and explain the key instructional strategies selected for implementation to support students in reaching the growth target for this SLO.</b>

<p><i>Teacher Professional Development (PD) and Support</i></p>	<p><b>9. Describe and explain the professional development opportunities that will support your instruction for this SLO.</b></p> <p><b>Describe and explain any additional materials or resources that will support your instruction and assist students in meeting the growth target for this SLO.</b></p>
<p><i>Target Results</i></p> <p>To be completed by the teacher prior to the End of Instructional Interval Conference</p>	

<i>Activity</i>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Teacher's Signature</b>	<b>Principal's Signature</b>
<p><i>Initial Conference</i></p> <p>Include comments as needed.</p>			
<p><i>SLO Approved</i></p>			
<p><i>Mid-Interval Review</i></p> <p>Include comments or mid-interval</p>			

adjustments if applicable.			
<b><i>End of Instructional Interval Conference</i></b>  Include comments as needed.  Score SLO using chart below.			
<b><i>Final Rating &amp; Score</i></b>	<b>Choose one:</b>		
<b>Total possible points for this SLO</b>	<b>Insufficient Attainment of Target</b> (33% x total possible points) =		<b>pts</b>
_ _ points	<b>Partial Attainment of Target</b> (67% x total possible points) =		<b>pts</b>
	<b>Full Attainment of Target</b> (100% of total possible points) =		<b>pts</b>

**B2: Student Learning Objective (SLO)  
Guiding Questions for Teachers to Write SLO**

This document is intended to provide information and guidance regarding the components of an SLO. The questions will assist teachers in completing the *Student Learning Objective Template for Teachers* prior to submission to the principal. Principals will use the *Rubric for Approving Teacher Written SLO* to review and approve the SLO.

<i>SLO Component</i>	<i>(Numbering Continued from B1)</i>
<i>Objective Summary Statement</i>	<p><b>1. Summarize the long-term academic goal for students</b> e.g. Students will improve their reading comprehension of informational text, increase the pass rate on Algebra I end-of-course assessments, increase mastery of Common Core State Writing Standards.</p>
<i>Data Review &amp; Baseline Evidence</i>	<p><b>2. Describe and explain the process and information used to create this SLO.</b></p> <p>a) Identify specific data sources used in the data analysis process.</p> <p>b) Identify baseline data for current student performance levels for all students taught by the teacher including student subgroup populations. (English language learners, special education, free and reduced meals (FARMS), gifted and talented, race/ethnicity)</p> <p><b>For more information about the data analysis process, go to:</b>  <a href="http://mdk12.org/process/cfip/index.html">http://mdk12.org/process/cfip/index.html</a>.</p>
<i>Student Population</i>	<p><b>3. Describe and explain the student group(s) selected for this SLO.</b></p> <p>a) What is the number and percentage of students targeted in the SLO?</p> <p>b) What is the grade level or performance level of the students?</p> <p>c) Does this student population represent the majority of the class total and/or does it represent a student subgroup? (English language learners, special education, free and reduced meals (FARMS), gifted and talented, race/ethnicity)</p>
<i>Learning Content</i>	<p><b>4. Describe the specific content focus for this SLO.</b></p> <p>a) What Maryland Common Core State Curriculum, Maryland curriculum, international, national, state, local, or industry standards are selected to develop the SLO?</p>

	b) What are (is) the essential knowledge and skills (critical content) that students must master?
<i>Instructional Interval</i>	<b>5. Describe the instructional period for this SLO.</b> What is the length of time the teacher has for instruction to meet the target? (e.g. one semester, one year)
<i>Target</i>	<b>6. Describe and explain the expectations for student growth for students included in this SLO.</b> a) Are the expectations/progress defined for all students included in this SLO? For example: achievement level, scores, percentages b) Explain why the target is appropriate and rigorous, including impact of any complexity factors.
<i>Evidence of Growth</i>	<b>7. Describe what evidence will be used to determine student progress or growth.</b> a) Identify the measures or assessments. For example: pre- and post-testing, formative, summative, performance-based b) Are the measures aligned to standards? c) How was it determined that the assessments are appropriate for the student populations listed? d) Will they provide the evidence to determine if the target has been met? e) Do the measures meet criteria established by state, district, or school?
<i>Strategies</i>	<b>8. Describe and explain the key instructional strategies selected for implementation to support students in reaching the growth target for this SLO.</b>
<i>Teacher Professional Development and Support</i>	<b>9. Describe and explain the professional development opportunities that will support your instruction for this SLO.</b>  <b>Describe and explain any additional materials or resources that will support your instruction and assist students in meeting the growth target for this SLO.</b>

### **B3: Student Learning Objective (SLO) Rubric for Approval of Teacher Written SLO**

The *Rubric for Approval of Teacher Written SLO* is a tool to assist principals with the review and approval of teacher written SLOs. Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) contain various components including Objective Summary Statement, Data, Student Population, Learning Content, Instructional Interval, Target, Evidence of Growth, Strategies and Professional Development. To assist teachers with writing SLOs, the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) has developed a set of guiding questions (*Student Learning Objective: Guiding Questions for Teachers to Write SLO*) for each of these components. The *Rubric for Approval of Teacher Written SLO* is designed to help principals ensure there is logic and unity among the individual components and that the SLO reflects careful planning and thoughtful reflection that will support successful implementation and accomplishment of the SLO targets.

The rubric contains four domains: Priority of Standard, Rigor of Target, Quality of Measure & Evidence, and Action Plan. Under each domain there are criteria that guide the principal during the review and approval process. These criteria are meant to guide the evaluator and are not all-inclusive. **Local school districts may add additional criteria or domains as necessary to support the focus and priorities of the district.** Professional development provided to teachers regarding SLOs should include a discussion about the criteria and expectations for approval of an SLO.

MSDE created a template, *Student Learning Objective: Template for Teachers*, for teachers to use to write and submit the SLO. After the teacher has submitted the SLO, the principal reviews the SLO and schedules a conference with the teacher to discuss how well the SLO meets the rubric criteria. If necessary, clarifications or revisions to the SLO may be required before approval. At the point of approval, there should be mutual agreement about the objective and action plan for implementation as well as a clear understanding of the target and how it will be measured for the purpose of the teacher evaluation. The date of the conference and approval of the SLO is recorded on the *SLO Template for Teachers*.

Element	Criteria
<b>Priority of Standard</b>	<p>The <b>content</b> is aligned to common core, international, national, state, local or industry recognized standards.</p> <p>The skill and/or knowledge are critical for advancement to future coursework (i.e. if students do not master the standards, they will not be able to progress to the next level).</p> <p>The content reflects school and district priorities.</p> <p>The scope of content is appropriate for the length of the <b>instruction interval</b>.</p>
<b>Rigor of Target</b>	<p>The <b>target</b> is anchored in <b>baseline data</b>, including historical data (i.e. district, school, and student level data) and multiple measures if possible.</p> <p>The rationale explains how the rigor and attainability of the numerical target was determined. For example, the target is based on the past performance of students or the expectation of a year's growth or the mastery of a standard or incremental improvement.</p> <p>The numerical target represents an appropriate amount of student learning for the interval of instruction.</p> <p>If appropriate, the SLO differentiates targets for individuals or groups of students based on baseline data so that all targets are rigorous yet attainable.</p>
<b>Quality of Measure &amp; Evidence</b>	<p>The source(s) of <b>evidence</b> provides the data needed to determine if the target has been met.</p> <p>The measure(s) is aligned to the standards and provides evidence relative to the target.</p> <p>The measure is appropriate for the <b>student population</b>.</p> <p>The measure meets the criteria established by the state, district, or school.</p>
<b>Action Plan</b>	<p>The selected <b>instructional strategies</b> support students in reaching the target for this SLO.</p> <p>The identified <b>professional development</b> supports the successful implementation of the SLO.</p>

## **B4: Student Learning Objectives (SLO) Scoring Process For the Maryland Teacher Evaluation Model**

This guidance is intended to assist evaluators in scoring individual SLOs for teachers.

During the initial SLO conference, the teacher and principal carefully review and discuss the targets proposed by the teacher, taking into consideration historical data, prior performance, school or district improvement goals and any known complexity factors. The targets should represent “stretch” goals for students which are both rigorous and attainable. Prior to approval of the SLO, it should be clear to both parties what data will be used to determine how well the target was attained according to the categories described below. These rule-of-thumb descriptions were written to *facilitate faster scoring, promote consistency among scorers, and maintain a high level of quality*. Given the various ways in which SLO targets may have been written, there is no one way to analyze the results and, therefore, this language should be used as guidance, not firm rules. Evaluators decide which performance level best describes the effect the teacher had on his or her students’ learning. This decision requires professional judgment including consideration of complexity factors. Ultimately, the evaluator must employ his or her own professional judgment.

**Full Attainment** - This category applies when all or almost all students met the target(s). Results within a few points, a few percentage points, or a few students on either side of the target(s) should be considered “Attained”. The bar for this category should be high and it should only be selected when it is clear that the students met the overall level of attainment established by the target(s). Results of the SLO indicate expected student mastery or progress. This category is reserved for the educator who has fully achieved the expectations described in their SLOs and/or demonstrated notable impact on student learning.

**Partial Attainment** - This category applies when many students met the target(s), but the target(s) was missed by more than a few points, a few percentage points, or a few students. This category should be selected when it is clear that students fell just short of the level of attainment established by the target(s). Results of the SLO indicate some student mastery or progress. This category applies to the educator who has partially achieved the expectations described in their SLOs and/or demonstrated a moderate impact on student learning.

**Insufficient Attainment** - This category applies if a substantial proportion of students did not meet the target(s); the SLO was not met. This category may also apply when results are missing, incomplete, or not able to be scored. Results of the SLO indicate insufficient student mastery or progress. This category applies to the educator who has not met the expectations described in their SLO(s) or the educator who has not engaged in the process of setting and gathering results for SLOs.

**When multiple pieces of evidence are used, the evaluator should consider:**

-Why was each piece of evidence included?

-Do pieces of evidence overlap and provide multiple measures of the same standards?

*For example, a teacher might use a written exam and a project as two modes for measuring students' progress or mastery on a single set of geometry standards. In this case, attainment on one piece of evidence may be sufficient for determining that the SLO was met.*

-Do pieces of evidence supplement each other to capture the full range of standards addressed by the SLO?

*For example, a teacher might use a written exam to measure students' ability to read and write in a foreign language and an oral exam to measure oral fluency. In this case, students should show attainment across both pieces of evidence for the SLO to be considered met.*

**Determining points awarded for Student Growth portion of evaluation:** After the principal has determined the attainment level for the target, the SLO is scored using the calculations below to determine the total number of points awarded toward the student growth portion of the evaluation.

<p><b><i>Final Rating &amp; Score</i></b></p> <p><b>Total possible points for this SLO*</b></p> <p>_____</p>	<p><b>Choose one:</b></p> <p><b>Insufficient Attainment of Target</b>    (33% x total possible points) = _____ <b>pts</b></p> <p><b>Partial Attainment of Target</b>        (67% x total possible points) = _____ <b>pts</b></p> <p><b>Full Attainment of Target</b>            (100% of total possible points) = _____ <b>pts</b></p>
--	--

\*In Maryland's model, the total possible points for each SLO are equal and are determined by dividing the total number of SLOs by the total possible points for all SLOs. For example, if SLOs are worth 30 points in the Student Growth portion of the evaluation and a teacher has 3 SLOs, the total possible points for each SLO is 10 points.

## **Appendix C: Determining Teacher Professional Practice in the State Teacher Evaluation**

This appendix includes the procedural information necessary for completing the Professional Practice section of the State Teacher Evaluation Instrument.

The Professional Practice portion of the State Teacher Evaluation Model aligns with the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching. The Framework is divided into four domains of Professional Practice: Planning and Preparation; Classroom Environment; Instruction; and Professional /Responsibilities. The domains further subdivide into 22 components and 76 smaller units. Each of the domains in the State Model comprises 12.5% for a total of 50% of the teacher’s evaluation (The Qualitative or Professional Practice Portion). The remaining 50% is made up of the quantitative or Student Growth components.

Tenured teachers are evaluated in the area of Professional Practice on a three year evaluation cycle with the first year of the cycle being extended for two years in those instance where teachers (tenured) have received a rating of highly effective or effective. Non-tenured teachers as well as those who have been rated Ineffective in Professional Practices will be evaluated annually.

Step I	<u>Pre-Planning</u> August	Planning should take part by both the teacher and principal prior to conducting any pre-conference. The principal should prepare by reviewing the teacher’s previous observation/ evaluation results, and determining the developmental needs for the teacher from the school’s perspective. Using available school data and information, along with prior evaluation results, the principal should develop an initial sense of the needs of the teacher within the domain areas to bring about the desired performance and developmental changes during the upcoming school year. In the same way, the teacher should reflect on his/her prior observation and evaluation records and results to determine areas of growth and professional development within the domains of Professional Practice. Additionally, both the teacher and the principal should consider possible goals for each of the domains and thought should be given as to what evidence of accomplishment should be evident in the teacher’s performance.
--------	-------------------------------	---

Step II	<u>Initial Conference</u> August/September	During the Initial Conference, both the teacher and principal will bring their interests to the table. With consideration to relevant complexity factor the principal, with teacher input, will determine priority Professional Practice needs for the teacher according to the guidelines of the four performance domains. During this process, the teacher will share, with Principal's concurrence, the evidence that will be found in the teacher's performance in planning/preparation, in classroom observations, and in the exercise of professional responsibilities during the school year. The conversation that occurs around this process is seen as the most important element of professional development for the teacher and when intentionally aligned to school improvement plans has the greatest potential for positively impacting student learning.
Step III	<u>Midyear Conferences</u> Jan. & Feb.	The Midyear Conference is intended to provide feedback on progress towards target goals identified in the Initial Conference. Except in the instances of flawed data, ill-conceived goals, or egregious error in design judgment, the individual conferences are not intended to arbitrarily alter targets to facilitate success. They should be used to identify additional supports for reinitiating, maintaining, or accelerating, progress towards goal accomplishment. Within this context, the principal will review, with the teacher, progress towards each of the Professional Practice Domains, as appropriate.
Step IV	<u>Evaluation Conference</u> May/June	During the Evaluation Conference, the principal will review, discuss, and score the Professional Practice portion of the Teacher Evaluation Instrument. Using the accompanying Rubric, the principal shall present evidence of the teacher's accomplishment of each Professional Practice Domain. Total Professional Practice Score should be entered into the appropriate level of the principal effectiveness rating calculation formula. (Part 3)