CSUSA Leadership Evaluation System 2015-2018
Administrator Evaluation: Postings and Assurances
Non-State Approved Evaluation Tool; District-Approved Evaluation Tool

Per MCL 380.1249b: Beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, a school district, intermediate school district, or public school academy shall post on its public website specific information about the evaluation tool(s) used for its performance evaluation system for school administrators. Complete language (including requirements) for MCL 380.1249b can be found [here](#)*.*

This evaluation tool has been approved by the district, as the result of a review process implemented with fidelity. The contents of this document are compliant with the law laid forth, specifically pertaining to CSUSA Leader Evaluation System 2015-2018.

Erin Lanoue
Printed Name of Superintendent

Erin Lanoue
Signature of Superintendent

2015-16 school year
Date of Adoption in District

Research Base for the Evaluation Framework, Instrument, and Process [Section 1249b(2)(a)]

The Charter Schools USA family of schools has developed the Leadership Evaluation System (LES) for 2015-16 and beyond with the ultimate goal of increasing student learning growth by improving the quality of instructional, administrative and supervisory services. A significant portion, forty-five percent (45%) of the LES will be comprised of the Leader Performance Evaluation (LPE) instrument which is based on the research of Robert J. Marzano and aligns to the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) standards. The metrics used to determine the final LES rating, along with each metric's weight in the final score, are as follows:

- Student Academic Performance:
  - Student Growth and Assessment: 25%
- Instructional Leadership Practice:
  - Leader Performance Evaluation (LPE) Score: 45%
  - Leader Growth Plan (LGP) Score: 30%

Specifically, the research base for the LPE, the largest portion of the LES includes:

Leadership Assessment

- Marzano, Robert J. et.al. *School Leadership that Works.* Arlington, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2005

- Marzano, Robert J. and Timothy Waters. *District Leadership that Works.* Bloomington, Indiana: Solution Tree Press, 2009
- Maxwell, John *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership.* Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, Inc. 2007

Leading Faculty Development for Instructional Improvement

- Marzano, Robert J. *What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Action*. Arlington, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2003
- Marzano, Robert J. *The Art and Science of Teaching*. Arlington, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2007
- Marzano, Robert J. et.al. *Classroom Instruction that Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2004
- Marzano, Robert J. et.al. *Classroom Management That Works: Research-Based Strategies for Every Teacher.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2008
- Marzano, Robert J. *Classroom Assessment & Grading that Work.* Arlington, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2006

The Leader Evaluation System (LES) for all school administrators is based on sound educational principles and contemporary research in effective educational practices. (See the reference list previously cited.) Primarily consisting of the research of Robert J. Marzano and aligned to the NAESP and NASSP standards. The LPE is designed to draw on and incorporate educational leadership practices, including the 21 responsibilities of a school leader (Maxwell 2007), the precepts of continuous improvement and others developed from Marzano's 35 years of research. These educational best practices form the foundation for the elements within the LPE that measure administrator proficiency on the host of skills and tasks necessary to lead a school, its faculty and its students, to success in improving student performance.

Identification and Qualifications of the Author(s) [Section 1249b(2)(b)]

The LPE is based primarily on the work of Robert J Marzano, PhD, who "is a nationally recognized researcher in education, speaker, trainer, and author of more than 30 books and 150 articles on topics such as instruction, assessment, writing and implementing standards, cognition, effective leadership, and school intervention. His books include District Leadership That Works, School Leadership that Works, Making Standards Useful in the Classroom, The Art and Science of Teaching, and Effective Supervision.

His practical translations of the most current research and theory into classroom strategies are internationally known and widely practiced by both teachers and administrators. He received a bachelor's degree from Iona College in New York, a master's degree from Seattle University, and

a doctorate from the University of Washington. He is also Executive Director of the Learning Sciences Marzano Center located in West Palm Beach, Florida, and of Marzano Research in Colorado.

Dr. Marzano believes that great teachers make great students: His Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model has been adopted by school districts in all 50 states because it doesn't just measure teacher ability, it helps teachers get better, improving their instruction over time. Dr. Marzano has partnered with Learning Sciences International to develop and implement the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model, the School Leader and District Leader Evaluation Models, and the Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel Evaluation model, four complimentary evaluation systems that may be used with the iObservation technology platform.

Founded in 2002, Learning Sciences International partners with schools and districts to develop custom solutions for school improvement and professional development. With Robert Marzano, Learning Sciences co-developed the Marzano Evaluation Models and was selected as the statewide technical assistance provider for teacher evaluation implementation throughout the state of Florida. Learning Sciences was selected by the Michigan Department of Education's School Reform Office to provide monitoring and technical assistance to Priority Schools. Learning Sciences offers innovative technology, data analysis, research, consultation, and the tools and training to help schools meet their challenges and reach their greatest potential in today's high-stakes educational environment. For further information, visit www.LearningSciences.com." (From the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model Postings and Assurances document.[1])

Evidence of Reliability, Validity, and Efficacy [Section 1249b(2)(c)]

Due to the timing of Success Mile Academy's opening (2013-14 school year), the school has yet to receive an overall performance rating or Top to Bottom Ranking. Upon receiving the 15-16 school rating and ranking, in addition to the student SGP results, the school with the support of CSUSA will evaluate the alignment between the Instructor and Leadership Evaluation Systems and actual student growth results to ensure that effective teachers and building leaders are recognized by the comprehensive evaluation system.

Initial work from the Marzano center has analyzed the Marzano Teacher Evaluation tool's ability to predict teacher Value-Added Model (VAM) results in a population of Florida schools. Their initial analysis found significant and positive correlation between the results of the Florida VAM and the teachers' evaluations.[1] A significant portion of both the CSUSA Instructional and Administrator Performance Evaluations are based on the work and research of Marzano. In CSUSA's Florida schools, there is also a positive and significant correlation between Teacher Feedback and Evaluation Tool (TFET) scores and state VAM results ($r(770)=.221$, $p<.0000$) from the 2015-16 school year.

CSUSA, with the support of Success Mile Academy, will conduct a similar analysis when the student growth results from either SGPs and/or NWEA data is available at the conclusion of the

---

[1] http://www.marzanocenter.com/files/MTEM%20Michigan%2006012016.pdf

16-17 school year. Success Mile Academy's results will be included in the overall CSUSA analysis to ensure a large enough sample size to draw inferences. In the best interest of school leaders and instructional staff, CSUSA and the school may revise any of the rating scales below in the event that LPE/TFET scores are not significantly aligned to student achievement and growth.

Evaluation Framework and Rubric [Section 1249b(2)(d)]

Instructional Leadership Evaluation Framework

The evaluation of Instructional Leadership is based on 5 strategic priorities – 1. Student Success, 2. Maximized Resources, 3. Development and Innovation, 4. Customer Focused Operational Performance and 5. World Class Team and Culture – which reflect a balanced approach to quality and continuous improvement based on Robert S. Kaplan and David P. Norton's *The Balanced Scorecard* (1996). The 5 strategic priorities represent CSUSA's approach to addressing the unique challenges of charter schools, and to ensuring that the energies, abilities, and specific knowledge of all employees throughout the school and the organization are focused on improving the quality of services needed to increase student learning growth.

The Complete Leadership Evaluation Score:

- Student Academic Performance:
    - Student Growth and Assessment: 25%
- Instructional Leadership Practice:
    - Leader Performance Evaluation (LPE) Score: 45%
    - Leader Growth Plan (LGP) Score: 30%

Student Academic Performance: Student Growth and Assessment

For the term of this plan (2015-2018), historical student growth on nationally normed assessments will be utilized (Northwest Evaluation Association's Measures of Academic Progress—NWEA MAP). The School will base 25% of a leader's final evaluation rating on data and indicators of student academic performance and learning growth assessed annually by MAP assessments in math and ELA. Administrator growth ratings will be assigned according to normative growth trends and across both math and ELA for all students in the building. All students are monitored and assessed three times per year using MAP. MAP assessments are aligned to the Michigan Standards as well as college and career readiness standards (ACT). At all grade levels MAP assessments are adaptive and computer-based. They also provide audio support for beginning readers.

After the fall MAP administration, each student receives an end-year RIT (scale score) growth target. These targets are provided by NWEA and represent the status (percentile) and growth norms drawn from over 5 million students' assessment results nationwide. A student's grade and instructional level impact their projected growth target. Students in the same grade, but at different percentiles, receive growth targets tailored to their ability level and the average growth achieved nationwide by students in the same grade and scoring at the same percentile at the

beginning of the year. Each spring, on the Achievement Status and Growth Report, NWEA calculates the total percentage of students meeting their RIT growth targets for each class, grade level and subject using the follow equation:

$$Percentage\ of\ Students\ who\ Met\ or\ Exceeded\ their\ Projected\ RIT =$$
$$\frac{Count\ of\ Students\ who\ Met\ or\ Exceeded\ their\ Projected\ RIT}{Count\ of\ Students\ with\ Available\ Growth\ Projections\ and\ Scores}$$

When this value exceeds 50%, average student growth, exceeds that of typical students nationwide.[2] Three years of ratings will be used when available, with the most recent year carrying the most weight. Final value ratings associated with performance on this metric are presented in the table below. These values are subject to change pending the schools' MSTEP results and when available preliminary SGP scores. The school aims to align the final growth ratings among state assessed courses and non-state assessed courses.

	% of Students Meeting RIT Growth Targets
1 - Ineffective	< 35%
2 - Minimally Effective	35% - 49%
3 - Effective	50% - 74%
4 - Highly Effective	≥75%

Instructional Leadership Practice:

Leader Performance Evaluation

With domains organized according to the 5 strategic priorities, the LPE's evaluation criteria reflect the comprehensive range of instructional leadership practices expected of each CSUSA principal. These domains are also aligned to the domains of the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model, recognizing that school leaders are the drivers of effective instruction in a building:

- **Student Success (29 Elements 24% of LPE):** An unwavering focus on implementing CSUSA's research-based Educational Model.
    - Domain 1: Pedagogical Strategies
    - Domain 2: Planning and Preparing
    - Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism

- **World Class Team and Culture (41 Elements 35% of LPE):** The intangible quality that inspires team members to volunteer their best every day, commits to their professional growth, and maximizes their effectiveness to increase student learning. It is also the

---

[2] When MAP growth norms are not available, improvement in student achievement will be used (mean percentile improvements from fall to spring). Kindergarten students will be evaluated using winter to spring growth norms, per the recommendation of the Northwest Evaluation Association.

component that supports team members in finding satisfaction and meaning in their work.
- o Domain 2: Planning and Preparing
- o Domain 3: Deliberate Practice
- o Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism

- **Maximized Resources (11 Elements 9% of LPE):** A commitment to sound business practices to ensure financial viability and the ability of the school to invest in educational programs and resources to increase student learning growth.
  - o Domain 3: Deliberate Practice
  - o Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism

- **Development and Innovation (5 Elements 4% of LPE):** Evaluates the unique challenges of a charter school to create and meet enrollment demands, which form the basis for the school's financial health.
  - o Domain 3: Deliberate Practice
  - o Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism

- **Customer Focused Operational Performance (33 Elements 28% of LPE):** The school-wide efforts to ensure a safe and orderly environment and the secure maintenance of student records.
  - o Domain 3: Deliberate Practice
  - o Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism

Included in the alignment with CSUSA 5 strategic priority areas, the LPE also addresses leader proficiency in recruiting and retaining effective teachers, improving the effectiveness of teachers, removing ineffective teachers, measures related to the effectiveness of classroom teachers in the school, the administrator's appropriate use of evaluation criteria and procedures, and other leadership practices that result in student learning growth. The indicators are based on evidence of leadership practice and include the following:

- *High Effect Size Indicators:* High Effect Size indicators focus on feedback practices, facilitating professional learning, clear goals and expectations, instructional resources, high effect size strategies and instructional initiatives. They are incorporated in the Leader Performance Evaluation (LPE) in the following indicators:
  - o Feedback Practices: 3, 4, 6, 9-11, 15, 20, 95, 96
  - o Facilitating Professional Learning: 23-29, 71, 96, 104-118
  - o Clear Goals and Expectations: 7, 8, 71, 76, 77, 83, 96, 115
  - o Instructional Resources: 85, 88, 96, 104-109
  - o High Effect Size Strategies: 10, 79-81, 87, 91- 96
  - o Instructional Initiatives
    - Monitoring Text Complexity: 1, 4, 5, 29, 96
    - Interventions: 1, 4, 6, 29, 96
    - Instructional Adaptations: 3, 8, 9, 55, 59, 93, 96
    - English as a Second Language Strategies: 3, 9, 11, 20, 31

- *The Effectiveness of Classroom Teachers in the School:* All the elements within the Student Success section address effectiveness of teachers. The indicator numbers and what each leader is rated on follows:
  - **1-29**
    - Involvement in the design and implementation of curriculum and instruction
    - Ensuring colleagues, faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and making the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture
    - Establishing clear academic goals for the entire school and keeping those goals in the forefront of the school's attention
    - Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of teacher instructional practices and their impact on student learning
    - Designing improvement plans based on benchmark data
    - Providing timely and specific feedback to teachers, including on high effect size strategies
    - Managing the organization, operations and facilities to provide faculty with quality resources and time for professional learning

- *The administrator's appropriate use of evaluation criteria procedures.* Elements in the Performance Planning and Review section. rate a leader's evaluation of staff members, including:
  - **71-75**
    - Ensuring that staff Deliberate Practice Plans are completed and align to school wide goals
    - Performance of regular classroom and building walkthroughs
    - Maintenance of appropriate performance documentation
    - Conducting bi-annual evaluative Teacher Feedback Evaluation Tool (TFET) reviews for all new teaching hires and annual for returning teachers

- *Recruiting and Retention of Effective and Highly Effective Teachers:* The indicators that address these areas follow, along with a description of what each leader will be rated on:
  - **67-70** – These indicators address following hiring guidelines that include:
    - Using salary worksheets, requisitions and approval process for staffing positions, as well as ensuring proper certifications and education before extending offers
    - Working with Charter Schools USA's Education Team to ensure the best staffing configuration to support school success
    - Working within budget constraints
    - Helping recruit for other schools in the network

  - **76-81** – These indicators focus on following guidelines for Compensation Management and Staff Recognition, including:
    - Supporting and advocating pay for performance

- Facilitating staff understanding of benefits
- Finding ways to make staff feel appreciated
- Fairly allocate incentive bonuses based on performance

- **87 -** Looking to encourage and develop people.
  - The latter is evidenced by the leader's use of recognition programs within the school, as well as programs to build up staff – such as staff meals, celebrations and the encouragement to participate in the CSUSA Leading Edge leadership development program

- **97-98** – These indicators rate the leader on Followership and positive relations with staff.
  - Staff's public support of school leaders
  - The leader's understanding that good leaders require good followers
  - Staff does not criticize school leadership to peers, parents or students
  - Staff raises concerns to appropriate leaders at appropriate times

- *Removing Ineffective Teachers:* Leader practices in removing ineffective teachers are addressed in the following indicators:
  - **63-66**
    - Adherence to Human Resources policies
    - Following progressive discipline guidelines, including maintaining appropriate documentation
    - Reaching out to HR appropriately to address sensitive HR matters
    - Ability to be called on to help support peers in sensitive or difficult HR matters
    - These elements include evidence that when requesting to dismiss an employee, the leader has appropriate documentation in place; and that the leader does not terminate without HR involvement and contacts HR on sensitive matters prior to taking action

- *Improvement in the Percentage of Instructional Personnel Rated as Highly Effective and Effective* Indicators rate on the leaders' as follows:
  - **72-74**
    - Conducting regular classroom and building walk throughs
    - Maintenance of appropriate performance documentation
    - Ensuring bi –annual TFET for all new teaching hires, annual for returning teachers and evaluations are completed for all staff in a timely manner

Evaluation Rating Criteria

Rating Labels

The School will utilize four comprehensive rating labels on the LPE that will ultimately translate to the four final LES evaluation labels required by statute. The scale is as follows:

- *Level 4: Innovating* (example: The leader has a deep understanding of instruction and assessment and innovates school wide strategies. The leader recognizes accomplishments and acknowledges failures while motivating continuous improvement)
- *Level 3: Applying* (example: The leader has a solid understanding of instruction and assessment and regularly monitors and evaluates effective instructional school practices and ensures it impacts student achievement.)
- *Level 2: Developing* (example: The leader has been in a leadership role for more than three years and has a basic understanding of instruction and assessment but struggles with implementation and monitoring the effectiveness of academic goals.)
- *Level 1: Beginning* (example: The leader has been in a leadership role for three years or less and has a basic understanding of instruction and assessment but struggles with implementation and monitoring the effectiveness of academic goals.)
- *Level 0: Not Using* (ex. Leader demonstrates little or no evidence of involvement in instruction and assessment)
- *Level N/A: Not Applicable* (Due to the nature of their position, the leader is exempt from this item as determined by the Regional Director of Education in the case of the school principal or by the principal for subordinates)

Rubrics and weighting scales

The elements in the LPE have been grouped by CSUSA's 5 strategic priority areas: 1. Student Success, 2. Maximized Resources, 3. Development and Innovation, 4. Customer Focused Operational Performance and 5. World Class Team and Culture, to ensure a balanced approach to continuous improvement throughout the School. The LPE elements incorporate the wide range of responsibilities that fall within the leader's realm and are weighted by the percentage shown above. All elements are combined to measure the LPE portion of the instructional leadership score in the final evaluation.

Note: Final weights will be determined by the number of elements receiving a score of 0-4, Not Applicable ratings will be excluded from the weighting determination.

Computation of Final LPE Score:
- **Step 1:** Rate observed elements at each of the following levels: Innovating (4), Applying (3), Developing (2), Beginning (1), Not Using (0) or Not Applicable (no value given).
- **Step 2:** Count the number of ratings at each level for each of the 5 LPE Priority Area segments.
- **Step 3:** Within each segment, determine the percentage of the total number of ratings, excluding Not Applicable, each level represents.

- **Step 4:** Apply the results from Step 3 to the leader category proficiency rules, *these segment ratings will range from 1 to 4.*
- **Step 5:** Calculate the weighted average of the 5 LPE segment scores and place the resulting score, ranging from one to four, on the LPE scale below.

The final LPE rating scale is as follows:

Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
2.9 – 4.0	2.0 – 2.89	1.5 – 1.99	1.0 – 1.49

All observation results will be calculated and overseen by Charter Schools USA's Human Resources Department, and with final approval by the leader's Regional Director of Education. CSUSA Regional Directors of Education are responsible for completing all Principal Evaluations, the principal will complete assistant principal evaluations and the principal and/or assistant principal will complete all other leadership evaluations in the building.

Leader Growth Plan (LGP): Leader's Deliberate Practice

The deliberate practice score is the final element in the instructional practice component of the Leader Evaluation System and will account for 30% of a leader's final rating. School leaders must set at least one goal aligned to enrollment and one to student success. Additional goals must be aligned to the leader's previous or mid-year LPE.

All leaders will identify priority area-aligned LPE indicators to focus on and develop throughout the year. Each selected indicator will become a goal in the Leader's Growth Plan (LGP). The LGP will be created, reviewed and monitored in collaboration with the leader's Regional Director of Education.

The school leader and regional director evaluate the year-long growth on each of the leader's goals. The annual baseline values are determined by the prior year LPE scores, or mid-year LPE in the case of a new leader, when available. If a prior score is not available, the regional director will determine the current/baseline rating. Growth from the baseline to end-year LPE is assigned according to the table below.

Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Developing (2)	Beginning (1)	Unsatisfactory (0)
Grows 4 levels	Grows 3 levels	Grows 2 level	Grows 1 level	Achieves no growth
or grows to **Innovating**	or grows to **Applying**	or grows to **Developing**	or grows to **Beginning**	or scores **Not Using**

The final LGP score is the average of all goals' growth scores. For example, a leader whose individual goal growth scores were 3, 3, 3, 2 and 2 would receive a LGP score of 2.6. This final score is place on the same rating scale as the final LPE score. Thus a LGP of 2.6 is "Effective."

Final Evaluation Scoring

The LES evaluation criteria will be based on three years (when available[3]) of student academic growth, and current year instructional practice. The Leader Performance Evaluation (LPE) and Leader Growth Plan (LGP) comprise the Instructional Practice component.

Final Evaluation weighting

The metrics used to determine the final LES rating, along with each metric's weight in the final rating, are as follows:
- Student Academic Performance:
  - Student Performance Measure: 25%
- Instructional Practice:
  - Leader Performance Evaluation (LPE) Score: 45%
  - Leader Growth Plan (LGP) Score: 30%

Details of the scoring and evaluation of leader performance on Student Performance Measures, the LPE and the LGP are presented above in sections 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

Once Student Performance, LPE and LGP scores (1-4) are determined, they are combined according to the weighting above and assigned a final rating based on the scale below:

Highly Effective	Effective	Minimally Effective	Ineffective
3.4 – 4.0	2.0 – 3.49	1.5 – 1.99	1.0 – 1.49

All evaluation results will be calculated and overseen by Charter Schools USA's Human Resources Department, and with final determination by the leader's Regional Director of Education, Charter Schools USA's Vice President of Education, Senior Director of Education, and Chief Academic Officer, all of whom supervise school leaders. CSUSA Regional Directors of Education are responsible for completing all Principal Evaluations, the principal will complete assistant principal evaluations and the principal and/or assistant principal will complete all other leadership evaluations in the building.

---

[3] For leaders with less than 3 years of data, years available will be used. Please see the **Student Academic Performance** section, for details.

Description of Process for Conducting Classroom Observations, Collecting Evidence, Conducting Evaluation Conferences, Developing Performance Ratings, and Developing Performance Improvement Plans [Section 1249b(2)(e)]

All building leaders will receive ongoing observations and feedback through classroom and building walkthroughs, non-evaluative LPE observations, and an evaluative LPE. The evaluative LPE will be completed at least once per year for existing leaders. New leaders will receive at least two evaluative LPE's in their first year.

Leaders will be evaluated by their Regional Director of Education. Non-evaluative observations can be conducted by other CSUSA supervisory staff members such as the regional lead principal, Vice President of Education or Chief Academic Officer. After each evaluation (evaluative and non-evaluative), Evaluator/Administrator conferences are conducted to review the leader's performance, provide written and verbal feedback, and engage in professional discussions around identified strengths and opportunities for growth.

At a minimum, quarterly data summits are conducted by Regional Directors to review student growth data. The evaluator will then work with the school leader to identify goals to be articulated in the leader's Leader Growth Plan, as well as recommend specific professional development opportunities to ensure the leader's continuous professional improvement. Ongoing classroom and building walk-throughs and observations will provide additional feedback and support to the leaders. Annually, in quarter 4, Charter Schools USA (CSUSA) will solicit feedback from teachers, leaders and regional directors to ensure continuous improvement of the process. Leader's identified as less than effective will be required to participate in specific professional development to help support their areas for growth.

As a member of the Charter Schools USA (CSUSA) family of schools, the School will utilize an internal evaluation platform. The platform already houses the instructor evaluation forms and administrator forms are in development. During this phase, administrator evaluations are still conducted and collected in a digital format to facilitate the calculation of a final score. Data collection and analysis from evaluation results seamlessly provides actionable data to inform the School's, and CSUSA's Improvement/Strategic Plans. This system will not only generate a score per the procedures outlined in a previous section, but will also provide data aligned to the 5 strategic priority areas—1.) Student Success, 2.) Maximized Resources, 3.) Development and Innovation, 4.) Customer Focused Operational Performance, and 5.) World Class Team and Culture – outlined in School Improvement Plans/Strategic Plans, school-based professional development and individual Leader Growth Plans.

Description of Plan for Providing Evaluators and Observers with Training [Section 1249b(2)(f)]

Evaluators will attend a mandatory training on CSUSA's Administrator and Teacher Evaluation Systems and tools. Training will include but is not limited to the research base, role modeling and practice for conducting evaluations and professional feedback discussions, and analysis of scoring consistency among Evaluators to ensure inter-rater reliability. Ongoing training and support will be provided by Charter Schools USA throughout the year. Additionally, annual refresher training will be required for all Evaluators and those who miss the initial training will be trained via Webinar. Charter Schools USA will monitor evaluation scores across all schools to ensure the reliability and consistency of observation ratings.