

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

Per MCL 380.1249: 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 teachers. Complete language (including requirements) for MCL 380.1249 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 Instructional Evaluation System 2015-2018.

Erin Lanoue

Printed Name of Superintendent

Erin Lanoue

Signature of Superintendent

2015-16 school year

Date of Approval

Research Base for the Evaluation Framework, Instrument, and Process [Section 1249(3)(a)]

The Charter Schools USA family of schools has developed the Teacher Evaluation System (TES) for 2015-16 and beyond with the ultimate goal of increasing student learning growth by improving the quality of instruction and maximizing teacher effectiveness outside of the classroom. A significant portion, forty-five percent (45%), of the TES will be comprised of an evaluative Teacher Feedback and Evaluation Tool (TFET), which aligns to the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) standards. The remaining metrics used to determine the final TES rating, along with each metric's weight in the final score, are as follows:

- Student Academic Performance:
 - Student Growth and Assessment: 25%
- Instructional Practice:
 - Teacher Feedback Evaluation Tool Score: 45%
 - Deliberate Practice Plan (DPP) Score: 30%

Both evaluative and non-evaluative versions of the TFET are based on the research of Robert J. Marzano, the Marzano Evaluation Model, and the AdvancED Effective Learning Environments Observation Tool. Specifically, the research base for the TFET includes:

- AdvancED Whitepaper. *Examining Learning Environments: Results from AdvancED's Classroom Observation Tool*. Accessed online at <http://www.advanc->

ed.org/sites/default/files/mobile_apps/eleot/eleot_wp.pdf

- Marzano, Robert J. *What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Action*. Arlington, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2003, 2013.
- 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.

Identification and Qualifications of the Author(s) [Section 1249(3)(b)]

The TFET 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 1249(3)(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 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.

Annually, as a part of the strategic planning process, Charter Schools USA (CSUSA) will review the Teacher Evaluation System to monitor and evaluate its effectiveness in improving instruction and student learning. The annual review begins with teacher feedback via a staff survey in May, on the effectiveness of the evaluation system in improving their instruction. Principals review the teachers’ feedback each June at the CSUSA hosted Principals’ Institute, then provide input for overall revisions to the evaluation system.

When all Statewide, Standardized Assessments/student performance data becomes available, CSUSA will work with the School’s leadership team to review assessment results (i.e. proficiency, learning gains, student growth model, etc.) correlated to teacher evaluation results (i.e. TFET scores, deliberate practice scores, etc.). CSUSA’s Human Resources and Education Departments will then take all input to revise the evaluation system as needed, set improvement goals for areas identified as opportunities for growth, and/or identify initiatives as needed to ensure continuous improvement. Goals at both the system and school level will be included in and tracked via the system and schools’ Strategic Plans.

The process for self-monitoring will also include:

¹ <http://www.marzanocenter.com/files/MTEM%20Michigan%2006012016.pdf>

- ongoing training and support with evaluators to ensure evaluator accuracy and inter-rater reliability;
- ensuring that evaluators are providing necessary and timely feedback to employees after being evaluated;
- monitoring evaluators to ensure they are following policies and procedures in the implementation of the evaluation system;
- use of evaluation data to identify professional development; and
- use of evaluation data to inform school and network-wide improvement plans.

Evaluation Framework and Rubric [Section 1249(3)(d)]

The Final TES score combines aspects of student performance and teacher’s instructional practice. As mentioned above the final weighting of each element is as follows:

- Student Academic Performance:
 - Student Growth and Assessment: 25%
- Instructional Practice:
 - Teacher Feedback Evaluation Tool Score: 45%
 - Deliberate Practice Plan (DPP) Score: 30%

Student Academic Performance: Student Growth and Assessment (25%)

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 teacher’s final evaluation rating on data and indicators of student academic performance and learning growth assessed annually by MAP assessments in math and ELA. Teacher growth ratings will be assigned according to normative growth trends and across both math and ELA for all students instructed. 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:

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

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 Practice (75% total):

Teacher Feedback and Evaluation Tool (45%) - TFET

The TFET is a student-centered feedback and evaluation tool first organized by the strategies and behaviors observed inside and outside of the classroom. Additionally, it is aligned to Charter Schools USA's (CSUSA) 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 – which reflect a balanced approach to quality and continuous improvement based on Robert S. Kaplan and David 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 required to increase student academic performance and foster student learning.

The 5 strategic priorities align to the Marzano Evaluation Model as follows:

- **Student Success:** An unwavering focus on implementing CSUSA's research-based Educational Model based on Marzano's research.
 - Domain 1: Inside the Classroom
 - Well-Managed Learning Environment
 - Equitable Learning Environment
 - High Expectations Environment
 - Supportive Learning Environment
 - Active Learning Environment
 - Progress Monitoring and Feedback
 - Digital Learning Environment
 - Domain 2: Outside of the Classroom
 - Planning and Preparing
 - Data-driven Instruction Results

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.

- **World Class Team and Culture:** The intangible quality that inspires team members to volunteer their best every day, commit to their professional growth, and maximize their effectiveness to increase student learning. It is also the component that supports team members in finding satisfaction and meaning in their work.
 - Domain 3: Outside of the Classroom
 - Reflecting on Teaching
 - Domain 4: Outside of the Classroom
 - Collegiality and Professionalism
- **Maximized Resources:** 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.
 - Domain 4: Outside of the Classroom
 - Promoting District and School Development
- **Development and Innovation:** The unique challenges of a charter school to create and meet enrollment demands, which form the basis for the school’s financial health.
 - Domain 4: Outside of the Classroom
 - Promoting District and School Development
- **Customer Focused Operational Performance:** The school-wide efforts to ensure a safe and orderly environment and the secure maintenance of student records.
 - Domain 4: Outside of the Classroom
 - Promoting District and School Development

The TFET alignment to the Marzano Evaluation tool is shown here, with the TFET item number on the left and the corresponding Marzano Evaluation tool item numbers on the right.

TFET Indicator Number	Marzano Framework Evaluation Indicator Number(s)
1	36, 37, 38
2	33, 34, 35
3	4, 5
4	21, 22
5	4
6	9, 13, 15
7	36, 39, 40, 41
8	33, 34, 35, 38
9	31, 36
10	39, 40, 41
11	39, 41
12	1, 2, 3, 41
13	17, 18, 19, 22
14	17, 18, 19, 40, 41
15	25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32
16	25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32
17	39, 40, 41
18	13, 20, 23

19	7, 15, 21
20	8, 10, 17, 18
21	24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32
22	1, 2, 13, 20
23	13, 17, 18, 19, 20
24	13, 17, 18, 19, 20
25	1, 2
26	20, 41
27	5, 22
28	22
29	7, 15, 21
30	44
31	42, 43
32	42
33	51, 42, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 22
34	51, 42, 43, 44, 1, 2, 3
35	51, 42, 43, 44, 1, 2, 3
36	47
37	48
38	49
39	45, 46

40	42, 43, 44
41	42, 43, 44
42	59, 60
43	50, 51, 52
44	55, 60
45	59, 60
46	59, 60
47	57, 58, 59, 60
48	59, 60
49	53, 54, 59
50	56
51	56, 57, 58, 59, 60
52	52, 59, 60
53	50, 55, 56, 57, 58
54	52, 53, 54

55	57, 58
56	55, 57, 58
57	55, 57, 58
58	53
59	53
60	50, 51, 52, 52, 54
61	54
62	52
63	57, 58, 59, 60
64	55, 56
65	56
66	59
67	60
68	60

Student Success (All segments of **Inside the Classroom**, **Planning and Preparing**, and **Operational Performance**) constitutes 65% or, a majority, of the TFET. In its entirety, the TFET will be used as an annual evaluative assessment of classroom and non-classroom full time instructional staff member performance and will constitute 45% of the final summative evaluation. The TFET will also be chunked into smaller non-evaluative segments (see below) to be used throughout the year to provide ongoing instructor feedback. The TFET informs teachers and school leaders on appropriate deliberate practice goals, please see the **Deliberate Practice Plan** section below.

Segments and weighting of the TFET (evaluative weighting):

- **Inside of the Classroom (50%)**
 - Well-Managed Learning Environment
 - Equitable Learning Environment
 - High Expectations Environment
 - Supportive Learning Environment
 - Active Learning Environment
 - Progress Monitoring and Feedback
 - Digital Learning Environment
- **Outside of the Classroom (15%)**
 - Planning and Preparing
- **Outside of the Classroom (35%)**
 - Data-driven Instruction Results
 - Operational Performance
 - Culture of Excellence
 - Financial Health/ Growth

To ensure the integrity of the system and inter-rater reliability, all evaluators will utilize a common rubric, participate in extensive professional development, and use a common core of effective practices.

Rating TFET Elements

Each indicator on the TFET utilizes a comprehensive, five-category scale, relative to observations and feedback inside and outside of the classroom.

Inside The Classroom					
Innovating (4)	Applying (3)	Developing (2)	Beginning (1)	Not Using (0)	Not Observed (No Value Given)
Teacher uses feedback gained from monitoring use of the strategy and has tweaked the strategy for those who were not responding to initial use of the strategy so that all students get to the intended learning outcome. (100% of students get to intended outcome of strategy)	Teacher use of this strategy has become fluent and the teacher is focused on the impact the use of the strategy has on students. (Students are monitored for the impact the use of the strategy has on their learning outcomes)	Teacher use of the strategy was appropriate and correct. Teacher becomes fluent with use of this strategy.	Teacher was aware that the instructional strategy was appropriate but teacher use of the strategy was ineffective. (Missing pieces, wrong time, wrong group of students, etc.)	Instructional strategy was appropriate, but the teacher did not know to use the strategy.	Instructional strategy was neither called for nor used during this portion of the lesson.
Outside The Classroom					
Innovating (4)	Applying (3)	Developing (2)	Beginning (1)	Not Using (0)	Not Observed (No Value Given)
Teacher is a network leader in this instructional area and has had positive impact on the CSUSA community at large	Teacher is seen as a leader in this instructional area and shares instructional practice within school community	Teacher focus on this instructional area is growing and teacher is able to achieve the intent for this instructional area.	Teacher was beginning to focus on this instructional area but efforts were not effective (pieces were missing, full extent of area not understood or realized)	This instructional area or goal was not focused on during this time period	Intended outcome not relevant to current teaching or case load



The scale outlined above will be used for both evaluative and non-evaluative observations ensuring consistent, clear, and specific feedback to teachers throughout the year and on their end-year evaluative TFET.

Scoring the TFET (Final)

The process to assign a final TFET score and rating is as follows:

- **Step 1:** Rate observed elements at each of the following levels: Innovating (4), Applying (3), Developing (2), Beginning (1), Not Using (0) or Not Observed (no value given).
- **Step 2:** Count the number of ratings at each level for each of the 12 TFET segments.
- **Step 3:** Within each segment, determine the percentage of the total number of ratings, excluding Not Observed, each level represents.
- **Step 4:** Apply the results from Step 3 to the following Proficiency Scales:
 - **Highly Effective (4)** – At least 55% at level 4 and 0% at level 1 or 0
 - **Effective (3)** – At least 55% at level 3 or higher
 - **Minimally Effective (2)** – Less than 55% at Level 3 or higher and less than 50% at Level 1 or 0
 - **Ineffective (1)** – 50% or more at level 1 or 0

**These segment ratings will range from 1 to 4.*

- **Step 5:** Calculate the weighted average of the 12 TFET segment scores and place the resulting score on the TFET scale below. Please see **Segments and weighting of the TFET** above.

The final TFET 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 electronically via the School’s instructional improvement system, a process that will be overseen by the CSUSA Human Resources Department, and with final approval by the School’s principal.

Deliberate Practice Plan (30%): Instructional staff professional goals setting

The deliberate practice score is the second element in the instructional practice component of the Teacher Evaluation System and will account for 25% of a teacher’s final rating.

All teachers will identify three TFET indicators to focus on and develop throughout the year. Each selected element will become a goal in the teacher’s Deliberate Practice Plan (DPP). The DPP will be created, reviewed and monitored collaboratively with the school leadership team.

The school leadership team evaluates growth on each of the three goals. The annual baseline values are determined by the prior year TFET score³, or mid-year TFET in the case of a new teacher. Growth from the

³ All new teachers will receive a Mid-Year TFET evaluation to drive DPP goals and baseline scores after their 90



baseline to end-year TFET is determined by the table below. The final DPP score is the average of all three goals' growth scores. For example, a teacher whose growth scores were 3, 3, and 2 would receive a DPP score of 2.6. This final score is placed on the same rating scale as the final TFET score. Thus a DPP of 2.6 is "Effective."

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
<u>or</u> grows to Innovating	<u>or</u> grows to Applying	<u>or</u> grows to Developing	<u>or</u> grows to Beginning	<u>or</u> scores Not Using

The Final TES Evaluation Criteria

The TES evaluation criteria will be based on three years (when available⁴) of student academic growth, and current year instructional practice. The Teacher Feedback and Evaluation Tool (TFET) and Deliberate Practice Plan (DPP) comprise the Instructional Practice component.

Final Evaluation weighting

The metrics used to determine the final TES rating, along with each metric's weight in the final rating, are as follows:

- Student Academic Performance:
 - Student Growth and Assessment: 25%
- Instructional Practice:
 - Teacher Feedback Evaluation Tool (TFET) Score: 45%
 - Deliberate Practice Plan (DPP) Score: 30%

Once Student Academic Performance, TFET and DPP 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 – 3.39	1.5 – 1.99	1.0 – 1.49

days.

⁴ For full time instructional staff members with less than 3 years of data, years available will be used. Please see the **Student Academic Performance** section, for details on instructional staff members without student growth results.



Description of Process for Conducting Classroom Observations, Collecting Evidence, Conducting Evaluation Conferences, Developing Performance Ratings, and Developing Performance Improvement Plans [Section 1249(3)(e)]

Annual Evaluation

Based on teacher and principal feedback, the following outlines the process for conducting the annual evaluations:

- Setting expectations – teachers will be provided a copy of the TFET form at the beginning of the year. Moreover, training sessions will be held so they are aware of the process and the criteria.
- Non-evaluative feedback – teachers will receive ongoing, non-evaluative feedback in the form of classroom walk-throughs and non-evaluative TFETs as well as peer coaching at least 2 times per year. Non-evaluative feedback does not directly impact a teacher’s final evaluation score.
- Evaluative feedback – teachers will receive a formal evaluation at the end of each year, with first year teachers and teachers new to CSUSA receiving at least two formal evaluations. Teachers will be asked to sign the evaluation form at the end of each evaluation process. The evaluation and score will be recorded in the internal electronic evaluation system. Teachers will receive their written report no more than 10 days after the evaluation takes place.
- The employee shall have the right to initiate a written response to the evaluation and the response shall become a permanent attachment to his or her personnel file.

Improvement Plans

As a member of the Charter Schools USA (CSUSA) family of schools, the School will utilize an internal improvement plan, in conjunction with the Education Team and HR. The School will be in compliance with all applicable state statutes regarding instructional personnel who receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluations.

Evaluation by Supervisor - Teachers will be evaluated by their School Principal, Assistant Principal, or other supervisor. Non-evaluative observations can be conducted by staff other than the Principal or supervisor and the supervisor may consider this input. Trained personnel including, but not limited to, Assistant Principals, CSUSA Regional Directors and Curriculum Specialists, Deans, Curriculum Resource Teachers (CRT), Department Heads, Team Leaders, Mentors through Leading Edge (Leadership development program) and Teacher Learning Communities (TLC - for new teachers) programs etc., may provide feedback through non-evaluative TFETs including those indicators identified on the teacher’s DPP, ultimately informing their evaluative TFET.

Process of Informing Teachers about the Evaluation Process - Charter Schools USA recognizes that each school’s learning environment is unique and must be supported in its quest for improved student learning growth. In *The Art & Science of Teaching* Robert J. Marzano (2007) details the benefits of unique learning environments focused on systemic goal setting to increase student achievement. Every school administrator and faculty member will be trained with Marzano’s research and the CSUSA Education Model.



Student and school performance data are collected throughout the year and are used by school leaders and teachers to monitor progress in achieving the School's goals. Administrators and faculty evaluate, create, and revise instructional goals based on the instructional calendar and progress made. Teacher evaluation indicators and evidences are incorporated into teacher trainings. In addition to pre-service training, teachers receive ongoing and continuous professional development (a minimum of monthly) as well as during their common planning meetings.

New teachers and those newly hired to the School are informed of the Teacher Evaluation System at New Teacher Induction training, which is held prior to the beginning of each new school year. Teachers who miss the initial training will receive follow-up training. They also receive ongoing instruction on the evaluation system through Teacher Learning Communities, which are held at least four times a year with a mentor.

Timely Feedback and Professional Development - After each evaluation, Evaluator/Teacher conferences are conducted to review the teacher's performance, provide written and verbal feedback, and engage in professional discussions around identified strengths and opportunities for growth. (Feedback will be given within three days of both evaluative and non-evaluative observations.) At a minimum, quarterly data summits are conducted by School Leadership to review student growth data. The evaluator will then work with the teacher to identify select goals to be articulated in the teacher's Deliberate Practice Plan), as well as recommend specific professional development opportunities to ensure the teacher's continuous professional improvement. Ongoing classroom walk-throughs and observations will provide additional feedback and support to the teachers. Annually, in quarter 4, Charter Schools USA (CSUSA) will solicit feedback from teachers and principals to ensure continuous improvement of the process. Teachers identified as less than effective will be required to participate in specific professional development to help support their areas for growth.

Minimum Requirements of observations and Evaluations – All classroom teachers will receive ongoing observations and feedback through classroom walkthroughs, non-evaluative TFET observations, and evaluative TFET. The evaluative TFET will be provided at least once per year. All instructional personnel will receive a formal evaluation once per year, at a minimum.

Multiple Evaluations for First Year Teachers – First year teachers will be evaluated by their supervisor no fewer than two times annually on each TFET indicator. The process will include feedback specific to the improvements and the level of progress to be achieved to attain greater instructional effectiveness. Feedback will follow within three days of formal evaluations – which are reviews at 90 days and the end of the year – as well as ongoing informal observations. The evaluation will include consideration from multiple forms of observation and evaluation types, including classroom walkthroughs, classroom observations, student data reviews, Deliberate Practice Plan reviews, and participation in the Charter Schools USA Teacher Learning Community (TLC) for first year teachers.

Teachers new to Charter Schools USA will receive the same process of multiple evaluations and multiple types of observation methods. Newly hired teachers will also participate in the Teacher Learning Community (TLC).



In their first year, teachers new to the school will receive a minimum of four classroom observations by the School Leadership Team and four reviews of student performance. The observation tools will be the same as those used for existing teachers. Student performance data will be essential to the evaluation process and will include quarterly review of interim and benchmark assessments, ongoing formative classroom assessments, review of student generated learning goals in the Personalized Learning Plan, and available summative assessment data.

Members of the School Leadership Team, including the principal, assistant principal(s) and trained principal designees and mentors, will conduct observations and reviews of student performance data. The observations conducted by school leadership team-members are used to support the teacher on observed instructional practices, by providing timely feedback or improvement. These observations can be used as descriptions in the evaluation, but will not directly impact the final evaluation score.

Evaluations, which include formal observations, will be conducted by the school principal, assistant principals, or other trained supervisors. All evaluators are trained by Charter Schools USA.

Description of Plan for Providing Evaluators and Observers with Training [Section 1249(3)(f)]

Evaluators will attend a mandatory training on CSUSA's Teacher Evaluation System and tools. Training will include but not be 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.
