

School District of Citrus County 2021-22

Instructional Personnel Evaluation System



Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide the district with a template for its instructional personnel evaluation system that addresses the requirements of Section 1012.34, Florida Statutes (F.S.), and Rule 6A-5.030, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.). This template, Form IEST-2017, is incorporated by reference in Rule 6A-5.030, F.A.C., effective April 2018.

Instructions

Each of the sections within the evaluation system template provides specific directions but does not limit the amount of space or information that can be added to fit the needs of the district. Where documentation or evidence is required, copies of the source documents (e.g., rubrics, policies and procedures, observation instruments) shall be provided at the end of the document as appendices in accordance with the Table of Contents.

Before submitting, ensure the document is titled and paginated.

Submission

Upon completion, the district shall email this form and any required supporting documentation as a Microsoft Word document for submission to DistrictEvalSysEQ@fldoe.org.

Modifications to an approved evaluation system may be made by the district at any time. Substantial revisions shall be submitted for approval, in accordance with Rule 6A-5.030(3), F.A.C. The entire template shall be sent for the approval process.

Table of Contents

Part I: Evaluation System Overview	3
Part II: Evaluation System Requirements	3
Part III: Evaluation Procedures	6
Part IV: Evaluation Criteria	8
A. Instructional Practice	8
B. Other Indicators of Performance	8
C. Performance of Students	9
D. Summative Rating Calculation	15
Appendices	24
Appendix A – Evaluation Framework Crosswalk	24
Appendix B – Observation Instruments for Classroom Teachers	26
Appendix C – Observation Instruments for Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel	28
Appendix D – Student Performance Measures	29
Appendix E – Summative Evaluation Forms	32

Part I: Evaluation System Overview

In Part I, the district shall describe the purpose and provide a high-level summary of the instructional personnel evaluation system.

Citrus County School District acknowledges that the purpose of the evaluation system is to increase student learning growth by improving the quality of instructional, administrative, and supervisory services. In addition, we recognize that the curriculum must allow discovery, advocate creative and critical thinking, vary learning opportunities, and affirm success. Teachers are the greatest resource students have for academic success. Therefore, the CCS Teacher Evaluation System has been created to assist classroom teachers in comparing the work they design to an established set of standards that identify effective methods and research-based strategies for engaging students in work that will achieve the district goals. When necessary, the Professional Assistance Plan provides a mechanism for assistance to teachers who are placed on performance probation. Through this assessment, a continuous, professional, and systematic cycle of improvement will emerge that better prepares Citrus County students for their place in the future.

Part II: Evaluation System Requirements

In Part II, the district shall provide assurance that its instructional personnel evaluation system meets each requirement established in section 1012.34, F.S., below by checking the respective box. School districts should be prepared to provide evidence of these assurances upon request.

System Framework

- The evaluation system framework is based on sound educational principles and contemporary research in effective educational practices.
- The observation instrument(s) to be used for classroom teachers include indicators based on each of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) adopted by the State Board of Education.
- The observation instrument(s) to be used for non-classroom instructional personnel include indicators based on each of the FEAPs and may include specific job expectations related to student support.

Training

- The district provides training programs and has processes that ensure
 - Employees subject to an evaluation system are informed of the evaluation criteria, data sources, methodologies, and procedures associated with the evaluation before the evaluation takes place; and
 - Individuals with evaluation responsibilities and those who provide input toward evaluations understand the proper use of the evaluation criteria and procedures.

Data Inclusion and Reporting

- The district provides instructional personnel the opportunity to review their class rosters for accuracy and to correct any mistakes.

- ☒ The district school superintendent annually reports accurate class rosters for the purpose of calculating district and statewide student performance, and the evaluation results of instructional personnel.
- ☒ The district may provide opportunities for parents to provide input into performance evaluations, when the district determines such input is appropriate.

Evaluation Procedures

- ☒ The district's system ensures all instructional personnel, classroom and non-classroom, are evaluated at least once a year.
- ☒ The district's system ensures all newly hired classroom teachers are observed and evaluated at least twice in the first year of teaching in the district. Each evaluation must include indicators of student performance; instructional practice; and any other indicators of performance, if applicable.
- ☒ The district's system identifies teaching fields for which special evaluation procedures or criteria are necessary, if applicable.
- ☒ The district's evaluation procedures comply with the following statutory requirements in accordance with section 1012.34, F.S.:
 - The evaluator must be the individual responsible for supervising the employee; the evaluator may consider input from other personnel trained on the evaluation system.
 - The evaluator must provide timely feedback to the employee that supports the improvement of professional skills.
 - The evaluator must submit a written report to the employee no later than 10 days after the evaluation takes place.
 - The evaluator must discuss the written evaluation report with the employee.
 - 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.
 - The evaluator must submit a written report of the evaluation to the district school superintendent for the purpose of reviewing the employee's contract.
 - The evaluator may amend an evaluation based upon assessment data from the current school year if the data becomes available within 90 days of the end of the school year.

Use of Results

- ☒ The district has procedures for how evaluation results will be used to inform the
 - Planning of professional development; and
 - Development of school and district improvement plans.
- ☒ The district's system ensures instructional personnel who have been evaluated as less than effective are required to participate in specific professional development programs, pursuant to section 1012.98(10), F.S.

Notifications

- ☒ The district has procedures for the notification of unsatisfactory performance that comply with the requirements outlined in Section 1012.34(4), F.S.

- ☒ The district school superintendent shall annually notify the Department of Education of any instructional personnel who
 - Receive two consecutive unsatisfactory evaluation ratings; or
 - Are given written notice by the district of intent to terminate or not renew their employment, as outlined in section 1012.34(5), F.S.

District Self-Monitoring

- ☒ The district has a process for monitoring implementation of its evaluation system that enables it to determine the following:
 - Compliance with the requirements of section 1012.34, F.S., and Rule 6A-5.030, F.A.C.;
 - Evaluators' understanding of the proper use of evaluation criteria and procedures, including evaluator accuracy and inter-rater reliability;
 - Evaluators provide necessary and timely feedback to employees being evaluated;
 - Evaluators follow district policies and procedures in the implementation of evaluation system(s);
 - Use of evaluation data to identify individual professional development; and,
 - Use of evaluation data to inform school and district improvement plans.

Part III: Evaluation Procedures

In Part III, the district shall provide the following information regarding the observation and evaluation of instructional personnel. The following tables are provided for convenience and may be customized to accommodate local evaluation procedures.

1. Pursuant to section 1012.34(3)(b), F.S., all personnel must be fully informed of the criteria, data sources, methodologies, and procedures associated with the evaluation process before the evaluation takes place. In the table below, describe when and how the following instructional personnel groups are informed of the criteria, data sources, methodologies, and procedures associated with the evaluation process: classroom teachers, non-classroom teachers, newly hired classroom teachers, and teachers hired after the beginning of the school year.

Instructional Personnel Group	When Personnel are Informed	Method(s) of Informing
Classroom and Non-Classroom Teachers	Within the first 10 days of school	Mandatory Training- Instructional Personnel Evaluation PowerPoint and handouts Administrators and staff must sign in as documentation that they attended the meeting
Newly Hired Classroom Teachers	Within the first 10 days of school and the District-wide New Teacher Orientation	Mandatory Training- Instructional Personnel Evaluation PowerPoint and handouts New Teacher Orientation Instructional Evaluation PowerPoint Administrators and staff must sign in as documentation that they attended the meeting
Late Hires	Within the first 10 days of hire	Mandatory Training- Instructional Personnel Evaluation PowerPoint and handouts Monthly e-mails are sent to all administrators as a reminder Administrators and staff must sign in as documentation that they attended the meeting

2. Pursuant to section 1012.34(3)(a), F.S., an observation must be conducted for each employee at least once a year, except that a classroom teacher who is newly hired by the district school board must be observed at least twice in the first year of teaching in the school district. In the table below, describe when and how many observations take place for the following instructional personnel groups: classroom teachers, non-classroom teachers, newly hired classroom teachers, and teachers hired after the beginning of the school year.

Instructional Personnel Group	Number of Observations	When Observations Occur	When Observation Results are Communicated to Personnel
All Classroom and Non-Classroom Teachers			
Teachers with 3 or more years	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By March 24 	Within 10 days of the observation
Teachers in their 2 nd or 3 rd year	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First observation- by December 11 Final observation- by March 24 	Within 10 days of the observation
Newly hired teachers	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First observation- by October 2 Second observation- by December 11 Final observation- by March 24 	Within 10 days of the observation
Newly hired after the beginning of the school year	3- before January 1 st 2- after January 1 st	*If hired after the dates listed above, HR works with the administrator to determine the completion dates	Within 10 days of the observation

3. Pursuant to section 1012.34(3)(a), F.S., a performance evaluation must be conducted for each employee at least once a year, except that a classroom teacher who is newly hired by the district school board must be evaluated at least twice in the first year. In the table below, describe when and how many evaluations are conducted for classroom teachers.

Instructional Personnel Group	Number of Evaluations	When Evaluations Occur	When Evaluation Results are Communicated to Personnel
Classroom and Non-Classroom Teachers	1	End-of-Year Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By April 30th <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 67% Instructional Practices - Student Performance and Final Evaluation made after state data is released from DOE and student performance ratings are calculated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 33%- Student Performance 	At evaluation meeting/ conference(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - End-of-Year: By April 30th and in the Fall upon release of state data and student performance rating calculations
Newly Hired Classroom Teachers	2	Mid-year Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By January 25th <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 67%- Instructional Practices o 33%- Student Performance (Measure-interim learning target progress) End-of-Year Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By April 30th <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 67% Instructional Practices - Student Performance and Final Evaluation made after state data is released from DOE and student performance ratings are calculated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 33%- Student Performance 	At evaluation meeting/ conference(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mid-Year: By January 25th - End-of-Year: By April 30th and in the Fall upon release of state data and student performance rating calculations

Part IV: Evaluation Criteria

A. Instructional Practice

In this section, the district shall provide the following information regarding the instructional practice data that will be included for instructional personnel evaluations.

- 1. Pursuant to section 1012.34(3)(a)2., F.S., at least one-third of the evaluation must be based upon instructional practice.**

In Citrus County, instructional practice accounts for 67% of the instructional personnel performance evaluation.

- 2. Description of the step-by-step calculation for determining the instructional practice rating for classroom and non-classroom instructional personnel, including cut points for differentiating performance.**

At the end of the school year, instructional personnel provide administrators a reflection document listing how they met or exceeded expectations in the five standards (See Appendix A, B, C), which are linked to the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. Administrators use this evidence along with observation documentation and walkthrough data to assign a rating for each standard. A rating of HE, E, NI/D, or U are given for each standard. Each rating is equated to a numerical value (HE=4, E=3, NI/D=2, U=1). Each standard is worth 20% of the district portion (instructional practice rating).

Standard 1:	HE(4)	E(3)	NI/D(2)	U(1)
Standard 2:	HE(4)	E(3)	NI/D(2)	U(1)
Standard 3:	HE(4)	E(3)	NI/D(2)	U(1)
Standard 4:	HE(4)	E(3)	NI/D(2)	U(1)
Standard 5:	HE(4)	E(3)	NI/D(2)	U(1)

The administrator adds the ratings of each standard together. The sum is then divided by 5 (number of standards linked to Florida Educator Accomplished Practices). The calculated average is then correlated to an Instructional Practice Rating based on the following cut points:

HE: 4.00-3.45 E: 3.44-2.45 NI/D: 2.44-1.45 U: 1.44-0.00

This portion makes up 67% of the summative evaluation.

B. Other Indicators of Performance (*Not Applicable in Citrus County*)

In this section, the district shall provide the following information regarding any other indicators of performance that will be included for instructional personnel evaluations.

- 1. Pursuant to section 1012.34(3)(a)4., F.S., up to one-third of the evaluation may be based upon other indicators of performance. In Citrus County, other indicators of performance account for 0% of the instructional personnel performance evaluation.**
- 2. Description of additional performance indicators, if applicable.**
- 3. Description of the step-by-step calculation for determining the other indicators of performance rating for classroom and non-classroom instructional personnel, including cut points for differentiating performance.**

C. Performance of Students

In this section, the district shall provide the following information regarding the student performance data that will be included for instructional personnel evaluations.

- Pursuant to section 1012.34(3)(a)1., F.S., at least-one third of the performance evaluation must be based upon data and indicators of student performance, as determined by each school district. This portion of the evaluation must include growth or achievement data of the teacher’s students over the course of at least three years. If less than three years of data are available, the years for which data are available must be used. Additionally, this proportion may be determined by instructional assignment.**

In Citrus County, performance of students accounts for 33% of the instructional personnel performance evaluation.

- Description of the step-by-step calculation for determining the student performance rating for classroom and non-classroom instructional personnel, including cut points for differentiating performance.**

Student performance measures are based on students assigned to teachers or schools, as appropriate. Student performance is measured by the required state assessments as specified in Florida Statute 1008.22(3) for courses and grade levels linked to a statewide, standardized assessment. District-approved local and/or other assessments are used for subjects and grade levels not assessed by statewide, standardized assessments. Each data source is weighted by number of scores/students and then combined to form a 3-year rubric score/rating, if 3 years of data exists.

All data sources are calculated using district-created models. When multiple data source models are used, the weighting of these scores are done based on the number of students/scores per course or data source. District models A-I are explained below. Each model below gives the calculation description for determining the student performance rating for instructional personnel for specific grade levels and/or courses, including cut points for differentiating performance.

MODEL A1:
KINDERGARTEN, 1ST, 2ND
THIS MODEL IS FOR BRICK & MORTAR TEACHERS ONLY. (K-2 CITRUS VIRTUAL TEACHERS, PLEASE SEE MODEL A1-V)

Courses linked to Model A1: ELA and Math

Student performance is based on the percent of students meeting their expected outcome on the end of year ELA Citrus Assessment and Math Citrus Assessment.

PRE-MEASURE:
 i-Ready Diagnostic ELA and Math (Fall 2020)

Pre-Measure <small>(Student's Fall iReady Diagnostic National Percentile Rank)</small>	Expected Outcome <small>(End-of-Year Citrus Assessment)</small>	Percent of Students Meeting the Expected Outcome on Spring 2021 Citrus Assessment			
		HE	E	N/D	U
1 st – 24 th	40% or above	80-100	70-79	60-69	0-59
25 th – 49 th	50% or above				
50 th – 74 th	60% or above				
75 th – 100 th	70% or above				

ELA will be calculated separately from the Math calculation. They will then be combined and weighted by number of students.



MODEL A1-V: KINDERGARTEN, 1ST, 2ND THIS MODEL IS FOR K-2 CITRUS VIRTUAL TEACHERS ONLY .

Courses linked to Model A1-V: ELA and Math

Performance is based on students' progress toward their individual annual typical growth set forth by iReady's diagnostic program, as customized for each student based on student's overall placement after the Fall Diagnostic.

Typical growth is the average annual growth for a student at his or her grade and placement level.

After the Spring Diagnostic, points will be given to each student based on the student's "Progress Toward Annual Typical Growth."

Student's Progress To Annual Typical Growth According to Spring Diagnostic	Points
100%+ (Meets or exceeds Typical Growth)	4
55% - 99%	3
40% - 54%	2
Less than 40%	1

The teacher's rating will be based on the average of points.

Rating	Average of Points
Highly Effective	3.00 – 4.00
Effective	2.00 – 2.99
Needs Improvement/Developing	1.00 – 1.99
Unsatisfactory	0 – 0.99

ELA will be calculated separately from the Math calculation. They will then be combined and weighted by number of students.

MODEL A2: 3RD & 4TH GRADE

Courses linked to Model A2: 3rd and 4th Grade ELA & Math

Student performance is based on the percent of students scoring satisfactory on the end of year FSA ELA, FSAA ELA, FSA Math and/or FSAA Math.

PRE-MEASURE:
iReady Fall Diagnostic

PRE-MEASURE National Percentile Class Average on Fall iReady Diagnostic	RATING Percent of Students Scoring Satisfactory on Spring 2021 FSA or FSAA (Level 3 or state mean-whichever is less)			
	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing/Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
Top Quartile	60 – 100	50 – 59	35 – 49	0 - 34
50 th to 74 th Quartile	50 – 100	40 – 49	25 – 39	0 – 24
26 th to 49 th Quartile	30 – 100	20 – 29	15 – 19	0 - 14
Bottom Quartile	20 - 100	10 – 19	5 – 9	0 - 4

ELA will be calculated separately from the Math calculation. They will then be combined and weighted by number of students.

MODEL B1: FSA ELA (grades 5-10) & FSA Mathematics (grades 5-8)

Student performance is calculated by comparing a previous year's FSA score to the current year's FSA score for matched students assigned to the teacher in ELA and/or Mathematics.

***Due to the Spring 2020 state-testing cancellation, growth will be based on the student's 2019 scale score and 2021 scale score (2-year gain).**

Courses linked to Model B1:

- ELA (grades 5-10)
- English (grades 9-10)
- Reading (grades 6-8)
- Mathematics (grades 5-8)
- Pre-Algebra

Student shows growth by ONE of the following:

- Increase of achievement level
- Maintain a level 3
- Maintain a level 4
- Maintain a level 5
- If maintaining a level 1 or 2, the student must improve from one subcategory to a higher subcategory within the level (Learning Gains for Level 1 and 2 are on next slide)
- Meet predicted score formulated by State-Model (Factors: attendance, ED, SWD, previous scores)

Rating	Percent of students showing growth
Highly Effective	65 - 100
Effective	50 - 64
Needs Improvement/Developing	35 - 49
Unsatisfactory	0 - 34

ELA will be calculated separately from the Math calculation. They will then be combined and weighted by number of students.

MODEL B1 (continued): FSA ELA (grades 5-10) & FSA Mathematics (grades 5-8)

*This slide pertains specifically to students that do **NOT** have a disability. The next slide pertains to gains needed for students who **DO** have a disability.

If maintaining a level 1 or 2, the student must improve from one subcategory to a higher subcategory within the level to show growth.

- Learning Gain Examples:**
- **FSA ELA Example:** A 5th grader's previous 3rd grade ELA FSA scale score was 250 (*Low Level 1*). The student would need to score at least a 273 (*Middle Level 1*) on the 5th grade ELA FSA.
 - **FSA Math Example:** An 8th grader's previous 6th grade FSA Math scale score was 315 (*Low Level 2*). The student would need to score at least a 330 (*High Level 2*) on the 8th grade Math FSA.

ELA	Level 1 (3 subcategories)			Level 2 (2 subcategories)			Level 3	
		Low	Middle	High		Low		High
Grade 3	240-284	240-254	255-269	270-284	285-299	285-292	293-299	300-314
Grade 4	251-296	251-266	267-281	282-296	297-310	297-303	304-310	311-324
Grade 5	257-303	257-272	273-288	289-303	304-320	304-312	313-320	321-335
Grade 6	259-308	259-275	276-292	293-308	309-325	309-317	326-325	326-338
Grade 7	267-317	267-283	284-300	301-317	318-332	318-325	326-332	333-345
Grade 8	274-321	274-289	290-305	306-321	322-336	322-329	330-336	337-351
Grade 9	276-327	276-293	294-310	311-327	328-342	328-335	336-342	343-354
Grade 10	284-333	284-300	301-317	318-333	334-349	334-341	342-349	350-361
MATH		Low	Middle	High		Low	High	
Grade 3	240-284	240-254	255-269	270-284	285-296	285-290	291-296	297-310
Grade 4	251-298	251-266	267-282	283-298	299-309	299-304	305-309	310-324
Grade 5	256-305	256-272	273-289	290-305	306-319	306-312	313-319	320-333
Grade 6	260-309	260-276	277-293	294-309	310-324	310-317	318-324	325-338
Grade 7	269-315	269-284	285-300	301-315	316-329	316-322	323-329	330-345
Grade 8	273-321	273-289	290-305	306-321	322-336	322-329	330-336	337-352

MODEL B1-SWD (continued): FSA ELA (grades 5-10) & FSA Mathematics (grades 5-8)

*This slide pertains specifically to students **WITH** a disability (SWD) who take the FSA ELA or FSA Math.

If a student with a disability (SWD) maintains a Level 1 or 2 on the FSA ELA or FSA Math, the student must improve from one subcategory to a higher subcategory within the level to show growth. To provide more opportunities for learning gains for students with disabilities, Level 1 and Level 2 ranges were separated into additional subcategories.

- Learning Gain Examples:**
- **FSA ELA Example:** A 5th grader's previous 3rd grade ELA FSA scale score was 245 (*Lowest Level 1*). The student would need to score at least a 268 (*Low Level 1*) on the 5th grade ELA FSA.
 - **FSA Math Example:** An 8th grader's previous 6th grade Math FSA scale score was 318 (*Middle Level 2*). The student would need to score at least a 332 (*Medium Level 2*) on the 8th grade Math FSA.

ELA	Level 1 (4 subcategories)				Level 2 (3 subcategories)			Level 3		
		Lowest	Low	Middle	High		Low		Middle	High
Grade 3	240-284	240-250	251-261	262-272	273-284	285-299	285-289	290-294	295-299	300-314
Grade 4	251-296	251-261	262-272	273-284	285-296	297-310	297-300	301-305	306-310	311-324
Grade 5	257-303	257-267	268-279	280-291	292-303	304-320	304-308	309-314	315-320	321-335
Grade 6	259-308	259-270	271-282	83-295	296-308	309-325	309-313	314-319	320-325	326-338
Grade 7	267-317	267-278	279-291	292-304	305-317	318-332	318-322	323-327	328-332	333-345
Grade 8	274-321	274-285	286-297	298-309	310-321	322-336	322-326	327-331	332-336	337-351
Grade 9	276-327	276-288	289-301	302-314	315-327	328-342	328-332	333-337	338-342	343-354
Grade 10	284-333	284-295	296-307	308-320	321-333	334-349	334-338	339-343	344-349	350-361
MATH		Lowest	Low	Middle	High		Low	Middle	High	
Grade 3	240-284	240-250	251-261	262-272	273-284	285-296	285-288	289-292	293-296	297-310
Grade 4	251-298	251-262	263-274	275-286	287-298	299-309	299-301	302-305	306-309	310-324
Grade 5	256-305	256-267	268-279	280-292	293-305	306-319	306-309	310-314	315-319	320-333
Grade 6	260-309	260-271	272-283	284-296	297-309	310-324	310-314	315-319	320-324	325-338
Grade 7	269-315	269-279	280-291	292-303	304-315	316-329	316-319	320-324	325-329	330-345
Grade 8	273-321	273-284	285-296	297-308	309-321	322-336	322-326	327-331	332-336	337-352

MODEL B2: FSAA ELA (grades 5-11) & FSAA Mathematics (grades 5-8)

Student performance is calculated by comparing a previous year's FSAA score to the current year's FSAA score for matched students assigned to the teacher in Access ELA and/or Access Mathematics.

*Due to the Spring 2020 state-testing cancellation, growth will be based on the student's 2019 scale score and 2021 scale score (2-year gain).

- Courses linked to Model B2:**
- Access ELA (grades 5-11)
 - Access Mathematics (grades 5-8)

- Student shows growth by **ONE** of the following:
- Increase of achievement level
 - Maintain a level 3
 - Maintain a level 4
 - If maintaining a level 1 or 2, the student must improve from one subcategory to a higher subcategory within the level
 - Learning Gains for Level 1 and 2 are on next slide

Rating	Percent of students showing growth
Highly Effective	65 - 100
Effective	50 - 64
Needs Improvement/Developing	35 - 49
Unsatisfactory	0 - 34

Model B2 (continued): FSAA ELA (grades 5-11) & FSAA Mathematics (grades 5-8)

If maintaining a level 1 or 2, the student must improve from one subcategory to a higher subcategory within the level to show growth.

Learning Gain Examples:

- **FSAA ELA Example:** A 5th grader's previous 3rd grade FSAA ELA scale score was 550 (*Low Level 1*). The student would need to score at least a 555 (*Middle Level 1*) on the 5th grade ELA FSAA.
- **FSAA Math Example:** A 7th grader's previous 5th grade FSAA Math scale score was 590 (*Low Level 2*). The student would need to score at least a 594 (*High Level 2*) on the 7th grade Math FSAA.

Assessment	Level 1				Level 2			Level 3	Level 4
	Level 1	Low	Middle	High	Level 2	Low	High	Level 3	Level 4
Grade 3	540-582	540-554	555-568	569-582	583-598	583-590	591-598	599-617	618-660
Grade 4	540-581	540-553	554-567	568-581	582-596	582-589	590-596	597-617	618-660
Grade 5	540-582	540-554	555-568	569-582	583-598	583-590	591-598	599-617	618-660
Grade 6	540-582	540-554	555-568	569-582	583-598	583-590	591-598	599-617	618-660
Grade 7	540-582	540-554	555-568	569-582	583-598	583-590	591-598	599-617	618-660
Grade 8	540-581	540-553	554-567	568-581	582-597	582-589	590-597	598-613	614-660
Grade 9	540-581	540-553	554-567	568-581	582-597	582-589	590-597	598-619	620-660
Grade 10	540-583	540-554	555-569	570-583	584-597	584-590	591-597	598-616	617-660

Assessment	Level 1				Level 2			Level 3	Level 4
	Level 1	Low	Middle	High	Level 2	Low	High	Level 3	Level 4
Grade 3	540-585	540-555	556-570	571-585	586-599	586-592	593-599	600-616	617-660
Grade 4	540-586	540-555	556-571	572-586	587-598	587-592	593-598	599-617	618-660
Grade 5	540-585	540-555	556-570	571-585	586-599	586-592	593-599	600-616	617-660
Grade 6	540-585	540-555	556-570	571-585	586-599	586-592	593-599	600-616	617-660
Grade 7	540-586	540-555	556-571	572-586	587-599	587-593	594-599	600-616	617-660
Grade 8	540-585	540-555	556-570	571-585	586-597	586-591	592-597	598-614	615-660

*Note- There may be incidents where a student's minimum FSAA score needed to show growth remains the same as the score he/she had previously. This is due to the scale scores set by the FDOE.

MODEL C:

FSA/FSAA EOCS- ALGEBRA, GEOMETRY, CIVICS, BIOLOGY, US HISTORY, SCIENCE-GRADES 5 & 8

Student performance is based on the percent of students scoring satisfactory (level 3 or the state average level- whichever one is less) on the end of course state assessment.

PRE-MEASURE: The students' previous FSA or FSAA scores will adjust the range for each rating area. The previous FSA/FSAA ELA class average is used for the pre-measure for all social studies and science courses. The previous FSA/FSAA Math class average is used for the pre-measure for Algebra and Geometry courses.

Courses linked to Model C (includes Honors and Access courses):

- Science Gr. 5 & Science Gr. 8
- Algebra 1 & Algebra 1b
- Geometry
- Biology
- US History
- Civics

Pre-Measure <small>(Average Class Achievement Level on Previous FSA/FSAA assessment)</small>		Rating: Percent Satisfactory on Spring 2021 EOC Assessment <small>(Level 3 or state average achievement level- whichever is less)</small>			
FSA	FSAA	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing/Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
4.0-5.00	3.45-4.00	80 – 100	60 – 79	45 – 59	0 – 44
3.0-3.99	2.45-3.44	70 – 100	50 – 69	35 – 49	0 – 34
2.0-2.99	1.45-2.44	40 – 100	20 – 39	15 – 19	0 – 14
1.0-1.99	1.0-1.44	30 – 100	10 – 29	5 – 9	0 – 4

MODEL D:

END-OF-TERM TESTS (EOTS)/SEGMENT EXAMS DISTRICT-CREATED OR TEACHER-CREATED

Student performance is based on the percent of students scoring an expected outcome on the EOT or Segment Exam. The student's previous FSA or FSAA score serves as the pre-measure and adjusts the outcome needed on the current year's EOT or Segment Exam. The previous ELA achievement level is used for the pre-measure for ELA, social studies, and science-related courses. The previous Mathematics or Algebra achievement level is used for the pre-measure for math-related courses.

EOTs are either *district-created* (created by team of teachers and aligned to standards), *teacher-created* (created by individual teacher, aligned to standards, and submitted to school administration for approval), or *Segment Exams* (created by FLVS).

Courses linked to Model D: Non state-tested courses in middle and high schools, including AP & IB courses
(see following slide for list of courses)

Pre-Measure <small>(Student's Achievement Level on previous FSA exam)</small>	Student's Expected Outcome	Percent of Students Scoring the Expected Outcome on 2020-21 EOTs or Segment Exams			
		HE	E	N/D	U
1	45% or above on EOT	80-100	70-79	60-69	0-59
2	50% or above on EOT				
3	55% or above on EOT				
4	60% or above on EOT				
5	65% or above on EOT				

MODEL D: (VIRTUAL) SEGMENT EXAMS OR EOTS

Student performance is based on the percent of students scoring an expected outcome on the Segment Exam. The student's previous FSA score serves as the pre-measure and adjusts the outcome needed on the current year's Segment Exam. The previous ELA achievement level is used for the pre-measure for ELA, social studies, and science-related courses. The previous Mathematics or Algebra achievement level is used for the pre-measure for math-related courses.

Virtual Segment Exams are created by FLVS and administered at the end of each semester.

Courses linked to Model D: All non state-tested courses in middle and high schools

Pre-Measure <i>(Student's Achievement Level on previous FSA exam)</i>	Student's Expected Outcome	Percent of Students Scoring the Expected Outcome on 2020-21 Segment Exams			
		HE	E	N/D	U
1	45% or above on EOT	80-100	70-79	60-69	0-59
2	50% or above on EOT				
3	55% or above on EOT				
4	60% or above on EOT				
5	65% or above on EOT				

MODEL E: ELEMENTARY SPECIAL AREAS

Student performance is based on the percent of students meeting their expected outcome on the end of year Art, Music, or PE Citrus Assessment.

Courses linked to Model E:

- 2nd Grade Art
 - Virtual 3-5 teacher will assess one grade level between 3rd-5th
- 2nd Grade Music
- 2nd Grade PE

Pre-Measure:

In order to differentiate the expectations of student performance on the end-of-year Art, Music, and PE Citrus Assessments, a *pre-measure* is applied. The *pre-measure* measures the OVERALL ACADEMIC READINESS of students at the beginning of the school year. The student's Fall iReady ELA Diagnostic National Percentile score will serve as the student *pre-measure* for Model E.

Pre-Measure <i>(Student's Fall iReady Diagnostic National Percentile Rank)</i>	Expected Outcome <i>(Student's End-of-Year Art, Music, PE Citrus Assessment)</i>	Percent of Students Meeting the Expected Outcome on End-of-Year Art, Music, or PE Citrus Assessment			
		HE	E	N/D	U
1 st – 33 rd	60% or above	80-100	70-79	60-69	0-59
34 th – 66 th	70% or above				
67 th – 100 th	80% or above				

MODEL F: INDUSTRY CERTIFICATION (MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL)

Pre-Measure <i>(Average Class Achievement Level on Most Recent FSA ELA or FSA Math/Algebra)</i>	Rating: Percent Passing Industry Certification Test			
	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing/Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
1.0-1.99	30 - 100	10 - 29	5 - 9	0 - 4
2.0-2.99	40 - 100	20 - 39	15 - 19	0 - 14
3.0-3.99	50 - 100	30 - 49	20 - 29	0 - 19
4.0-5.00	60 - 100	40 - 59	25 - 39	0 - 24

*If 50% or more of students are not IC tested, then the End-of-Term Test will serve as the teacher's data source for evaluation purposes and Model D will be used.

MODEL G: INDUSTRY CERTIFICATION: PROFICIENCY TARGET (WTC)

Rating: Percent Passing Industry Certification Test			
Highly Effective	Effective	Developing/Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
50 – 100	30 – 49	20 – 29	0 – 19

MODEL H1 (CREST): GPS, DP3, EMPLOYABILITY CHECKLIST

Growth is calculated by comparing the pre and post data of matched students assigned to the teacher.

Courses linked to Model H1:
-CREST K-12 Access courses (GPS, DP3, Employability Checklist)

Rating	Percent of students showing growth	Student shows growth by:
Highly Effective	80 - 100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Showing an increase in at least one component of one of the following assessments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GPS - DP3 - Employability Checklist
Effective	60 - 79	
Needs Improvement/Developing	40 - 59	
Unsatisfactory	0 - 39	

MODEL H2 (PRIVATE SCHOOLS): SAT-10 OR MAPS

Growth is calculated by comparing the pre and post data of matched students assigned to the teacher.

Courses linked to Model H2:
-Private School Courses

Rating	Percent of students showing growth	Student shows growth by:
Highly Effective	80 - 100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase at least one percentile ranking from pre to post test <p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scored above the 80th percentile ranking on the post test
Effective	60 - 79	
Needs Improvement/Developing	40 - 59	
Unsatisfactory	0 - 39	

MODEL I: PRE-K/VPK

Growth is calculated by comparing the pre and post VPK Assessment data for each component of matched students assigned to the teacher. Each student would have the potential of showing growth in four components.

	Print Knowledge	Phonological Awareness	Oral Language / Vocabulary	Mathematics
Students can show growth in <u>two</u> ways:	Score at or above 80% on post-test			
	OR			
	Match or exceed state average improvement on post-test			
	Increase 33%	Increase 29%	Increase 27%	Increase 33%

Rating	Percent of components where students showed growth
Highly Effective	80 - 100
Effective	65 - 79
Needs Improvement/Developing	45 - 64
Unsatisfactory	0 - 44



D. Summative Rating Calculation

In this section, the district shall provide the following information regarding the calculation of summative evaluation ratings for instructional personnel.

1. Description of the step-by-step calculation for determining the summative rating for classroom and non-classroom instructional personnel.

The Teaching Practices/District Portion of the summative evaluation, which includes the five Citrus County Standards, is given one of the four ratings: HE, E, D/NI, or U. Each standard is given a rating and is worth 20% of the Teaching Practices Rating which makes up 67% of the overall rating. The ratings have a numerical point value of HE- 4 points, E- 3 points, NI/D- 2 points, and U- 1 point.

HE = 3.45 to 4.0	E = 2.45 to 3.44	D/NI = 1.45 to 2.44	U = 1 to 1.44
------------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

The Student Data Portion (33%) of the summative evaluation is also given one of the four ratings (combining up to 3 years of data, if available). The Overall Rating Matrix chart below shows the final summative rating options based on the two ratings received for the district and data portions. The Range Column on the rating matrix justifies what rating options are available based on the numerical range depending on the two ratings- district and data portion.

Rating Areas		Overall Rating Options	Range
Teaching Practices 67%	Student Data 33%		
H	H	Highly Effective	3.45-4.00
H	E	Highly Effective, Effective	3.12-3.81
H	D/NI	Highly Effective, Effective	2.78-3.48
H	U	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.30-3.15
E	H	Highly Effective, Effective	2.78-3.63
E	E	Effective	2.45-3.44
E	D/NI	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.12-3.11
E	U	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	1.97-2.77
D/NI	H	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.12-2.96
D/NI	E	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	1.78-2.77
D/NI	D/NI	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.45-2.44
D/NI	U	Developing/Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory	1.30-2.11
U	H	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.82-2.29
U	E	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.48-2.11
U	D/NI	Developing/Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory	1.15-1.77
U	U	Unsatisfactory	1.00-1.44

2. Pursuant to section 1012.34(2)(e), F.S., the evaluation system for instructional personnel must differentiate across four levels of performance. Using the district's calculation methods and cut scores described above in sections A – C, illustrate how a fourth grade teacher and a ninth grade English language arts teacher can earn a highly effective and an unsatisfactory summative performance rating respectively.

4th Grade Teacher (Mrs. Lott)- Overall Evaluation- Highly Effective

A. Professional Standards and Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (Teaching Practices/District Portion- 67%)

The principal utilized the evidence from the Instructional Observation Instrument (pictured below), multiple walk-throughs, and teacher reflection to give a rating for each Instructional Practices Standard. Mrs. Lott received HE (4) in each of the 5 standards. So, when averaged, Mrs. Lott's *Teaching Practices Rating* was "Highly Effective" (4.00).

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Teacher: Mrs. M. Lott ID XXXX Date: 5/1/19
 School: ABC School Position: Teacher Grade Level(s): 4th Grade

A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES

COMMENTS: [In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or area(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted specifically.]

Mrs. Lott is highly effective in all five professional standards.

Evidence
 Standard 1: Member of SAC, PTO, co-wrote Parent Involvement Plan, School Safety representative
 Standards 2-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation
 Standard 5: Demonstrates leadership by implementing and sharing knowledge and skills learned from professional development in her classroom and with her 4th grade team

A-EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory) **(HE) E / NI or D / U**
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19 Mrs. M. Lott's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____ Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

NAME: Mrs. M. Lott SCHOOL: ABC SUBJECT: ELA OBSERVATION DATE/TIME: 9/15/18 START 9:30 END 10:50 OBSERVER: [Signature]

APPRAISAL RATINGS: HE - Highly Effective E - Effective NI/D - Needs Improvement/Developing U - Unsatisfactory *First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

STANDARD 2 The teacher manages the resources of time, space, and information, and technology in order to enhance the quality of work provided to students.

Standard 2 Lesson Rating: (E) NI/D U

Standard 3 Lesson Rating: (E) NI/D U

Standard 4 Lesson Rating: (E) NI/D U

CUMULATIVE RATING TO DATE

Overall Standard 1 Rating: (HE) E NI/D U
 Overall Standard 2 Rating: (HE) E NI/D U
 Overall Standard 3 Rating: (HE) E NI/D U
 Overall Standard 4 Rating: (HE) E NI/D U
 Overall Standard 5 Rating: (HE) E NI/D U

Teacher's Signature: [Signature] Date: 9/15/18
 Administrator's Signature: [Signature] Date: 9/15/18

HE(4) X 5 standards = 20
 20 points /5 standards = 4.00
 (Highly Effective)

B. Student Learning Growth/Achievement Data (Data Source- 33%)

Mrs. Lott's *Student Performance Rating* was "Effective".
 Mrs. Lott's student performance rating of "Effective" was based on three years of data.
 In 2020-21, Model A2 (pictured below) was utilized to calculate her data source rating.

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Teacher: Mrs. M. Lott ID XXXX Date: 5/1/19
 School: ABC School Position: Teacher Grade Level(s): 4th Grade

A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES

COMMENTS: [In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or area(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted specifically.]

Mrs. Lott is highly effective in all five professional standards.

Evidence
 Standard 1: Member of SAC, PTO, co-wrote Parent Involvement Plan, School Safety representative
 Standards 2-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation
 Standard 5: Demonstrates leadership by implementing and sharing knowledge and skills learned from professional development in her classroom and with her 4th grade team

A-EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory) **(HE) E / NI or D / U**
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19 Mrs. M. Lott's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____ Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

B - STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Mrs. Lott's student performance rating of 2.98 (Effective) included her students' FSA ELA and FSA Math assessment data utilizing Model A2. See attached Data Source Teacher Report Card for calculation of 3-year rating.

B-EVALUATION RATING (33%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory) **(E) NI or D / U**
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

MODEL A2:
3RD & 4TH GRADE

Courses linked to Model A2: 3rd and 4th Grade ELA & Math

Student performance is based on the percent of students scoring satisfactory on the end of year FSA ELA, FSA ELA, FSA Math and/or FSA Math.

PRE-MEASURE:
 Ready Fall Diagnostic

PRE-MEASURE National Percentile Class Average on Fall Ready Diagnostic	RATING Percent of Students Scoring Satisfactory on Spring 2021 FSA or FSAA (Level 3 or state mean-whichever is less)			
	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing/Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
Top Quartile	60 - 100	50 - 59	35 - 49	0 - 34
50 th to 74 th Quartile	50 - 100	40 - 49	25 - 39	0 - 24
26 th to 49 th Quartile	30 - 100	20 - 29	15 - 19	0 - 14
Bottom Quartile	20 - 100	10 - 19	5 - 9	0 - 4

ELA will be calculated separately from the Math calculation. They will then be combined and weighted by number of students.

The picture below shows how Mrs. Lott's 3-year data source rating is calculated.

In 2020-21, Model A2 was used to calculate the following:

- 10 of her 19 ELA students (53%) scored satisfactory on the FSA ELA = Effective (3)
- 15 of her 19 Math students (79%) scored satisfactory on the FSA Math = HE (4)

The number of students is multiplied by the rubric equivalent in each subject giving the weighted rubric points earned. The same process is done for the two previous years of data (if available).

Then the sum of points from all three years is divided by the sum of students or scores from all three years to give the 3-Year Rubric Score (238/80= 2.98- Effective).

MRS. LOTT'S TEACHER REPORT CARD- DATA SOURCE			
		HE = 3.45 to 4.0	E = 2.45 to 3.44
		NI/D = 1.45 to 2.44	U = 1 to 1.44
Three-Year Sum of Points = 238	Three-Year Sum of Scores = 80	3 Year Rubric Score = 2.98	2020-21 Three-Year Data Evaluation Rating = Effective
2020-21 (YEAR 3 of 3)			
Subject	4 th grade ELA	4 th grade Math	
Data Source	FSA ELA - Model A2	FSA Math - Model A2	133 points
Number of Students/Scores	19	19	38 scores
Rating (rubric equivalent)	3 (Effective)	4 (Highly Effective)	133/38=
Weighted Rubric Points Earned	57	76	3.50 (E)- Total Points/Students
2019-20 (YEAR 2 of 3)			
Subject	NO DATA WAS COLLECTED DUE TO THE CANCELATION OF STATE TESTING IN THE SPRING OF 2020. IF THE STATE DECIDES TO UTILIZE THE 2017-18 DATA IN ORDER TO INCLUDE THREE YEARS OF DATA, CITRUS COUNTY WILL INCLUDE 2017-18, AS WELL.		
Data Source			
Number of Students/Scores			
Rating (rubric equivalent)			
Weighted Rubric Points Earned			
2018-19 (YEAR 1 of 3)			
Subject	4 th grade ELA	4 th grade Math	
Data Source	FSA ELA- Model A2	FSA Math- Model A2	105 points
Number of Students/Scores	21	21	42 scores
Rating (rubric equivalent)	2 (Needs Improvement)	3 (Effective)	105/42=
Weighted Rubric Points Earned	42	63	2.80(E)- Total Points/Students

C. Overall Evaluation Rating

Mrs. Lott's Overall Evaluation Rating is "Highly Effective".

Mrs. Lott's administrator combined the HE (4) from Teaching Practices (67%) and the E (2.98) from Student Data (33%) to assign an overall evaluation rating of "Highly Effective" based on the rating options in the Matrix below.

Rating Areas		Overall Rating Options	Range
Teaching Practices	Student Data		
67%	33%		
H	H	Highly Effective	3.45-4.00
H	E	Highly Effective, Effective	3.12-3.81
H	D/NI	Highly Effective, Effective	2.78-3.48
H	U	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.30-3.15
E	H	Highly Effective, Effective	2.78-3.63
E	E	Effective	2.45-3.44
E	D/NI	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.12-3.11
E	U	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	1.97-2.77
D/NI	H	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.12-2.96
D/NI	E	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	1.78-2.77
D/NI	D/NI	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.45-2.44
D/NI	U	Developing/Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory	1.30-2.11
U	H	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.82-2.29
U	E	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.48-2.11
U	D/NI	Developing/Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory	1.15-1.77
U	U	Unsatisfactory	1.00-1.44

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Teacher: Mrs. M. Lott ID: XXXX Date: 5/1/19
 School: ABC School Position: Teacher Grade Level(s): 4th Grade

A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES

COMMENTS: (In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or area(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted specifically.)

Mrs. Lott is highly effective in all five professional standards.

Evidence
 Standard 1: Member of SAC, PTO, co-wrote Parent Involvement Plan, School Safety representative
 Standards 2-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation
 Standard 5: Demonstrated leadership by implementing and sharing knowledge and skills learned from professional development in her classroom and with her 4th grade team

A-EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing/Unsatisfactory) **(HE)** E / NI or D / U
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____
 Mrs. M. Lott's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

B - STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Mrs. Lott's student performance rating of 2.98 (Effective) included her students' FSA ELA and FSA Math assessment data utilizing Model A2. See attached Data Source Teacher Report Card for evaluation of 3-year rating.

B-EVALUATION RATING (33%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing/Unsatisfactory) **(E)** NI or D / U
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement

C - OVERALL EVALUATION RATING

C-OVERALL EVALUATION RATING (Highly Effective, Effective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing/Unsatisfactory) **(HE)** E / NI or D / U
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement

D - TEACHER COMMENTS (Optional)

N/A

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 10/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____
 Mrs. M. Lott's Signature: _____ Date: 10/1/19
 Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____
 (Signature indicates that a copy has been provided to the teacher.)

$$3.66 = 2.68 + 0.98$$

(67% of 4.00) (33% of 2.98)

4th Grade Teacher (Mrs. Lott)- Overall Evaluation- Unsatisfactory

A. Professional Standards and Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (Teaching Practices/District Portion- 67%)

The principal utilized the evidence from the Instructional Observation Instrument (pictured below), multiple walk-throughs, and teacher reflection to give a rating for each Instructional Practices Standard. Mrs. Lott received ratings in each of the 5 standards. When averaged, Mrs. Lott's *Teaching Practices Rating* was "Unsatisfactory" (1.2).

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Teacher: Mrs. M. Lott ID XXXX Date: 5/1/19
 School: ABC School Position: Teacher Grade Level(s): 4th Grade

A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES

COMMENTS: (In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or area(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted specifically.)

Mrs. Lott is unsatisfactory in all five professional standards.

Evidence
 Standards 1-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation
 Standard 5: Has not shown implementation or sharing of knowledge and skills learned from professional development in her classroom or with her 4th grade team

A-EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D (U)
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____
 Mrs. M. Lott's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

NAME: Mrs. M. Lott SCHOOL: ABC SUBJECT: ELA OBSERVATION DATE/TIME: 9/15/18 START 9:30 END 10:50 OBSERVER RL

APPRAISAL RATINGS: HE - Highly Effective E - Effective NI/D - Needs Improvement/Developing U - Unsatisfactory *First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

STANDARD 1 The teacher designs and delivers knowledge work that meets the needs of students, parents, school system, and community.

Standard 1 Lesson Rating: E NI/D (U)

STANDARD 2 The teacher manages the resources of time, people, space, information, and technology in order to enhance the quality of work provided to students.

Standard 2 Lesson Rating: E NI/D (U)

STANDARD 3 The teacher continuously monitors and communicates the extent to which students are engaging with the work, participating with the work, experiencing satisfaction in the products of the work, and modifies the work accordingly.

Standard 3 Lesson Rating: E NI/D (U)

STANDARD 4 The teacher differentiates instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students.

Standard 4 Lesson Rating: E NI/D (U)

STANDARD 5 The teacher supports, encourages, and provides immediate and specific feedback to students to promote student achievement.

Standard 5 Lesson Rating: E NI/D (U)

CUMULATIVE RATING TO DATE

Overall Standard 1 Rating: HE E NI/D (U)
 Overall Standard 2 Rating: HE E NI/D (U)
 Overall Standard 3 Rating: HE E NI/D (U)
 Overall Standard 4 Rating: HE E NI/D (U)
 Overall Standard 5 Rating: HE E NI/D (U)

Number of Students Met Engaged: 13 15 17 16
 NOTE TIME: 9:32 9:45 10:00 10:30

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:
 - Higher-order questioning } Areas to develop (Priority)
 - Student Engagement }
 - EA guiding lesson }

*highlighted indicators were not observed

Teacher's Signature: Mrs. Lott Date: 9/15/18
 Administrator's Signature: Mrs. Lott Date: 9/15/18

NI(2)+U(1)+U(1)+U(1)+U(1)= 6
 6 points / 5 standards = 1.2
 (Unsatisfactory)

B. Student Learning Growth/Achievement Data (Data Source- 33%)

Mrs. Lott's *Student Performance Rating* was "Needs Improvement".

Mrs. Lott's student performance rating of "Needs Improvement" was based on three years of data.

In 2020-21, Model A2 (pictured below) was utilized to calculate her data source rating.

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Teacher: Mrs. M. Lott ID XXXX Date: 5/1/19
 School: ABC School Position: Teacher Grade Level(s): 4th Grade

A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES

COMMENTS: (In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or area(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted specifically.)

Mrs. Lott is unsatisfactory in all five professional standards.

Evidence
 Standards 1-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation
 Standard 5: Has not shown implementation or sharing of knowledge and skills learned from professional development in her classroom or with her 4th grade team

A-EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D (U)
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____
 Mrs. M. Lott's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

B - STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Mrs. Lott's student performance rating of 1.50 (Needs Improvement) included her student's FSA ELA and FSA Math assessment data utilizing Model A2. See attached Data Source Teacher Report Card for calculation of 3-year rating.

B-EVALUATION RATING (33%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D / U
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

MODEL A2: 3RD & 4TH GRADE

Courses linked to Model A2: 3rd and 4th Grade ELA & Math

Student performance is based on the percent of students scoring satisfactory on the end of year FSA ELA, FSA ELA, FSA Math and/or FSA Math.

PRE-MEASURE:
 iReady Fall Diagnostic

PRE-MEASURE	RATING			
	Highly Effective	Effective	Developing/Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
Top Quartile	60 - 100	50 - 59	35 - 49	0 - 34
50 th to 74 th Quartile	50 - 100	40 - 49	25 - 39	0 - 24
26 th to 49 th Quartile	30 - 100	20 - 29	15 - 19	0 - 14
Bottom Quartile	20 - 100	10 - 19	5 - 9	0 - 4

ELA will be calculated separately from the Math calculation. They will then be combined and weighted by number of students.

The picture below shows how Mrs. Lott's 3-year data source rating is calculated.

In 2020-21, Model A2 was used to calculate the following:

- 7 of her 19 ELA students (37%) scored satisfactory on the FSA ELA = Needs Improvement (2)
- 5 of her 19 Math students (26%) scored satisfactory on the FSA Math = Unsatisfactory (1)

The number of students is multiplied by the rubric equivalent in each subject giving the weighted rubric points earned. The same process is done for the two previous years of data (if available).

Then the sum of points from all three years is divided by the sum of students or scores from all three years to give the 3-Year Data Rating (120/80= 1.50- Needs Improvement).

MRS. LOTT'S TEACHER REPORT CARD- DATA SOURCE			
		HE = 3.45 to 4.0	E = 2.45 to 3.44
		NI/D = 1.45 to 2.44	U = 1 to 1.44
Three-Year Sum of Points = 120	Three-Year Sum of Scores = 80	3 Year Rubric Score= 1.50	2020-21 Three-Year Data Evaluation Rating = Needs Improvement
2020-21 (YEAR 3 of 3)			
Subject	4 th grade ELA	4 th grade Math	
Data Source	FSA ELA - Model A2	FSA Math - Model A2	57 points
Number of Students/Scores	19	19	38 scores
Rating (rubric equivalent)	2 (Needs Improvement)	1 (Unsatisfactory)	57/38=
Weighted Rubric Points Earned	38	19	1.50 (NI)- Total Points/Students
2019-20 (YEAR 2 of 3)			
Subject	NO DATA WAS COLLECTED DUE TO THE CANCELLATION OF STATE TESTING IN THE SPRING OF 2020. IF THE STATE DECIDES TO UTILIZE THE 2017-18 DATA IN ORDER TO INCLUDE THREE YEARS OF DATA, CITRUS COUNTY WILL INCLUDE 2017-18, AS WELL.		
Data Source			
Number of Students/Scores			
Rating (rubric equivalent)			
Weighted Rubric Points Earned			
2018-19 (YEAR 1 of 3)			
Subject	4 th grade ELA	4 th grade Math	
Data Source	FSA ELA- Model A2	FSA Math- Model A2	63 points
Number of Students/Scores	21	21	42 scores
Rating (rubric equivalent)	1 (Unsatisfactory)	2 (Needs Improvement)	63/42=
Weighted Rubric Points Earned	21	42	1.50(NI)- Total Points/Students

C. Overall Evaluation Rating

Mrs. Lott's *Overall Evaluation Rating* is "Unsatisfactory".

Mrs. Lott's administrator combined the U (1.2) from Teaching Practices (67%) and the NI (1.50) from Student Data (33%) to assign an overall evaluation rating of "Unsatisfactory" based on the rating options in the Matrix below.

Rating Areas		Overall Rating Options	Range
Teaching Practices 67%	Student Data 33%		
H	H	Highly Effective	3.45-4.00
H	E	Highly Effective, Effective	3.12-3.81
H	D/NI	Highly Effective, Effective	2.78-3.48
H	U	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.30-3.15
E	H	Highly Effective, Effective	2.78-3.63
E	E	Effective	2.45-3.44
E	D/NI	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.12-3.11
E	U	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	1.97-2.77
D/NI	H	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.12-2.96
D/NI	E	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	1.78-2.77
D/NI	D/NI	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.45-2.44
D/NI	U	Developing/Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory	1.30-2.11
U	H	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.82-2.29
U	E	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.48-2.11
U	D/NI	Developing/Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory	1.15-1.77
U	U	Unsatisfactory	1.00-1.44

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Teacher: Mrs. M. Lott ID: XXXX Date: 5/1/19
 School: ABC School Position: Teacher Grade Level(s): 4th Grade

A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES

COMMENT: In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or area(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted specifically.

Mrs. Lott is unsatisfactory in all five professional standards.

Evidence
 Standards 1-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation
 Standard 5: Has not shown implementation or sharing of knowledge and skills learned from professional development in her classroom or with her 4th grade team

A-EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D / U
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19

B - STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Mrs. Lott's student performance rating of 1.50 (Needs Improvement) included her students' FSA ELA and FSA Math assessment data utilizing Model A2. See attached Data Source Teacher Report Card for calculation of 3-year rating.

B-EVALUATION RATINGS (33%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D / U
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement

C - OVERALL EVALUATION RATING

C-OVERALL EVALUATION RATING (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D / U
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement

D - TEACHER COMMENTS (Optional)

N/A

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 10/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: 10/1/19
 (Signature indicates that a copy has been provided to the teacher.)

$$1.30 = 0.80 + 0.50$$

(67% of 1.2) (33% of 1.50)

9th Grade Teacher (Mr. Johnson)- Overall Evaluation- Highly Effective

A. Professional Standards and Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (Teaching Practices/District Portion- 67%)

The principal utilized the evidence from the Instructional Observation Instrument (pictured below), multiple walk-throughs, and teacher reflection to give a rating for each Instructional Practices Standard. Mr. Johnson received HE (4) in each of the 5 standards. So, when averaged, Mr. Johnson's *Teaching Practices Rating* was "Highly Effective" (4.00).

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Teacher: Mr. B. Johnson ID XXXX Date: 5/1/19
 School: ABC School Position: ELA Teacher Grade Level(s): 9th Grade

A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES

COMMENTS: (In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or area(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted specifically.)

Mr. Johnson is highly effective in all five professional standards.

Evidence
 Standard 1: Member of SAC, PTO, co-wrote Parent Involvement Plan, School Safety representative
 Standards 2-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation
 Standard 5: Demonstrates leadership by implementing and sharing knowledge and skills learned from professional development in his classroom and with his ELA department

EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory) **(HE) E / NI or D / U**
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

Supervisor's Signature: _____ 5/1/19 Date
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date
 Mr. Johnson's Signature: _____ 5/1/19 Date
 Teacher's Signature: _____ Date

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

NAME: Mr. B. Johnson SCHOOL: ABC SUBJECT: ELA OBSERVATION DATE/TIME: 9/15/18 START 9:30 END 10:50 OBSERVER: [Signature]

APPRAISAL RATING: HE - Highly Effective E - Effective NI - Needs Improvement/Developing U - Unsatisfactory *First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

STANDARD 2 The teacher designs and delivers knowledge work that meets the needs of students, parents, school system, and community.

Standard 2 Lesson Rating: (E) NI D U

Sequences lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and register prior knowledge (A1b)
 Essential question/learning objective posted
 Essential question/learning objective is explicitly used to guide lesson
 Teacher assesses and extends prior knowledge
 Students can explain how their current activities relate to the essential question/ learning goal

Delivers engaging and challenging lessons (A3a)
 Uses pacing techniques to maintain students' engagement
 Breaks the content into small chunks of information that can be easily processed by the students
 Engages students in actively processing new information
 Notices when specific students or groups of students are not engaged and effectively takes overt action
 Demonstrates intensity, excitement, and enthusiasm for the content in a variety of ways
 Demonstrates academic "vitality"

Deepens and enriches students' understanding through content area literacy strategies, verbalization of thought, and application of the subject matter (A3b)
 Models and verbalizes thought processes and strategies
 Engages students in activities that help them record their understanding of new content in linguistic-linguistic ways
 Engages students in activities that requires them to reflect and apply their learning and the learning process
 Engages students in complex tasks
 Designs relevant practice/network that deepens students' knowledge of content or process

Employs higher-order questioning techniques (A3f)
 Poses academic questions before soliciting student to respond
 Uses response rate techniques to maximize student engagement during questioning
 Prompts use of students' metacognitive skills
 Uses a majority of higher-order questions during the lesson

Low-order questions: HTT I
 High-order questions: HTT HTT III

STANDARD 3 The teacher manages the resources of time, people, space, information, and technology in order to enhance the quality of work provided to students.

Standard 3 Lesson Rating: (E) NI D U

Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, and attention (A2a)
 Academically engages students upon entering room
 Maintains lesson momentum with a sense of purpose from "bust to rest"
 Utilizes pacing techniques to guide instruction
 Effectively organizes the physical layout of the classroom
 Manages individual and class behaviors through a well-planned management system (A2b)
 Implements clear procedures, routines, and expectations
 Demonstrates classroom management "vitality"
 Responds to misbehavior in an objective and controlled manner
 Adapts the learning environment to accommodate the differing needs and diversity of students (A2c)
 Utilizes emptying system (when available)
 Displays evidences of students' thinking and learning
 Provides visual support systems
 Applies varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology to provide comprehensive instruction, and to teach for student understanding (A3g)
 Applies varied instructional strategies
 Utilizes technology resources to make learning relevant and engaging

Number of Students Not Engaged: 1 0 1 1 4 1
 NOTE TIME: 9:35 9:50 10:00 10:10 10:30

STANDARD 4 The teacher continuously monitors and communicates the extent to which students are engaging with the work, persisting with the work, experiencing satisfaction in the products of the work, and modifying the work accordingly.

Standard 4 Lesson Rating: (E) NI D U

Differentiates instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students (A3h)
 Uses multiple modalities to deliver instruction
 Uses purposeful grouping in ways that facilitate practicing and deepening knowledge of content
 Provides accommodations based on individual student needs
 Supports, encourages, and provides immediate and specific feedback to students to promote student achievement (A3i)
 Provides specific ongoing feedback to students by establishing and communicating learning goals, tracking student progress, and celebrating successes

CUMULATIVE RATING TO DATE

STANDARD 1 Overall Standard 1 Rating: (HE) E NI D U
 STANDARD 2 Overall Standard 2 Rating: (HE) E NI D U
 STANDARD 3 Overall Standard 3 Rating: (HE) E NI D U
 STANDARD 4 Overall Standard 4 Rating: (HE) E NI D U
 STANDARD 5 Overall Standard 5 Rating: (HE) E NI D U

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:

Teacher's Signature: [Signature] Date: 9/15/18
 Administrator's Signature: [Signature] Date: 9/15/18

HE(4) X 5 standards = 20
 20 points / 5 standards = 4.00
 (Highly Effective)

B. Student Learning Growth/Achievement Data (Data Source- 33%)

Mr. Johnson's *Student Performance Rating* was "Highly Effective".
 Mr. Johnson's student performance rating of "Highly Effective" was based on three years of data.
 In 2020-21, Model B1 (pictured below) was utilized to calculate his data source rating.

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Teacher: Mr. B. Johnson ID XXXX Date: 5/1/19
 School: ABC School Position: ELA Teacher Grade Level(s): 9th Grade

A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES

COMMENTS: (In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or area(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted specifically.)

Mr. Johnson is highly effective in all five professional standards.

Evidence
 Standard 1: Member of SAC, PTO, co-wrote Parent Involvement Plan, School Safety representative
 Standards 2-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation
 Standard 5: Demonstrates leadership by implementing and sharing knowledge and skills learned from professional development in his classroom and with his ELA department

EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory) **(HE) E / NI or D / U**
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

Supervisor's Signature: _____ 5/1/19 Date
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date
 Mr. Johnson's Signature: _____ 5/1/19 Date
 Teacher's Signature: _____ Date

B - STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/Achievement DATA

Mr. Johnson's student performance rating of 3.55 (Highly Effective) included his student's FSA ELA assessment data utilizing Model B1. See attached Data Source Teacher Report Card for calculation of 3-year rating.

EVALUATION RATING (33%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory) **(HE) E / NI or D / U**
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

MODEL B1:
 FSA ELA (grades 5-10) & FSA Mathematics (grades 5-8)

Student performance is calculated by comparing a previous year's FSA score to the current year's FSA score for matched students assigned to the teacher in ELA and/or Mathematics.

***Due to the Spring 2020 state-testing cancellation, growth will be based on the student's 2019 scale score and 2021 scale score (2-year gain).**

Courses linked to Model B1:

- ELA (grades 5-10)
- English (grades 5-10)
- Reading (grades 5-8)
- Mathematics (grades 5-8)
- Pre-Algebra

Student shows growth by ONE of the following:

- Increase of achievement level
- Maintain a level 3
- Maintain a level 4
- Maintain a level 5
- If maintaining a level 1 or 2, the student must improve from one subcategory to a higher subcategory within the level (Learning Gains for Level 1 and 2 are on next slide)
- Meet predicted score formulated by State-Model (Factors: attendance, ED, SWD, previous scores)

ELA will be calculated separately from the Math calculation. They will then be combined and weighted by number of students.

Rating	Percent of students showing growth
Highly Effective	65 - 100
Effective	50 - 64
Needs Improvement/Developing	35 - 49
Unsatisfactory	0 - 34

The picture below shows how Mr. Johnson’s 3-year data source rating is calculated.

In 2020-21, Model B1 was used to calculate the following:

- 65 of his 110 ELA students (59%) showed growth on the FSA ELA = Effective (3)

The number of students is multiplied by the rubric equivalent in each subject giving the weighted rubric points earned. The same process is done for the two previous years of data (if available).

Then the sum of points from all three years is divided by the sum of students or scores from all three years to give his 3-Year Rubric Score (870/245= 3.55- Highly Effective).

MR. JOHNSON'S TEACHER REPORT CARD- DATA SOURCE			
Three-Year Sum of Points = 870		Three-Year Sum of Students/Scores = 245	
3 Year Rubric Score= 3.55		2020-21 Three-Year Data Evaluation Rating = Highly Effective	
2020-21 (YEAR 3 of 3)			
Subject	English 1		
Data Source	FSA ELA-Model B1		330 points
Number of Students/Scores	110		110 students/scores
Rating (rubric equivalent)	3 (Effective)		330/110=
Weighted Rubric Points Earned	330		3.00 (E)- Total Points/Students
2019-20 (YEAR 2 of 3)			
Subject	NO DATA WAS COLLECTED DUE TO THE CANCELATION OF STATE TESTING IN THE SPRING OF 2020. IF THE STATE DECIDES TO UTILIZE THE 2017-18 DATA IN ORDER TO INCLUDE THREE YEARS OF DATA, CITRUS COUNTY WILL INCLUDE 2017-18, AS WELL.		
Data Source			
Number of Students/Scores			
Rating (rubric equivalent)			
Weighted Rubric Points Earned			
2018-19 (YEAR 1 of 3)			
Subject	English 1	Journalism	
Data Source	FSA ELA-Model B1	EOT- Model D	540 points
Number of Students/Scores	100	35	135 students/scores
Rating (rubric equivalent)	4 (Highly Effective)	4 (Highly Effective)	540/135=
Weighted Rubric Points Earned	400	140	4.00 (HE)- Total Points/Students

C. Overall Evaluation Rating

Mr. Johnson’s Overall Evaluation Rating is “Highly Effective”.

Mr. Johnson’s administrator combined the HE (4) from Teaching Practices (67%) and the HE (3.55) from Student Data (33%) to assign an overall evaluation rating of “Highly Effective” based on the rating options in the Matrix below.

Rating Areas		Overall Rating Options	Range
Teaching Practices	Student Data		
67%	33%		
H	H	Highly Effective	3.45-4.00
H	E	Highly Effective, Effective	3.12-3.81
H	D/NI	Highly Effective, Effective	2.78-3.48
H	U	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.30-3.15
E	H	Highly Effective, Effective	2.78-3.63
E	E	Effective	2.45-3.44
E	D/NI	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.12-3.11
E	U	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	1.97-2.77
D/NI	H	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.12-2.96
D/NI	E	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	1.78-2.77
D/NI	D/NI	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.45-2.44
D/NI	U	Developing/Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory	1.30-2.11
U	H	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.82-2.29
U	E	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.48-2.11
U	D/NI	Developing/Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory	1.15-1.77
U	U	Unsatisfactory	1.00-1.44

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Teacher: Mr. B. Johnson ID XXXX Date: 5/1/19
 School: ABC School Position: ELA Teacher Grade Level(s): 9th Grade

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES

COMMENTS: In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or areas(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted separately.

Mr. Johnson is highly effective in all five professional standards.

Evidence
 Standard 1: Member of the PTO, co-wrote Parent Involvement Plan, School Safety representative
 Standards 2-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation
 Standard 5: Demonstrates leadership by implementing and sharing knowledge and skills learned from professional development in his classroom and within the ELA department

EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing; Unsatisfactory) (HE) E / NI or D / U
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19 Mr. Johnson's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____ Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

B – STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Mr. Johnson's student performance rating of 3.55 (Highly Effective) includes his students' FSA ELA assessment data utilizing Model B1. See attached Data Source Teacher Report Card for calculation of 3-year rating.

EVALUATION RATINGS (33%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing; Unsatisfactory) (HE) E / NI or D / U
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement

C – OVERALL EVALUATION RATING

C-OVERALL EVALUATION RATING (Highly Effective, Effective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing; Unsatisfactory) (HE) E / NI or D / U
 First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement

D – TEACHER COMMENTS (Optional)

N/A

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 10/1/19 Mr. Johnson's Signature: _____ Date: 10/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____ (Signature indicates that a copy has been provided to the teacher.)

$$3.85 = 2.68 + 1.17$$

(67% of 4.00) (33% of 3.55)

9th Grade Teacher (Mr. Johnson)- Overall Evaluation- Unsatisfactory

A. Professional Standards and Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (Teaching Practices/District Portion- 67%)

The principal utilized the evidence from the Instructional Observation Instrument (pictured below), multiple walk-throughs, and teacher reflection to give a rating for each Instructional Practices Standard. Mr. Johnson received ratings in each of the 5 standards. When averaged, Mr. Johnson's *Teaching Practices Rating* was "Unsatisfactory" (1.2).

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Teacher: Mr. B. Johnson ID XXXX Date: 5/1/19
 School: ABC School Position: ELA Teacher Grade Level(s): 9th Grade

A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES

COMMENTS: [In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or area(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted specifically.]

Mr. Johnson performs unsatisfactorily in all five professional standards.

Evidence
 Standards 1-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation
 Standard 5: Has not demonstrated implementation of knowledge and skills learned from professional development in the classroom or with his ELA department

A-EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D (U)

First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Mr. Johnson's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

NAME: Mr. B. Johnson SCHOOL: ABC SUBJECT: ELA OBSERVATION DATE/TIME: 9/15/18 START 9:30 END 10:50 OBSERVER: RL

APPRAISAL RATINGS: HE = Highly Effective E = Effective NI/D = Needs Improvement/Developing U = Unsatisfactory *First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

STANDARD 2 The teacher designs and delivers knowledge work that meets the needs of students, parents, school system, and community.
 Standard 2 Lesson Rating: E NI/D (U)

STANDARD 3 The teacher manages the resources of time, people, space, information, and technology in order to enhance the qualities of work provided to students.
 Standard 3 Lesson Rating: E NI/D (U)

STANDARD 4 The teacher continuously monitors and communicates the extent to which students are engaging with the work, persisting with the work, experiencing satisfaction in the products of the work, and modifies the work accordingly.
 Standard 4 Lesson Rating: E NI/D (U)

STANDARD 5 The teacher demonstrates effective communication skills and uses appropriate technology to enhance the quality of work provided to students.
 Standard 5 Lesson Rating: E NI/D (U)

CUMULATIVE RATING TO DATE

STANDARD 1: Overall Standard 1 Rating: HE E NI/D (U)
 STANDARD 2: Overall Standard 2 Rating: HE E NI/D (U)
 STANDARD 3: Overall Standard 3 Rating: HE E NI/D (U)
 STANDARD 4: Overall Standard 4 Rating: HE E NI/D (U)
 STANDARD 5: Overall Standard 5 Rating: HE E NI/D (U)

Number of Students Not Engaged: 3 5 7 10
 NOTE TIME: 9:32 9:45 10:00 10:30

COMMENT/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:
 - Higher-order questioning } Areas to develop (Priority)
 - Student Engagement }
 - EA guiding lesson }
 *highlighted indicators were not observed

Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: 9/15/18
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: 9/15/18

NI(2)+U(1)+U(1)+U(1)+U(1)= 6
 6 points / 5 standards = 1.2
 (Unsatisfactory)

B. Student Learning Growth/Achievement Data (Data Source- 33%)

Mr. Johnson's *Student Performance Rating* was "Unsatisfactory".

Mr. Johnson's student performance rating of "Unsatisfactory" was based on three years of data.

In 2020-21, Model B1 (pictured below) was utilized to calculate his data source rating.

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Teacher: Mr. B. Johnson ID XXXX Date: 5/1/19
 School: ABC School Position: ELA Teacher Grade Level(s): 9th Grade

A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES

COMMENTS: [In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or area(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted specifically.]

Mr. Johnson performs unsatisfactorily in all five professional standards.

Evidence
 Standards 1-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation
 Standard 5: Has not demonstrated implementation of knowledge and skills learned from professional development in the classroom or with his ELA department

A-EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D (U)

First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Mr. Johnson's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19

B - STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Mr. Johnson's student performance rating of 1.34 (Unsatisfactory) included his students' FSA ELA assessment data utilizing Model A2. See attached Data Source Teacher Report Card for calculation of 3-year rating.

B-EVALUATION RATING (33%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D (U)

First 3 years of employment = Developing/4+ years = Needs Improvement

MODEL B1:
FSA ELA (grades 5-10) & FSA Mathematics (grades 5-8)

Student performance is calculated by comparing a previous year's FSA score to the current year's FSA score for matched students assigned to the teacher in ELA and/or Mathematics.

***Due to the Spring 2020 state-testing cancellation, growth will be based on the student's 2019 scale score and 2021 scale score (2-year gain).**

Courses linked to Model B1:

- ELA (grades 5-10)
- English (grades 9-10)
- Reading (grades 6-8)
- Mathematics (grades 5-8)
- Pre-Algebra

Student shows growth by ONE of the following:

- Increase of achievement level
- Maintain a level 3
- Maintain a level 4
- Maintain a level 5
- If maintaining a level 1 or 2, the student must improve from one subcategory to a higher subcategory within the level (Learning Gains for Level 1 and 2 are on next slide)
- Meet predicted score formulated by State-Model (factors: attendance, ED, SWD, previous scores)

ELA will be calculated separately from the Math calculation. They will then be combined and weighted by number of students.

Rating	Percent of students showing growth
Highly Effective	65 - 100
Effective	50 - 64
Needs Improvement/Developing	35 - 49
Unsatisfactory	0 - 34

The picture below shows how Mr. Johnson’s 3-year data source rating is calculated.

In 2020-21, Model B1 was used to calculate the following:

- 39 of his 110 ELA students (35%) showed growth on the FSA ELA = Needs Improvement (2)

The number of students is multiplied by the rubric equivalent in each subject giving the weighted rubric points earned. The same process is done for the two previous years of data (if available).

Then the sum of points from all three years is divided by the sum of students or scores from all three years to give his 3-Year Rubric Score (360/250= 1.44- Unsatisfactory).

MR. JOHNSON'S TEACHER REPORT CARD- DATA SOURCE			
		HE = 3.45 to 4.0	E = 2.45 to 3.44
		NI/D = 1.45 to 2.44	U = 1 to 1.44
Three-Year Sum of Points = 360	Three-Year Sum of Students/Scores = 250	3 Year Rubric Score= 1.44	2020-21 Three-Year Data Evaluation Rating = Unsatisfactory
2020-21 (YEAR 3 of 3)			
Subject	English I		
Data Source	FSA ELA-Model B1		220 points
Number of Students/Scores	110		110 students/scores
Rating (rubric equivalent)	2 (Needs Improvement)		220/110=
Weighted Rubric Points Earned	220		2.00 (NI)- Total Points/Students
2019-20 (YEAR 2 of 3)			
Subject	NO DATA WAS COLLECTED DUE TO THE CANCELATION OF STATE TESTING IN THE SPRING OF 2020. IF THE STATE DECIDES TO UTILIZE THE 2017-18 DATA IN ORDER TO INCLUDE THREE YEARS OF DATA, CITRUS COUNTY WILL INCLUDE 2017-18, AS WELL.		
Data Source			
Number of Students/Scores			
Rating (rubric equivalent)			
Weighted Rubric Points Earned			
2018-19 (YEAR 1 of 3)			
Subject	English I	Journalism	
Data Source	FSA ELA-Model B1	EOT- Model D	140 points
Number of Students/Scores	100	40	140 students/scores
Rating (rubric equivalent)	1 (Unsatisfactory)	1 (Unsatisfactory)	140/140=
Weighted Rubric Points Earned	100	40	1.00 (U)- Total Points/Students

C. Overall Evaluation Rating

Mr. Johnson’s Overall Evaluation Rating is “Unsatisfactory”

Mr. Johnson’s administrator combined the U (1.2) from Teaching Practices (67%) and the U (1.44) from Student Data (33%) to assign an overall evaluation rating of “Unsatisfactory” based on the Matrix below.

Rating Areas		Overall Rating Options	Range
Teaching Practices 67%	Student Data 33%		
H	H	Highly Effective	3.45-4.00
H	E	Highly Effective, Effective	3.12-3.81
H	D/NI	Highly Effective, Effective	2.78-3.48
H	U	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.30-3.15
E	H	Highly Effective, Effective	2.78-3.63
E	E	Effective	2.45-3.44
E	D/NI	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.12-3.11
E	U	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	1.97-2.77
D/NI	H	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	2.12-2.96
D/NI	E	Effective, Developing/Needs Improvement	1.78-2.77
D/NI	D/NI	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.45-2.44
D/NI	U	Developing/Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory	1.30-2.11
U	H	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.82-2.29
U	E	Developing/Needs Improvement	1.48-2.11
U	D/NI	Developing/Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory	1.15-1.77
U	U	Unsatisfactory	1.00-1.44

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT

Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.

Teacher: Mr. B. Johnson ID XXXX Date: 5/1/19
 School: ABC School Position: ELA Teacher Grade Level(s): 9th Grade

A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES

COMMENTS: (In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or areas) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted specifically.)

Mr. Johnson performs unsatisfactorily in all five professional standards.

Evidence

Standard 1.4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation

Standard 5: Has not demonstrated implementation of knowledge and skills learned from professional development in the classroom or with his ELA department.

A-EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory); HE / E / NI or D (U)

First 3 years of employment = Developing + 4 years = Needs Improvement

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19 Mr. Johnson's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____ Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

B - STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Mr. Johnson's student performance rating of 1.34 (Unsatisfactory) included his student's FSA ELA assessment data utilizing Model A2. See attached Data Source Teacher Report Card for calculation of 3-year rating.

B-EVALUATION RATING (33%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory); HE / E / NI or D (U)

First 3 years of employment = Developing + 4 years = Needs Improvement

C - OVERALL EVALUATION RATING

C-OVERALL EVALUATION RATING (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory); HE / E / NI or D (U)

First 3 years of employment = Developing + 4 years = Needs Improvement

D - TEACHER COMMENTS (Optional)

N/A

Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 10/1/19 Mr. Johnson's Signature: _____ Date: 10/1/19
 Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____ Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

$$1.28 = 0.80 + 0.48$$

(67% of 1.2) (33% of 1.44)

Appendix A – Evaluation Framework Crosswalk

In Appendix A, the district shall include a crosswalk of the district's evaluation framework to each of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs).

Alignment to the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices	
Practice	Evaluation Indicators
1. Instructional Design and Lesson Planning	
<i>Applying concepts from human development and learning theories, the effective educator consistently:</i>	
a. Aligns instruction with state-adopted standards at the appropriate level of rigor;	Standard 2
b. Sequences lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and required prior knowledge;	Standard 2
c. Designs instruction for students to achieve mastery;	Standard 2
d. Selects appropriate formative assessments to monitor learning;	Standard 4
e. Uses diagnostic student data to plan lessons; and,	Standard 4
f. Develops learning experiences that require students to demonstrate a variety of applicable skills and competencies.	Standard 2
2. The Learning Environment	
<i>To maintain a student-centered learning environment that is safe, organized, equitable, flexible, inclusive, and collaborative, the effective educator consistently:</i>	
a. Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, and attention;	Standard 3
b. Manages individual and class behaviors through a well-planned management system;	Standard 3
c. Conveys high expectations to all students;	Standard 1
d. Respects students' cultural linguistic and family background;	Standard 1
e. Models clear, acceptable oral and written communication skills;	Standard 1
f. Maintains a climate of openness, inquiry, fairness and support;	Standard 1
g. Integrates current information and communication technologies;	Standard 3
h. Adapts the learning environment to accommodate the differing needs and diversity of students; and	Standard 3
i. Utilizes current and emerging assistive technologies that enable students to participate in high-quality communication interactions and achieve their educational goals.	Standard 3
3. Instructional Delivery and Facilitation	
<i>The effective educator consistently utilizes a deep and comprehensive knowledge of the subject taught to:</i>	
a. Deliver engaging and challenging lessons;	Standard 2
b. Deepen and enrich students' understanding through content area literacy strategies, verbalization of thought, and application of the subject matter;	Standard 2
c. Identify gaps in students' subject matter knowledge;	Standard 4
d. Modify instruction to respond to preconceptions or misconceptions;	Standard 4
e. Relate and integrate the subject matter with other disciplines and life experiences;	Standard 2
f. Employ higher-order questioning techniques;	Standard 2
g. Apply varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology, to provide comprehensible instruction, and to teach for student understanding;	Standard 3
h. Differentiate instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students;	Standard 4
i. Support, encourage, and provide immediate and specific feedback to students to promote student achievement;	Standard 4
j. Utilize student feedback to monitor instructional needs and to adjust instruction.	Standard 4
4. Assessment	
<i>The effective educator consistently:</i>	

a. Analyzes and applies data from multiple assessments and measures to diagnose students' learning needs, informs instruction based on those needs, and drives the learning process;	Standard 4
b. Designs and aligns formative and summative assessments that match learning objectives and lead to mastery;	Standard 2
c. Uses a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress, achievement and learning gains;	Standard 4
d. Modifies assessments and testing conditions to accommodate learning styles and varying levels of knowledge;	Standard 4
e. Shares the importance and outcomes of student assessment data with the student and the student's parent/caregiver(s); and,	Standard 4
f. Applies technology to organize and integrate assessment information.	Standard 3
5. Continuous Professional Improvement	
<i>The effective educator consistently:</i>	
a. Designs purposeful professional goals to strengthen the effectiveness of instruction based on students' needs;	Standard 5
b. Examines and uses data-informed research to improve instruction and student achievement;	Standard 5
c. Uses a variety of data, independently, and in collaboration with colleagues, to evaluate learning outcomes, adjust planning and continuously improve the effectiveness of the lessons;	Standard 4
d. Collaborates with the home, school and larger communities to foster communication and to support student learning and continuous improvement;	Standard 5
e. Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices; and,	Standard 5
f. Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development in the teaching and learning process.	Standard 5
6. Professional Responsibility and Ethical Conduct	
Understanding that educators are held to a high moral standard in a community, the effective educator:	
a. Adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession of Florida, pursuant to Rules 6A-10.080 and 6A-10.081, F.A.C., and fulfills the expected obligations to students, the public and the education profession.	Standard 1

Appendix B – Observation Instruments for Classroom Teachers

In Appendix B, the district shall include the observation rubric(s) to be used for collecting instructional practice data for classroom teachers.

FRONT

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

NAME: _____ SCHOOL: _____ SUBJECT: _____ OBSERVATION DATE/TIME: _____ START _____ END _____ OBSERVER _____

APPRAISAL RATINGS: HE –Highly Effective E–Effective D/NI*–Developing/Needs Improvement U–Unsatisfactory *First 3 years of employment = Developing / 4+ years = Needs Improvement

STANDARD 2 The teacher designs and delivers knowledge work that meets the needs of students, parents, school system, and community.

Standard 2 Lesson Rating: E D/NI U

Sequences lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and required prior knowledge (A1b)

- Essential question/learning objective posted
- Essential question/learning objective is explicitly used to guide lesson
- Teacher accesses and extends prior knowledge
- Students can explain how their current activities relate to the essential question/ learning goal

Delivers engaging and challenging lessons (A3a)

- Uses pacing techniques to maintain students' engagement
- Breaks the content into small chunks of information that can be easily processed by the students
- Engages students in actively processing new information
- Notices when specific students or groups of students are not engaged and effectively takes overt action
- Demonstrates intensity, excitement, and enthusiasm for the content in a variety of ways
- Demonstrates academic "withitness"

Deepens and enriches students' understanding through content area literacy strategies, verbalization of thought, and application of the subject matter (A3b)

- Models and verbalizes thought processes and strategies
- Engages students in activities that help them record their understanding of new content in linguistic/non-linguistic ways
- Engages students in activities that requires them to reflect and apply their learning and the learning process
- Engages students in complex tasks
- Designs relevant practice/homework that deepens students' knowledge of content or process

Employs higher-order questioning techniques (A3f)

- Poses academic questions before selecting student to respond
- Uses response rate techniques to maintain student engagement during questioning
- Prompts use of students' metacognitive skills
- Uses a majority of higher-order questions during the lesson

Low-order questions: _____
High-order questions: _____

STANDARD 3 The teacher manages the resources of time, people, space, information, and technology in order to enhance the qualities of work provided to students.

Standard 3 Lesson Rating: E D/NI U

Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, and attention (A2a)

- Academically engages students upon entering room
- Maintains lesson momentum with a sense of purpose from "bell to bell"
- Utilizes pacing timelines to guide instruction
- Effectively organizes the physical layout of the classroom

Manages individual and class behaviors through a well-planned management system (A2b)

- Implements clear procedures, routines, and expectations
- Demonstrates classroom management "withitness"
- Responds to misbehavior in an objective and controlled manner

Adapts the learning environment to accommodate the differing needs and diversity of students (A2h)

- Utilizes amplifying system (when available)
- Displays evidences of students' thinking and learning
- Provides visual support systems

Applies varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology, to provide comprehensible instruction, and to teach for student understanding (A3g)

- Applies varied instructional strategies
- Utilizes technology resources to make learning relevant and engaging

Number of Students Not Engaged: 1 2 3 4

NOTE TIME: _____

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:

Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____ Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

STANDARD 4 The teacher continuously monitors and communicates the extent to which students are engaging with the work, persisting with the work, experiencing satisfaction in the products of the work, and modifies the work accordingly.

Standard 4 Lesson Rating: E D/NI U

Differentiates instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students (A3h)

- Uses multiple modalities to deliver instruction
- Uses purposeful grouping in ways that facilitate practicing and deepening knowledge of content
- Provides accommodations based on individual student needs

Supports, encourages, and provides immediate and specific feedback to students to promote student achievement (A3i)

- Provides specific ongoing feedback to students by establishing and communicating learning goals, tracking student progress, and celebrating successes

CUMULATIVE RATING TO DATE

STANDARD 1.					
Overall Standard 1 Rating:	HE	E	D/NI	U	
STANDARD 2					
Overall Standard 2 Rating:	HE	E	D/NI	U	
STANDARD 3					
Overall Standard 3 Rating:	HE	E	D/NI	U	
STANDARD 4					
Overall Standard 4 Rating:	HE	E	D/NI	U	
STANDARD 5					
Overall Standard 5 Rating:	HE	E	D/NI	U	

BACK**STANDARD 2****(A1b)**

- An **essential question/learning objective** is a clear question/statement of knowledge or information - not an activity or assignment

(A3a)

- Teacher demonstrates **intensity, excitement, and enthusiasm** for the content in a variety of ways that may include physical gestures, voice tone, dramatization of information, etc
- **Academic "withitness"** involves recognizing and responding to students' cues that reflect their understanding/lack of understanding and scaffolds instruction as necessary

(A3b)

- Uses "Teach, Model, Practice" to sequence instruction ("I do, We do, You do")
- **Linguistic/non-linguistic activities** include summarizing, note taking that identifies critical information about content, graphic organizers, flow charts, pictographs, mnemonics, etc
- Activities that help **students reflect on their learning and the learning process** include think-pair-share, jigsaw, response journals, exit cards, Cornell notes, anchor charts, etc
- **Complex tasks** include decision making, problem solving, summarizing, classifying, experimental inquiry, investigations, comparisons, analogies, metaphors, etc
- **Relevant practice/homework** should be purposeful, not a routine event/activity

(A3f)

- When utilizing questioning strategies watch for practices that can impede the momentum of learning
Concerns: unison response/call outs, multiple questions asked as one, non-academic questions
- **Response rate techniques** include using wait time, response cards, hand signals by students to respond, choral response, technology to keep track of students' responses
- Definitions: **Choral response** – model provided by teacher or student, signal is used for students to respond as a group
- **Unison response** – students call out answers – ineffective technique
- Prompting the use of students' **metacognitive** skills involves mentally interacting with content by: monitoring for meaning, using and creating schema, asking questions, determining importance, inferring, using sensory and emotional images, and synthesizing

EXPLANATIONS / EXAMPLES**STANDARD 3****(A2a)**

- **Organized physical layout** of the classroom = clear traffic patterns and easy access to student and teacher materials

(A2b)

- Classroom management "**withitness**" involves physically occupying all quadrants of the room, scanning and making eye contact with all students, recognizing potential sources of disruption and dealing with them immediately

(A2h)

- **Visual Support Systems** include charts, rubrics, anchor charts, word walls, visual schedules, visual communication cards, etc

(A3g)

- Examples of technology resources include: MOBI's, clickers, doc cameras, Smart Boards, e readers, flip cameras, cameras, blogs, educational websites, etc

STANDARD 4**(A3h)**

- **Modalities** – visual, auditory, kinesthetic
- **Accommodations can be offered in various forms:**
Presentation: large print, sign language, oral presentation, color overlays, audio books, reduced items, assistive devices
Responding: dictation, sign language, alpha smart, computer, text-to-speech software, assistive devices
Scheduling: extended time, change the way the time is organized, frequent breaks
Setting: small group, one-on-one, preferential seating

(A3i)

- Providing **specific ongoing feedback** to students includes evidences of goal setting, graphing, charts, conference logs, etc

AREAS OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES**STANDARD 1 The teacher supports the beliefs, shared vision, and mission adopted by the district.**

- Conveys high expectations to all students
- Respects students' cultural, linguistic and family background
- Models clear, acceptable oral and written communication skills in an effective manner
- Maintains a climate of openness, inquiry, fairness and support
- Collaborates with the home, school and larger communities to foster communication and to support student learning and continuous improvement
- Adheres to The Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct
- Adheres to policies
- Effective in duty assignments
- Maintains appropriate appearance
- Demonstrates commitment to school and the community
- Plans effectively for instruction
- Appropriately evaluates achievement
- Knowledgeable of subject matter

STANDARD 5 The teacher demonstrates leadership.

- Designs purposeful professional goals to strengthen the effectiveness of instruction based on students' needs
- Examines and uses data-informed research to improve instruction and student achievement
- Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices, both independently and in collaboration with colleagues (*with the intent to increase student achievement*)
- Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development in the teaching and learning process

Guiding Questions for Post Observation Conference /Mid-Year Review

- How are you using data to drive instruction?
- What progress are you making in implementing new learnings from the professional development activities?

Appendix C – Observation Instruments for Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel

In Appendix C, the district shall include the observation rubric(s) to be used for collecting instructional practice data for non-classroom instructional personnel.

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS
NON-CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL TEACHER OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT

NAME: _____ **SCHOOL:** _____

AREA: _____ **OBSERVATION DATE/TIME:** _____ **OBSERVER** _____

APPRAISAL RATINGS: HE –Highly Effective E–Effective D/NI*–Developing/Needs Improvement U–Unsatisfactory
*First 3 years of employment = Developing / 4+ years = Needs Improvement

CUMULATIVE RATING TO DATE

STANDARD 1: The teacher supports the beliefs, shared vision, and mission adopted by the district.

Overall Standard 1 Rating: HE E D/NI U

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:

STANDARD 2: The teacher designs and delivers knowledge work that meets the needs of students, parents, school system, and community.

Overall Standard 2 Rating: HE E D/NI U

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:

STANDARD 3: The teacher manages the resources of time, people, space, information, and technology in order to enhance the qualities of work provided to students.

Overall Standard 3 Rating: HE E D/NI U

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:

STANDARD 4: The teacher continuously monitors and communicates the extent to which students are engaging with the work, persisting with the work, experiencing satisfaction in the products of the work, and modifies the work accordingly.

Overall Standard 4 Rating: HE E D/NI U

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:

STANDARD 5: The teacher demonstrates leadership.

Overall Standard 5 Rating: HE E D/NI U

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:

Non-Classroom Instructional Teacher's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Administrator's Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Appendix D – Student Performance Measures

In Appendix D, the district shall provide the list of assessments and the performance standards that will apply to the assessment results to be used for calculating the performance of students assigned to instructional personnel. The following table is provided for convenience; other ways of displaying information are acceptable.

Student Performance Measures			
Teaching Assignment	Assessment(s)	Performance Standard(s) (HE, E, NI/D, or U)	Model Used to Calculate HE, E, NI/D, or U <i>(See Part IV © of this document for details)</i>
Pre-Kindergarten (PK)	VPK Assessment	Percent of students showing growth	Model I
Kindergarten (K)	Citrus Assessment- ELA & Math	Percent of students meeting expected outcome	Model A1
First Grade (1)	Citrus Assessment- ELA & Math	Percent of students meeting expected outcome	Model A1
Second Grade (2)	Citrus Assessment- ELA & Math	Percent of students meeting expected outcome	Model A1
K-2 – Innovative Virtual	I Ready- ELA & Math	Percent of students showing growth	Model A1-V
Third Grade (3)	FSA ELA & FSA Math	Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater	Model A2
Fourth Grade (4)	FSA ELA & FSA Math	Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater	Model A2
Fifth Grade (5)	FSA ELA, FSA Math & NGSSS Science	ELA & Math – Percent of students showing growth Science – Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater	Model B1 Model C
Elementary Art	Citrus Art End-of-Term Test	Percent of students meeting expected outcome	Model E
Elementary Music	Citrus Music End-of-Term Test	Percent of students meeting expected outcome	Model E
Elementary PE	Citrus PE End-of-Term Test	Percent of students meeting expected outcome	Model E
Access Points (3-5)	FSAA Assessment	3 rd -4 th - Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater	Model A2
		5 th - ELA & Math- Percent of students showing growth	Model B2
		5 th Science- Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater	Model C
Other (PK-5) (including non-classroom instructional personnel)	School-wide Rating	Combination of all student performance ratings in school	All Models
English/Language Arts, Reading Courses (6-8)	FSA ELA	Percent of students showing growth	Model B1
Math Courses (6-8)	FSA Math	Percent of students showing growth	Model B1

Student Performance Measures			
Teaching Assignment	Assessment(s)	Performance Standard(s) (HE, E, NI/D, or U)	Model Used to Calculate HE, E, NI/D, or U <i>(See Part IV © of this document for details)</i>
Science Courses (6-8)	6 th & 7 th – Science End-of-Term Test (EOT) 8 th – NGSSS Science Assessment	6 th & 7 th – Percent of students scoring their expected outcome 8 th - Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater	Model D Model C
Social Studies Courses (6-8)	6 th – US History End-of-Term Test (EOT) 7 th - NGSSS Civics Assessment 8 th – World History End-of-Term Test (EOT)	6 th – Percent of students scoring their expected outcome 7 th - Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater 8 th - Percent of students scoring their expected outcome	Model D Model C Model D
Access Points (6-8)	FSAA Assessment	ELA & Math- Percent of students showing growth Civics & 8 th Science- Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater	Model B2 Model C
Electives	End-of-Term Test (EOT)	Percent of students scoring their expected outcome	Model D
Other (6-8) (including non-classroom instructional personnel)	School-wide Rating	Combination of all student performance ratings in school	All Models
English 1	FSA ELA	Percent of students showing growth	Model B1
English 2	FSA ELA	Percent of students showing growth	Model B1
English 3	End-of-Term Test (EOT)	Percent of students scoring their expected outcome	Model D
English 4	End-of-Term Test (EOT)	Percent of students scoring their expected outcome	Model D
Algebra 1; Algebra 1B	FSA Algebra 1 EOC	Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater	Model C
Geometry	FSA Geometry EOC	Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater	Model C
Math Courses (9-12)- except Algebra 1 and Geometry	End-of-Term Test (EOT)	Percent of students scoring their expected outcome	Model D
Biology 1; Biology 1 Pre-IB	NGSSS Biology EOC	Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater	Model C
Science Courses (9-12)- except Biology 1	End-of-Term Test (EOT)	Percent of students scoring their expected outcome	Model D
U.S. History	NGSSS U.S. History EOC	Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater	Model C

Student Performance Measures			
Teaching Assignment	Assessment(s)	Performance Standard(s) (HE, E, NI/D, or U)	Model Used to Calculate HE, E, NI/D, or U <i>(See Part IV © of this document for details)</i>
Social Studies Courses (9-12)- except U.S. History	End-of-Term Test (EOT)	Percent of students scoring their expected outcome	Model D
AP and IB Courses (9-12)	End-of-Term Test (EOT)	Percent of students scoring their expected outcome	Model D
Access Points (9-12)	FSAA Assessment	ELA- Percent of students showing growth	Model B2
		EOC Courses- Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater	Model C
Electives (9-12)	End-of-Term Test (EOT)	Percent of students scoring their expected outcome	Model D
ROTC (9-12)	End-of-Term Test (EOT)	Percent of students scoring their expected outcome	Model D
Other (9-12) (including non-classroom instructional personnel)	School-wide Rating	Combination of all student performance ratings in school	All Models
Industry Certification Courses (9-adult)	Industry Certification Test	Percent of students passing the test	Models F or G
District Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel	District-wide Rating	Combination of all student performance ratings in district	All Models
CREST K-12 Access courses	GPS, DP3, Employability Checklist	Percent of students showing growth	Model H1
Private School courses (ELA & Math)	SAT-10, MAPS	Percent of students showing growth	Model H2

Appendix E – Summative Evaluation Forms

In Appendix E, the district shall include the summative evaluation form(s) to be used for instructional personnel.

CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT			
Directions: This summative assessment reflects the instructor's professional growth and demonstrated achievement of meeting or not meeting Citrus County Professional Standards and the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices. It will be completed and filed in the teacher's personnel file.			
Teacher:	ID	Date:	
Number:			
School:	Position:	Grade Level(s):	
A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES			
COMMENTS: [In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or area(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory <u>must</u> be noted specifically.]			
<p>A-EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing; <u>Unsatisfactory</u>): HE / E / NI or D / U <i>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement</i></p>			
Administrator's Signature	Date	Teacher's Signature	Date
B – STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA			
<p>B-EVALUATION RATING (33%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing; <u>Unsatisfactory</u>): HE / E / NI or D / U <i>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement</i></p>			
C – OVERALL EVALUATION RATING			
<p>C-OVERALL EVALUATION RATING (Highly Effective, Effective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing; <u>Unsatisfactory</u>): HE / E / NI or D / U <i>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement</i></p>			
D – TEACHER COMMENTS (Optional)			
Administrator's Signature	Date	Teacher's Signature	Date
(Signature indicates that a copy has been provided to the teacher.)			
Revised 5/11/2018			