

# 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](mailto: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

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Part I: Evaluation System Overview .....</b>                                      | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Part II: Evaluation System Requirements .....</b>                                 | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Part III: Evaluation Procedures .....</b>   | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Part IV: Evaluation Criteria .....</b>  | <b>8</b>  |
| A. Instructional Practice .....  | 8         |
| B. Other Indicators of Performance .....   | 8         |
| C. Performance of Students .....   | 9         |
| D. Summative Rating Calculation .....  | 15        |
| <b>Appendices .....</b>  | <b>24</b> |
| 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<br>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<br>New Teacher Orientation Instructional Evaluation PowerPoint<br>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<br>Monthly e-mails are sent to all administrators as a reminder<br>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 |
|---|---|---|--|
| <b>All Classroom and Non-Classroom Teachers</b>           |   |   |  |
| Teachers with 3 or more years                             | 1   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>By March 24</li> </ul>   | Within 10 days of the observation                      |
| Teachers in their 2 <sup>nd</sup> or 3 <sup>rd</sup> year | 2   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>First observation- by December 11</li> <li>Final observation- by March 24</li> </ul>   | Within 10 days of the observation                      |
| Newly hired teachers                                      | 3   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>First observation- by October 2</li> <li>Second observation- by December 11</li> <li>Final observation- by March 24</li> </ul> | Within 10 days of the observation                      |
| Newly hired after the beginning of the school year        | 3- before January 1 <sup>st</sup><br>2- after January 1 <sup>st</sup> | *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                     | <b>End-of-Year Evaluation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By April 30<sup>th</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 67% Instructional Practices</li> </ul> </li> <li>- 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"> <li>o 33%- Student Performance</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | <b>At evaluation meeting/ conference(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- End-of-Year: By April 30<sup>th</sup> and in the Fall upon release of state data and student performance rating calculations</li> </ul>   |
| Newly Hired Classroom Teachers       | 2                     | <b>Mid-year Evaluation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By January 25<sup>th</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 67%- Instructional Practices</li> <li>o 33%- Student Performance (Measure-interim learning target progress)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <b>End-of-Year Evaluation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By April 30<sup>th</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 67% Instructional Practices</li> </ul> </li> <li>- 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"> <li>o 33%- Student Performance</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <b>At evaluation meeting/ conference(s)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mid-Year: By January 25<sup>th</sup></li> <li>- End-of-Year: By April 30<sup>th</sup> and in the Fall upon release of state data and student performance rating calculations</li> </ul> |



## 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.*

1. 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.

2. 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, 1<sup>ST</sup>, 2<sup>ND</sup>

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<br>(Student's Fall iReady Diagnostic<br>National Percentile Rank) | Expected Outcome<br>(End-of-Year Citrus Assessment) | Percent of Students Meeting the Expected Outcome<br>on Spring 2021 Citrus Assessment |       |       |      |
|---|---|--|-------|-------|------|
|   |   | HE   | E     | N/D   | U    |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> – 24 <sup>th</sup>  | 40% or above  | 80-100   | 70-79 | 60-69 | 0-59 |
| 25 <sup>th</sup> – 49 <sup>th</sup>   | 50% or above  |  |       |       |      |
| 50 <sup>th</sup> – 74 <sup>th</sup>   | 60% or above  |  |       |       |      |
| 75 <sup>th</sup> – 100 <sup>th</sup>  | 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, 1<sup>ST</sup>, 2<sup>ND</sup> 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<br>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: 3<sup>RD</sup> & 4<sup>TH</sup> GRADE

### Courses linked to Model A2: 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> 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<br>National Percentile Class Average on Fall iReady Diagnostic | RATING<br>Percent of Students Scoring Satisfactory on Spring 2021 FSA or FSAA<br>(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 <sup>th</sup> to 74 <sup>th</sup> Quartile                              | 50 – 100   | 40 – 49   | 25 – 39                      | 0 – 24         |
| 26 <sup>th</sup> to 49 <sup>th</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> grader's previous 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> grade ELA FSA.
- **FSA Math Example:** An 8<sup>th</sup> grader's previous 6<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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 | 293-299 | 300-314 |
| Grade 4     | 251-296                   | 251-266 | 267-281 | 282-296                   | 297-310 | 297-303 | 311-324 |
| Grade 5     | 257-303                   | 257-272 | 273-288 | 289-303                   | 304-320 | 304-312 | 313-320 |
| Grade 6     | 259-308                   | 259-275 | 276-292 | 293-308                   | 309-325 | 309-317 | 326-332 |
| Grade 7     | 267-317                   | 267-283 | 284-300 | 301-317                   | 318-332 | 318-325 | 326-332 |
| Grade 8     | 274-321                   | 274-289 | 290-305 | 306-321                   | 322-336 | 322-329 | 330-336 |
| Grade 9     | 276-327                   | 276-293 | 294-310 | 311-327                   | 328-342 | 328-335 | 336-342 |
| Grade 10    | 284-333                   | 284-300 | 301-317 | 318-333                   | 334-349 | 334-341 | 342-349 |
| <b>MATH</b> |                           | Low     | Middle  | High                      | Low     | High    |         |
| Grade 3     | 240-284                   | 240-254 | 255-269 | 270-284                   | 285-296 | 285-290 | 291-296 |
| Grade 4     | 251-298                   | 251-266 | 267-282 | 283-298                   | 299-309 | 299-304 | 305-309 |
| Grade 5     | 256-305                   | 256-272 | 273-289 | 290-305                   | 306-319 | 306-312 | 313-319 |
| Grade 6     | 260-309                   | 260-276 | 277-293 | 294-309                   | 310-324 | 310-317 | 318-324 |
| Grade 7     | 269-315                   | 269-284 | 285-300 | 301-315                   | 316-329 | 316-322 | 323-329 |
| Grade 8     | 273-321                   | 273-289 | 290-305 | 306-321                   | 322-336 | 322-329 | 330-336 |

## 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 5<sup>th</sup> grader's previous 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> grade ELA FSA.
- **FSA Math Example:** An 8<sup>th</sup> grader's previous 6<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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 |
| Grade 4     | 251-296                   | 251-261 | 262-272 | 273-284 | 285-296                   | 297-310 | 297-300 | 301-305 | 306-310 |
| Grade 5     | 257-303                   | 257-267 | 268-279 | 280-291 | 292-303                   | 304-320 | 304-308 | 309-314 | 315-320 |
| Grade 6     | 259-308                   | 259-270 | 271-282 | 283-295 | 296-308                   | 309-325 | 309-313 | 314-319 | 320-325 |
| Grade 7     | 267-317                   | 267-278 | 279-291 | 292-304 | 305-317                   | 318-332 | 318-322 | 323-327 | 328-332 |
| Grade 8     | 274-321                   | 274-285 | 286-297 | 298-309 | 310-321                   | 322-336 | 322-326 | 327-331 | 332-336 |
| Grade 9     | 276-327                   | 276-288 | 289-301 | 302-314 | 315-327                   | 328-342 | 328-332 | 333-337 | 338-342 |
| Grade 10    | 284-333                   | 284-295 | 296-307 | 308-320 | 321-333                   | 334-349 | 334-338 | 339-343 | 344-349 |
| <b>MATH</b> |                           | 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 |
| Grade 4     | 251-298                   | 251-262 | 263-274 | 275-286 | 287-298                   | 299-309 | 299-301 | 302-305 | 306-309 |
| Grade 5     | 256-305                   | 256-267 | 268-279 | 280-292 | 293-305                   | 306-319 | 306-309 | 310-314 | 315-319 |
| Grade 6     | 260-309                   | 260-271 | 272-283 | 284-296 | 297-309                   | 310-324 | 310-314 | 315-319 | 320-324 |
| Grade 7     | 269-315                   | 269-279 | 280-291 | 292-303 | 304-315                   | 316-329 | 316-319 | 320-324 | 325-329 |
| Grade 8     | 273-321                   | 273-284 | 285-296 | 297-308 | 309-321                   | 322-336 | 322-326 | 327-331 | 332-336 |

## 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 5<sup>th</sup> grader's previous 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> grade ELA FSAA.
- **FSAA Math Example:** A 7<sup>th</sup> grader's previous 5<sup>th</sup> 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 7<sup>th</sup> grade Math FSAA.

\*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.

| 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 |

## 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<br>(Average Class Achievement Level on Previous FSA/FSAA assessment) |           | Rating: Percent Satisfactory on Spring 2021 EOC Assessment<br>(Level 3 or state average achievement level- whichever is less) |           |                              |                |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|------------------------------|----------------|
| 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<br>(Student's Achievement Level on previous FSA exam) | 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<br>(Student's Achievement<br>Level on previous FSA exam) | Student's Expected<br>Outcome | Percent of Students Scoring the Expected Outcome on<br>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:**

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Art
- Virtual 3-5 teacher will assess one grade level between 3rd-5th
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade Music
- 2<sup>nd</sup> 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<br>(Student's Fall iReady Diagnostic<br>National Percentile Rank) | Expected Outcome<br>(Student's End-of-Year Art, Music,<br>PE Citrus Assessment) | Percent of Students Meeting the Expected Outcome<br>on End-of-Year Art, Music, or PE Citrus Assessment |       |       |      |
|---|---|--|-------|-------|------|
|   |   | HE   | E     | N/D   | U    |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> – 33 <sup>rd</sup>  | 60% or above  | 80-100   | 70-79 | 60-69 | 0-59 |
| 34 <sup>th</sup> – 66 <sup>th</sup>   | 70% or above  |  |       |       |      |
| 67 <sup>th</sup> – 100 <sup>th</sup>  | 80% or above  |  |       |       |      |

## MODEL F: INDUSTRY CERTIFICATION (MIDDLE/HIGH SCHOOL)

| Pre-Measure<br>(Average Class Achievement Level<br>on Most Recent FSA ELA or FSA<br>Math/Algebra) | Rating: Percent Passing Industry Certification Test |           |                                 |                |
|---|---|-----------|---------------------------------|----------------|
|   | Highly Effective                                    | Effective | Developing/Needs<br>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:<br><br>- Showing an increase in at least one component of one of the following assessments:<br>- GPS<br>- DP3<br>- Employability Checklist |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Highly Effective             | 80 - 100                           |   |
| 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:<br><br>- Increase at least one percentile ranking from pre to post test<br><br>or<br><br>- Scored above the 80 <sup>th</sup> percentile ranking on the post test |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Highly Effective             | 80 - 100                           |   |
| 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<br>67% | Student Data<br>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.

## 4<sup>th</sup> 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): 4<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 5/1/19 \_\_\_\_\_ Mrs. M. Lott's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ 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

**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): 4<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 5/1/19 \_\_\_\_\_ Mrs. M. Lott's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ 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 moving average.

**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: 3<sup>RD</sup> & 4<sup>TH</sup> GRADE

Courses linked to Model A2: 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA & Math

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

PRE-MEASURE:  
iReady Fall Diagnostic

| PRE-MEASURE<br>National Percentile Class Average on Fall Ready Diagnostic | RATING<br>Percent of Students Scoring Satisfactory on Spring 2021 FSA or FSAA<br>(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 <sup>th</sup> to 74 <sup>th</sup> Quartile                             | 50 - 100   | 40 - 49   | 25 - 39                      | 0 - 24         |
| 26 <sup>th</sup> to 49 <sup>th</sup> 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).

| <b>MRS. LOTT'S TEACHER REPORT CARD-<br/>DATA SOURCE</b> |  |   |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|
|   |  | <b>HE = 3.45 to 4.0    E = 2.45 to 3.44    NI/D = 1.45 to 2.44    U = 1 to 1.44</b> |  |  |
| <b>Three-Year Sum of Points = 238</b>                   | <b>Three-Year Sum of Scores = 80</b>   | <b>3 Year Rubric Score= 2.98</b>  | <b>2020-21 Three-Year Data Evaluation Rating = Effective</b> |  |
| <b>2020-21 (YEAR 3 of 3)</b>                            |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Subject</b>  | 4 <sup>th</sup> grade ELA  | 4 <sup>th</sup> grade Math  |  |  |
| <b>Data Source</b>                                      | FSA ELA - Model A2   | FSA Math - Model A2   |  | <b>133 points</b>                      |
| <b>Number of Students/Scores</b>                        | 19   | 19  |  | <b>38 scores</b>                       |
| <b>Rating (rubric equivalent)</b>                       | 3 (Effective)  | 4 (Highly Effective)  |  | <b>133/38=</b>                         |
| <b>Weighted Rubric Points Earned</b>                    | <b>57</b>  | <b>76</b>   |  | <b>3.50 (E)- Total Points/Students</b> |
| <b>2019-20 (YEAR 2 of 3)</b>                            |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Subject</b>  | NO DATA WAS COLLECTED DUE TO THE CANCELAN 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. |   |  |  |
| <b>Data Source</b>                                      |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Number of Students/Scores</b>                        |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Rating (rubric equivalent)</b>                       |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Weighted Rubric Points Earned</b>                    |  |   |  |  |
| <b>2018-19 (YEAR 1 of 3)</b>                            |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Subject</b>  | 4 <sup>th</sup> grade ELA  | 4 <sup>th</sup> grade Math  |  |  |
| <b>Data Source</b>                                      | FSA ELA- Model A2  | FSA Math- Model A2  |  | <b>105 points</b>                      |
| <b>Number of Students/Scores</b>                        | 21   | 21  |  | <b>42 scores</b>                       |
| <b>Rating (rubric equivalent)</b>                       | 2 (Needs Improvement)  | 3 (Effective)   |  | <b>105/42=</b>                         |
| <b>Weighted Rubric Points Earned</b>                    | <b>42</b>  | <b>63</b>   |  | <b>2.50(E)- Total Points/Students</b>  |

### 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   |                   |                                       |         |
|--|-------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| <b>Directions:</b> 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): 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade |         |
| <b>A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES</b>  |                   |                                       |         |
| <b>Comments:</b> (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.)<br>Mrs. Lott is highly effective in all five professional standards.<br><b>Evidence:</b><br>Standard 1: Member of SAC, PTO, co-wrote Parent Involvement Plan, School Safety representative<br>Standard 2.4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation<br>Standard 5: Demonstrated leadership by implementing and sharing knowledge and skills learned from professional development in her classroom and with her 4 <sup>th</sup> grade team<br><b>A-EVALUATION RATING (57%)</b> (Highly Effective, Effective Performance: Needs Improvement/Developing/Unsatisfactory) <b>(HE)</b> E / NI or D / U<br>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement |                   |                                       |         |
| Supervisor's Signature   | 5/1/19            | Mrs. M. Lott's Signature              | 5/1/19  |
| Administrator's Signature  | Date              | Teacher's Signature                   | Date    |
| <b>B - STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA</b>  |                   |                                       |         |
| 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.<br><b>B-EVALUATION RATING (33%)</b> (Highly Effective, Effective Performance: Needs Improvement/Developing/Unsatisfactory) <b>(E)</b> HE / NI or D / U<br>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement   |                   |                                       |         |
| <b>C - OVERALL EVALUATION RATING</b>   |                   |                                       |         |
| <b>C-OVERALL EVALUATION RATING</b> (Highly Effective, Effective Performance: Needs Improvement/Developing/Unsatisfactory) <b>(HE)</b> E / NI or D / U<br>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement  |                   |                                       |         |
| <b>D - TEACHER COMMENTS (Optional)</b>   |                   |                                       |         |
| N/A  |                   |                                       |         |
| Supervisor's Signature   | 10/1/19           | Mrs. M. Lott's Signature              | 10/1/19 |
| Administrator's Signature  | Date              | 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)



## 4<sup>th</sup> 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): 4<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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

**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**

Sequences lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and required prior knowledge (A1b)  
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  
Notifies when specific students or groups of students are not engaged and effectively takes over 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 regular/semi-regular 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 (A3c)**  
Poses academic questions before selecting student to respond during questioning  
Prompts use of students' metacognitive skills  
Uses a majority of higher-order questions during the lesson

Low-order questions: 111  
High-order questions: \_\_\_\_\_

**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**

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 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 seating system (when available)  
Displays evidence of students' thinking and learning  
Provides visual support for lessons

**Applies varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology, to provide comprehensible instruction, and to teach for student understanding (A2d)**  
Applies varied instructional strategies  
Utilizes technology resources to make learning relevant and engaging

Number of Students Not Engaged: 1/3 2/5 7/7 6/6  
NOTE TIME: 9:32 9:45 10:00 10:30

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

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

**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**

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**

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**

\*highlighted indicators were not observed

$$NI(2) + U(1) + U(1) + U(1) + U(1) = 6$$

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): 4<sup>th</sup> 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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

**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:**  
3<sup>RD</sup> & 4<sup>TH</sup> GRADE

**Courses linked to Model A2:** 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Grade ELA & Math

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

**PRE-MEASURE:**  
iReady Fall Diagnostic

| PRE-MEASURE<br>National Percentile Class Average on Fall iReady Diagnostic | RATING<br>Percent of Students Scoring Satisfactory on Spring 2021 FSA or FSA Math<br>(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 <sup>th</sup> to 74 <sup>th</sup> Quartile                              | 50-100   | 40-49     | 25-39                        | 0-24           |
| 25 <sup>th</sup> to 49 <sup>th</sup> 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).

| <b>MRS. LOTT'S TEACHER REPORT CARD- DATA SOURCE</b> |  |   |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|
|   |  | <b>HE = 3.45 to 4.0    E = 2.45 to 3.44    NI/D = 1.45 to 2.44    U = 1 to 1.44</b> |  |  |
| <b>Three-Year Sum of Points = 120</b>               | <b>Three-Year Sum of Scores = 80</b>   | <b>3 Year Rubric Score= 1.50</b>  |  | <b>2020-21 Three-Year Data Evaluation Rating = Needs Improvement</b> |
| <b>2020-21 (YEAR 3 of 3)</b>                        |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Subject</b>                                      | 4 <sup>th</sup> grade ELA  | 4 <sup>th</sup> grade Math  |  |  |
| <b>Data Source</b>                                  | FSA ELA - Model A2   | FSA Math - Model A2   |  | 57 points  |
| <b>Number of Students/Scores</b>                    | 19   | 19  |  | 38 scores  |
| <b>Rating (rubric equivalent)</b>                   | 2 (Needs Improvement)  | 1 (Unsatisfactory)  |  | 57/38=   |
| <b>Weighted Rubric Points Earned</b>                | 38   | 19  |  | 1.50 (NI)- Total Points/Students                                     |
| <b>2019-20 (YEAR 2 of 3)</b>                        |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Subject</b>                                      | NO DATA WAS COLLECTED DUE TO THE CANCELAN 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. |   |  |  |
| <b>Data Source</b>                                  |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Number of Students/Scores</b>                    |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Rating (rubric equivalent)</b>                   |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Weighted Rubric Points Earned</b>                |  |   |  |  |
| <b>2018-19 (YEAR 1 of 3)</b>                        |  |   |  |  |
| <b>Subject</b>                                      | 4 <sup>th</sup> grade ELA  | 4 <sup>th</sup> grade Math  |  |  |
| <b>Data Source</b>                                  | FSA ELA- Model A2  | FSA Math- Model A2  |  | 63 points  |
| <b>Number of Students/Scores</b>                    | 21   | 21  |  | 42 scores  |
| <b>Rating (rubric equivalent)</b>                   | 1 (Unsatisfactory)   | 2 (Needs Improvement)   |  | 63/42=   |
| <b>Weighted Rubric Points Earned</b>                | 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<br>67% | Student Data<br>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 |

| <b>CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT</b>   |                   |                                       |  |
|---|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Directions:</b> 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): 4 <sup>th</sup> Grade |  |
| <b>A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES</b><br><small>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.</small><br>Mrs. Lott is unsatisfactory in all five professional standards.<br><b>Evidence</b><br>Standards 1-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation<br>Standard 5: Has not shown implementation or sharing of knowledge and skills learned from professional development in her classroom or with her 4 <sup>th</sup> grade team<br><b>EVALUATION RATING (67%)</b> (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D / U<br><small>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement</small><br>Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19      Mrs. M. Lott's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19<br>Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____      Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____ |                   |                                       |  |
| <b>B - STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA</b><br>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.<br><b>EVALUATION RATING (33%)</b> (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D / U<br><small>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement</small>   |                   |                                       |  |
| <b>C - OVERALL EVALUATION RATING</b><br><b>OVERALL EVALUATION RATING</b> (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D / U<br><small>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement</small>   |                   |                                       |  |
| <b>D - TEACHER COMMENTS (Optional)</b><br>N/A<br>Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 10/1/19      Mrs. M. Lott's Signature: _____ Date: 10/1/19<br>Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____      Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____<br>(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)

**9<sup>th</sup> 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):** 9<sup>th</sup> 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

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

*Superintendent's Signature*  
 Administrator's Signature

5/1/19  
 Date

*Mr. Johnson's Signature*  
 Teacher's Signature

5/1/19  
 Date

| <b>CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT</b>  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>NAME:</b> Mr. B. Johnson<br><b>SCHOOL:</b> ABC<br><b>APPRaisal RATINGS:</b> HE = Highly Effective E = Effective NPD = Needs Improvement D = Unsatisfactory  | <b>SUBJECT:</b> ELA<br><b>OBSERVATION DATE/TIME:</b> 9/15/18 START 9:30 END 10:50<br><b>OBSERVER:</b> [Signature]  |
| <b>STANDARD 2:</b> The teacher designs and delivers knowledge work that meets the needs of students, parents, school system, and community.<br><br><b>Standard 2 Lesson Rating:</b> (E) NPD U  | <b>STANDARD 3:</b> The teacher manages the resources of time, people, space, information, and technology in order to enhance the qualities of student learning.<br><br><b>Standard 3 Lesson Rating:</b> (E) NPD U  |
| <b>Sequences lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and required prior knowledge (A3a)</b><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Essential questioning/focusing objective posed<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Essential questioning/objective is explicitly used to guide lesson<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Teacher recognizes and extends prior knowledge<br>Students can explain how their current activities relate to the essential question/learning goal<br><br><b>Delivers engaging and challenging lessons (A3a)</b><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Uses grouping techniques to maximize students' engagement<br>Breaks the content into small chunks of information that can be easily processed by the students<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Presents students in problem processing new information<br>Notices when specific students or groups of students are not engaged and effectively takes over action<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates intensity, excitement, and enthusiasm for the content in a variety of ways<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communicates academic "vitalities"<br><br><b>Depends and enriches students' understanding through content area literacy strategies, verbalization of thought, and application of the subject matter (A3b)</b><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Models and verbalizes thought processes and strategies<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engages students in activities that help them record their understandings of new content as linguistic representations<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engages students in activities that requires them to reflect and apply their learning and the learning process<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engages students in complex tasks<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Designs relevant practice/worksheet that deepens students' knowledge of content or process<br><br><b>Employs higher-order questioning techniques (A3f)</b><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poses advanced questions before selecting student to respond<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Uses response rate techniques to maximize student engagement during questioning<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prompts use of students' metacognitive skills<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Uses a majority of higher-order questions during the lesson | <b>Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, and materials (A3a)</b><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Academically engages students upon entering room<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maintains instant momentum with a sense of purpose from "hall to bell"<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilizes pacing techniques to guide instruction<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Effectively organizes the physical layout of the classroom<br><br><b>Manages individual and class behaviors through a well-planned management system (A3c)</b><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implements clear procedures, routines, and expectations<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Democratizes classroom management "vitalities"<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responds to misbehavior in an objective and controlled manner<br><br><b>Adapts the learning environment to accommodate the differing needs and diversity of students (A3h)</b><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilizes seating system (when available)<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Displays evidences of students' thinking and learning<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides visual support systems<br><br><b>Applies varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology to provide comprehensive instruction, and to teach for student understanding (A3g)</b><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applies varied instructional strategies<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Applies technology resources to make learning relevant and engaging<br><br><b>Number of Students Not Engaged:</b> 1 0 0 1 0 0<br><b>NOTE TIME:</b> 9:35 9:50 10:00 10:36<br><br><b>COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:</b> |
| <b>Low-order questions:</b> HTT<br><b>High-order questions:</b> HTT HTT  | <b>STANDARD 4:</b> 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.<br><br><b>Standard 4 Lesson Rating:</b> (E) NPD U<br><br><b>Differentiates instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students (A3h)</b><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Uses multiple modalities to deliver instruction<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Uses purposeful grouping in ways that facilitate practicing and deepening knowledge of content<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides accommodations based on individual student needs<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Supports, encourages, and provides immediate and specific feedback to students to promote student achievement (A3i)<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Provides specific ongoing feedback to students by establishing and communicating learning goals, tracking student progress, and celebrating successes<br><br><b>CUMULATIVE RATING TO DATE</b><br><b>STANDARD 1:</b><br>Overall Standard 1 Rating: (HE) E NPD U<br><b>STANDARD 2:</b><br>Overall Standard 2 Rating: (HR) E NPD U<br><b>STANDARD 3:</b><br>Overall Standard 3 Rating: (HE) E NPD U<br><b>STANDARD 4:</b><br>Overall Standard 4 Rating: (HE) E NPD U<br><b>STANDARD 5:</b><br>Overall Standard 5 Rating: (HE) E NPD U   |

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.

# 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 state score and 2021 state score (2-year gain).**

**Courses linked to Model B1:**

- ELA (grades 5-10)
- English (grades 5-10)
- 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.

## 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. Brown

**ID:** XXXX

**Date:** 5/1/19

**School:** ABC School

**Position:** ELA Teacher

**Grade Level(s):** 9<sup>th</sup> 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 should be noted specifically.)

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

#### Evidence

**Standard 1:** Member of SAC, PTO, co-write 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 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 \_\_\_\_\_ 5/1/19  
 Administrator's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date

Mr. Johnson's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ 5/1/19  
 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 trend.

**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



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).

| <b>MR. JOHNSON'S TEACHER REPORT CARD- DATA SOURCE</b> |  |                           |                  |  |
|---|--|---------------------------|------------------|--|
|   |  | 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 = 870                        | Three-Year Sum of Students/Scores = 245  | 3 Year Rubric Score= 3.55 |                  | 2020-21 Three-Year Data Evaluation Rating = Highly Effective |
| <b>2020-21 (YEAR 3 of 3)</b>                          |  |                           |                  |  |
| 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                              |
| <b>2019-20 (YEAR 2 of 3)</b>                          |  |                           |                  |  |
| Subject   | NO DATA WAS COLLECTED DUE TO THE CANCELANON 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                         |  |                           |                  |  |
| <b>2018-19 (YEAR 1 of 3)</b>                          |  |                           |                  |  |
| 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): 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade |  |
| <b>PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES</b><br>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 separately.<br>Mr. Johnson is highly effective in all five professional standards.<br>Evidence:<br>Standard 1: Member of PTO, co-wrote Parent Involvement Plan, School Safety representative<br>Standards 2-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation<br>Standard 5: Demonstrates leadership by implementing and sharing knowledge and skills learned from professional development in his classroom and within ELA department<br>EVALUATION RATING (67%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing; Unsatisfactory) <b>(HE)</b> E / NI or D / U<br>First 3 years of employment + Developing + years + Needs Improvement<br>Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19 Mr. Johnson's Signature: _____ Date: 5/1/19<br>Administrator's Signature: _____ Date: _____ Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____ |                       |                                       |  |
| <b>B - STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA</b><br>Mr. Johnson's student performance rating of 3.55 (Highly Effective) included his students' FSA ELA assessment data utilizing Model B1. See attached Data Source Teacher Report Card for calculation of 3-year rating.<br>EVALUATION RATING (33%) (Highly Effective, Effective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing; Unsatisfactory) <b>(HE)</b> E / NI or D / U<br>First 3 years of employment + Developing + years + Needs Improvement  |                       |                                       |  |
| <b>C - OVERALL EVALUATION RATING</b><br>C-OVERALL EVALUATION RATING (Highly Effective, Effective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing; Unsatisfactory) <b>(HE)</b> E / NI or D / U<br>First 3 years of employment + Developing + years + Needs Improvement  |                       |                                       |  |
| <b>D - TEACHER COMMENTS (Optional)</b><br>N/A<br>Supervisor's Signature: _____ Date: 10/1/19 Mr. Johnson's Signature: _____ Date: 10/1/19<br>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)

## 9<sup>th</sup> 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): 9<sup>th</sup> 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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Administrator's Signature Date: 5/1/19

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Johnson's Signature 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: [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 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 required prior knowledge (A2b)  
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

**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 "bell to bell"  
Utilizes pacing timelines to guide instruction  
Effectively organizes the physical layout of the classroom

**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**

Differentiates instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students (A3b)  
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

**STANDARD 5** The teacher provides immediate and specific feedback to students to promote student achievement (A3c)  
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**  
Overall Standard 5 Rating: HE E NI/D **U**

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

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:  
- Higher-order questioning  
- Student Engagement  
- EA guiding lesson

Teacher's Signature: [Signature] Date: 9/15/18  
Administrator's Signature: [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): 9<sup>th</sup> 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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Administrator's Signature Date: 5/1/19

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Johnson's Signature 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-<br>DATA SOURCE |   |   |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| 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 1   |   |  |  |
| 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 1   | 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<br>67% | Student Data<br>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   |                       |                                       |         |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| <b>Directions:</b> 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): 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade |         |
| <b>A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES</b><br><b>Comments:</b> (In this section, note highly effective indicators, effective indicators, and/or areas(s) of development. Any area(s) designated as unsatisfactory must be noted specifically.)<br>Mr. Johnson performs unsatisfactorily in all five professional standards.<br><b>Evidence</b><br>Standards 1-4: See Instructional Observation Instrument from 9/15 observation<br>Standard 5: Has not demonstrated implementation of knowledge and skills learned from professional development in the classroom or with his ELA department. |                       |                                       |         |
| <b>A-EVALUATION RATING (67%)</b> (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D (U)<br>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement   |                       |                                       |         |
| Supervisor's Signature   | 5/1/19                | Mr. Johnson's Signature               | 5/1/19  |
| Administrator's Signature  | Date                  | Teacher's Signature                   | Date    |
| <b>B - STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA</b><br>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>B-EVALUATION RATING (33%)</b> (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D (U)<br>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement   |                       |                                       |         |
| <b>C - OVERALL EVALUATION RATING</b><br><b>C-OVERALL EVALUATION RATING</b> (Highly Effective, Effective Performance, Needs Improvement/Developing, Unsatisfactory): HE / E / NI or D (U)<br>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement   |                       |                                       |         |
| <b>D - TEACHER COMMENTS (Optional)</b><br>N/A  |                       |                                       |         |
| Supervisor's Signature   | 10/1/19               | Mr. Johnson's Signature               | 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 |
| <b>1. Instructional Design and Lesson Planning</b>  |                       |
| <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            |
| <b>2. The Learning Environment</b>  |                       |
| <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            |
| <b>3. Instructional Delivery and Facilitation</b>   |                       |
| <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            |
| <b>4. Assessment</b>  |                       |
| <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 |
| <b>5. Continuous Professional Improvement</b>  |            |
| <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 |
| <b>6. Professional Responsibility and Ethical Conduct</b>  |            |
| 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.*

| <b>CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS</b><br><b>NON-CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL TEACHER OBSERVATION INSTRUMENT</b>   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>NAME:</b> _____  | <b>SCHOOL:</b> _____                                      |
| <b>AREA:</b> _____  | <b>OBSERVATION DATE/TIME:</b> _____ <b>OBSERVER</b> _____ |
| <b>APPRAISAL RATINGS:</b> HE –Highly Effective    E–Effective    D/NI*–Developing/Needs Improvement    U–Unsatisfactory<br><small>*First 3 years of employment = Developing / 4+ years = Needs Improvement</small>  |   |
| <b>CUMULATIVE RATING TO DATE</b>  |   |
| <b>STANDARD 1:</b> The teacher supports the beliefs, shared vision, and mission adopted by the district.<br>Overall Standard 1 Rating:    HE       E       D/NI       U   |   |
| <b>COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:</b>  |   |
| <b>STANDARD 2:</b> The teacher designs and delivers knowledge work that meets the needs of students, parents, school system, and community.<br>Overall Standard 2 Rating:    HE       E       D/NI       U  |   |
| <b>COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:</b>  |   |
| <b>STANDARD 3:</b> The teacher manages the resources of time, people, space, information, and technology in order to enhance the qualities of work provided to students.<br>Overall Standard 3 Rating:    HE       E       D/NI       U   |   |
| <b>COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:</b>  |   |
| <b>STANDARD 4:</b> 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.<br>Overall Standard 4 Rating:    HE       E       D/NI       U |   |
| <b>COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:</b>  |   |
| <b>STANDARD 5:</b> The teacher demonstrates leadership.<br>Overall Standard 5 Rating:    HE       E       D/NI       U  |   |
| <b>COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS:</b>  |   |
| <b>Non-Classroom Instructional Teacher's Signature:</b> _____ <b>Date:</b> _____  |   |
| <b>Administrator's Signature:</b> _____ <b>Date:</b> _____  |   |



## 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)<br>(HE, E, NI/D, or U)   | Model Used to Calculate HE, E, NI/D, or U<br><br>(See Part IV © of this document for details) |
| 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<br>Science – Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater  | Model B1<br>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 <sup>rd</sup> -4 <sup>th</sup> - Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater<br><br>5 <sup>th</sup> - ELA & Math- Percent of students showing growth<br><br>5 <sup>th</sup> Science- Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater | Model A2<br><br>Model B2<br>Model C   |
| Other (PK-5)<br>(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)<br>(HE, E, NI/D, or U)   | Model Used to Calculate HE, E, NI/D, or U<br><br>(See Part IV © of this document for details) |
| Science Courses (6-8)  | 6 <sup>th</sup> & 7 <sup>th</sup> – Science End-of-Term Test (EOT)<br>8 <sup>th</sup> – NGSSS Science Assessment   | 6 <sup>th</sup> & 7 <sup>th</sup> – Percent of students scoring their expected outcome<br>8 <sup>th</sup> - Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater   | Model D<br><br>Model C  |
| Social Studies Courses (6-8)                                     | 6 <sup>th</sup> – US History End-of-Term Test (EOT)<br>7 <sup>th</sup> - NGSSS Civics Assessment<br>8 <sup>th</sup> – World History End-of-Term Test (EOT) | 6 <sup>th</sup> – Percent of students scoring their expected outcome<br>7 <sup>th</sup> - Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater<br>8 <sup>th</sup> - Percent of students scoring their expected outcome | Model D<br><br>Model C<br><br>Model D   |
| Access Points (6-8)  | FSAA Assessment  | ELA & Math- Percent of students showing growth<br><br>Civics & 8 <sup>th</sup> Science- Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater   | Model B2<br><br>Model C   |
| Electives  | End-of-Term Test (EOT)   | Percent of students scoring their expected outcome   | Model D   |
| Other (6-8)<br>(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)-<br>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)-<br>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   |



| <b>Student Performance Measures</b>                               |                                   |  |   |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Teaching Assignment</b>  | <b>Assessment(s)</b>              | <b>Performance Standard(s)<br/>(HE, E, NI/D, or U)</b>   | <b>Model Used to Calculate HE, E, NI/D, or U</b><br><br><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<br><br>EOC Courses- Percent of students scoring a level 3 or greater | Model B2<br><br>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)<br>(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.*

| <b>CITRUS COUNTY SCHOOLS INSTRUCTIONAL SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT</b>   |                  |   |               |
|---|------------------|---|---------------|
| <b>Directions:</b> 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. |                  |   |               |
| <b>Teacher:</b>   | <b>ID</b>        | <b>Date:</b>  |               |
| <b>Number:</b>  |                  |   |               |
| <b>School:</b>  | <b>Position:</b> | <b>Grade Level(s):</b>  |               |
| <b>A - PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND FLORIDA EDUCATOR ACCOMPLISHED PRACTICES</b><br><b>COMMENTS:</b> [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.]                 |                  |   |               |
|   |                  |   |               |
| <b>A-EVALUATION RATING (67%)</b> (Highly Effective, <u>E</u> ffective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing; <u>U</u> nsatisfactory): <b>HE / E / NI or D / U</b><br><i>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement</i>  |                  |   |               |
| _____<br>Administrator's Signature  | _____<br>Date    | _____<br>Teacher's Signature  | _____<br>Date |
| <b>B – STUDENT LEARNING GROWTH/ACHIEVEMENT DATA</b>   |                  |   |               |
| <b>B-EVALUATION RATING (33%)</b> (Highly Effective, <u>E</u> ffective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing; <u>U</u> nsatisfactory): <b>HE / E / NI or D / U</b><br><i>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement</i>  |                  |   |               |
| <b>C – OVERALL EVALUATION RATING</b>  |                  |   |               |
| <b>C-OVERALL EVALUATION RATING</b> (Highly Effective, <u>E</u> ffective Performance; Needs Improvement/Developing; <u>U</u> nsatisfactory): <b>HE / E / NI or D / U</b><br><i>First 3 years of employment = Developing/4 + years = Needs Improvement</i>  |                  |   |               |
| <b>D – TEACHER COMMENTS (Optional)</b>  |                  |   |               |
|   |                  |   |               |
| _____<br>Administrator's Signature  | _____<br>Date    | _____<br>Teacher's Signature<br>(Signature indicates that a copy has been provided to the teacher.) | _____<br>Date |
| Revised 5/11/2018   |                  |   |               |