



Manchester School District

Educator Evaluation
Master Plan
Handbook

July 2017 - June 2021

Approved by BOSCO 08/14/17

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Section 1: Introduction	3
Statement of Purpose	3
Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Planning Committee	3
Goal Statements	3
Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Committee	4
Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Planning Committee Members	5
Section 2: Educator Evaluation	6
EVALUATION	6
Effective Teaching	7
The Definition of Highly Effective Teaching – New Hampshire	7
Adapted from: New Hampshire Task Force on Effective Teaching Phase II - November, 2013	7
Evaluation Plan for Educators	8
Elements of the Educator Evaluation Plan	10
Improvement Track	11
Awareness Phase	11
Improvement Phase	12
Professional Improvement Plan (PIP):	13
Exiting Improvement Phase:	14
Section 4: Timeline for Educator Evaluation Process	15
Section 5: FORMS	16
Evaluation Forms	17
Form 9 - Pre-Observation Conference	17
Form 10 - Observations (Mini- & Formal)	22

T æ & @ • c ; Á Ú & @ [| Ö ä d ä ö Á
Ä ä ~ & æ | Ö ç æ ~ æ æ } Á æ c ; Á Ú | æ P æ ä à [\ Á
R | ^ Á Ê F Í Á Æ R } ^ Á Ê G F Á
Ö] ; [ç ^ ä Á ~ Á Ö U Ö Ö Ä Æ Ì Þ Þ Á

[Form 11 - Awareness Phase](#) 28

[Form 12 - Improvement Phase: Professional Improvement Plan](#) 30

[APPENDIX](#) 32

[Appendix A. Danielson's Rubrics and Standards](#) 32

Section 1: Introduction

It would be difficult if not impossible to recognize all who were involved in the planning, design, and implementation of this plan. To quote Phil Jackson, basketball coach,

“The strength of the team is each individual member. The strength of each member is the team.”

A great team of strong members worked hard to create a plan that will improve the Manchester school system. Thanks to all who had a hand in creating this plan.

Statement of Purpose

The stated mission of the Manchester School District, in partnership with the community, is to inspire and empower all learners with the knowledge, skills, and experiences essential for them to reach their greatest potential. The Manchester School District Educator Evaluation Master Plan Handbook emphasizes the link between high quality professional growth and learning; educator effectiveness and use of best practices; student growth, learning, and academic achievement. This plan aligns with local, state, and national professional teaching and learning standards.

Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Planning Committee

Goal Statements

- To develop a comprehensive plan that emphasizes and evaluates educator effectiveness and use of best practices.
- To provide opportunities for educators to improve their instruction and practice.
- To be a collaborative endeavor between the evaluator and the educator being evaluated.
- To facilitate open communication in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect.
- To assist educators develop skills of self-reflection and self-assessment which enhances professional practices and fosters life-long learning.

Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Committee

The Manchester School District Educator Evaluation Master Plan Handbook and Professional Development Master Plan were developed by the Professional Development Educator Evaluation Planning Committee. This committee was formed under the direction of the Superintendent of Schools, Debra Livingston, Ed.D., and is chaired by the Director of Federal Projects and Professional Development. This volunteer committee consists of teachers, building-level administrators, and district-level administrators. This committee worked tirelessly to develop a comprehensive plan based on goals determined by the committee. The Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Planning Committee used Ed 512 and the NH DOE Professional Development Master Plan template for reference as well as the NH Task Force on Effective Teaching: Phase II report for guidance in developing this document.

Although the document currently fits our needs, we acknowledge that there will be a need to edit and revise it consistently in the future. The Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Committee will review data provided by the administration. The data will be used for evidence of success of the Educator Evaluation Master Plan Handbook and Professional Development Master Plan, for setting new goals in a cycle of continuous improvement, and for discussion of future professional development needs.

Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Planning Committee Members

Alan Michie, Teacher, English, Manchester Memorial High School
Alisha Hansen-Proulx, Teacher, Middle School at Parkside
Angela Friborg, English BLIL, Manchester Memorial High School
Ann Kalasky, Teacher, Green Acres Elementary School
Ashley Forcier, Teacher, Hallsville Elementary School
Bernadette Cassidy, Teacher: English, Manchester West High School
Daniele Caradonna, Teacher: STEAM/ELA, Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School
Debbie Villiard, Teacher, Northwest Elementary School
Erica Hauck, Teacher: Special Education, Manchester Memorial High School
Forrest Ransdell, Principal, Middle School at Parkside
Heidi Rivard, Reading Supervisor, Highland-Goffe's Falls Elementary School
Jane Elwood, Teacher, Northwest Elementary School
Janice Moore-Simmons, Teacher: Special Education: EBD, Henry J. McLaughlin Middle School
Jennifer Young, Speech and Language Specialist, Gossler Park Elementary School
Judy Adams, Principal, Bakersville Elementary School
Kelly Jobel, Library Media Specialist, Parker-Varney Elementary School
Kerry Tripp, Teacher: Social Studies, Middle School at Parkside
Kristine Pelletier, Title I Literacy Implementation Coordinator, District
Laurie Cloutier, Teacher, Northwest Elementary School
Liane St. Laurent, Educational Technology, District
Line Ricard, Science BLIL, Manchester High School Central
Mandi Tappin, Assistant Principal, Gossler Park Elementary School
Michelle Macropol, Teacher, Northwest Elementary School
Natalie Sears, Teacher, English, Manchester High School Central
Patricia Snow, Executive Director of the Innovation Zone
Polly Golden, Principal, Henry Wilson Elementary School
Richard Dichard, Assistant Principal, Central High School
Samantha Audet, Teacher, Parker-Varney Elementary School
Sharon DeVincent, Director of Federal Projects & Professional Development

Section 2: Educator Evaluation

EVALUATION

In order for an evaluation to be meaningful and serve the purpose of improving the educator’s professional practices, the evaluator (defined as a building administrator or superintendent designee) must always complete this process in a careful and thoughtful way. The Manchester School District has chosen to base the educator evaluation system on Charlotte Danielson’s rubrics and standards ([Appendix A](#)).

An evaluation would not be comprehensive or meaningful if based upon only an annual pre-planned observation of the educator. In order to be meaningful and have an impact on learning by causing the educator to continuously hone his/her professional skills and knowledge, an evaluation must be a reflective process based upon a body of evidence gathered over the course of a year and developed through a collegial relationship between the evaluator and the educator. The Manchester School District may include in its comprehensive educator evaluation plan: domain monitoring, observations, student learning objectives, feedback, reflective dialogue, professional improvement process, and other evidence.

Effective Teaching

“Of all of the factors that contribute to student learning, the quality of teaching is the single most important.”
– Charlotte Danielson

V @ Á Ö ^ - ç ä ä } Á Á - Á r æ } Á Ö - ^ & ç ^ Á ^ æ & @ * Á Á ^ , Á r æ] • @ ^ Á

Adapted from: New Hampshire Task Force on Effective Teaching Phase II - November, 2013

Teachers performing at the highly effective level consistently advance student growth and achievement. They set and maintain high expectations for learning and achievement for all students and create an environment of mutual respect, inquisitiveness, and caring.

Highly effective teachers demonstrate extensive knowledge of content, standards, and competencies, and connect them to relevant local and global issues. These teachers model and encourage innovation, creativity, critical thinking, and engagement on the part of their students, and use their expertise and skills to engage their students in authentic, accessible, and meaningful learning opportunities aligned to the content, standards, and competencies.

Highly effective educators facilitate personalized learning through intentional, flexible, and research-based strategies. They are literate in multiple forms of assessment and incorporate these multiple assessment strategies to evaluate student learning and adjust instruction accordingly. Highly effective educators integrate technology into their instructional and assessment approaches in ways that advance student learning opportunities.

Highly effective educators consistently demonstrate leadership in their contributions to their school’s academic progress and culture of growth. They engage productively in learning communities and continuously strive to maximize their own self-directed professional growth. These educators consistently uphold high standards of professional practice.

The process with which the Manchester School District evaluates educator effectiveness...

- Maintains high expectations of all educators and their professional practices.
- Blends self-reflective and collaborative processes.
- Is equitable and fair to all educators.
- Recognizes highly effective teaching, provides support for basic and effective teaching, and provides remedies for ineffective teaching.
- Focuses on student growth and the collection, analysis, and response to evidence of student growth.

”

”

Evaluation Plan for Educators

Educators will be evaluated on each of the domains using the Danielson Rubrics ([Appendix A](#)), adapted from V@Á/æ ^, [\ Á | Á ^ æ & @ *. These rubrics articulate each of four Levels of Performance for each of the five domains. The four Levels of Performance are defined as follows: Ineffective, Basic, Effective, and Highly Effective.

<p>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</p> <p>1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy *Content Knowledge *Prerequisite relationships *Content pedagogy</p> <p>1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students *Child development *Learning process *Special needs *Student skills, knowledge, and proficiency *Interests and cultural heritage</p> <p>1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes *Value, sequence, and alignment *Clarity *Balance *Suitability for diverse learners</p> <p>1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources *For classroom *To extend content knowledge *For students</p> <p>1e: Designing Coherent Instruction *Learning activities *Instructional materials and resources *Instructional groups *Lesson and unit structure</p> <p>1f: Designing Student Assessments *Congruence with outcomes *Criteria and standards *Formative assessments *Use for planning</p> <p>Domain 2: Learning Environment</p> <p>2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport *Teacher interaction with students *Student interaction with students</p> <p>2b: Establishing a culture for learning *Importance of content *Expectations for learning and behavior</p> <p>2c: Managing procedures *Instructional groups *Transitions *Materials and supplies *Non-instructional duties *Supervision of volunteers and paraprofessionals</p> <p>2d: Managing student behavior *Expectations *Monitoring behavior *Response to misbehavior</p> <p>2e: Organizing physical space *Safety and accessibility *Arrangement of furniture & resources</p>	<p>Domain 3: Instruction</p> <p>3a: Communicating with students *Expectations for learning *Directions and procedures *Explanations of content *Use of oral and written language</p> <p>3b: Using appropriate pedagogy *Quality of questions *Discussion techniques *Student participation</p> <p>3c: Engaging students in learning *Activities and assignments *Student groups *Instructional materials and resources *Structure and pacing</p> <p>3d: Using assessment in instruction *Assessment criteria *Monitoring of student learning *Feedback to students *Student self-assessment and monitoring</p> <p>3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness *Lesson adjustment *Response to students *Persistence</p> <p>Domain 4: Professional Responsibility</p> <p>4a: Reflecting on teaching *Accuracy *Use in future teaching</p> <p>4b: Maintaining accurate records *Student completion of assignments *Student progress of learning *Non-instructional records</p> <p>4c: Communicating with families *About instructional program *About individual students *Engagement of families in instructional program</p> <p>4d: Participating in a professional community *Relationships with colleagues *Participation in school projects *Involvement in culture of professional inquiry *Service to school</p> <p>4e: Growing and developing professionally *Enhancement of content knowledge & pedagogical skill *Service to profession</p> <p>4f: Showing professionalism *Integrity/ethical conduct *Service to students *Advocacy *Decision-making *Compliance with school/district regulations</p>
---	---

Itinerant educators are defined as educators assigned to more than one building site. It will be determined at the start of each school year which building administrator/Superintendent’s designee will be responsible for the evaluation of itinerant educators. Whenever possible, consistency of the evaluator should be maintained from year to year. The decision should be made collaboratively with the educator and all of the building administrators/Superintendent’s designee involved. This decision does not require a formal meeting but may be accomplished through a simple group email, including the educator, if that is acceptable to all involved. The decision must be documented in writing.

Other building-level credentialed educators in the Manchester School District will be evaluated using rubrics similar in structure to classroom teachers, but specific to their categorical area of certification ([Appendix A](#)). The process will be **the same** with identified **job-specific domains and components**.

Each year the educator will be observed per the table below. Additional observations may be conducted at any time by an administrator’s discretion or educator’s request.

Teaching Year	Formal Observation (minimum)	Annual Mini Observations (minimum)
Beginning Educator (1-5)	1 Annually (first semester/trimester for first year)	2
Career Track (6+)	Upon request by educator and/or evaluator	2

Ò ^ { ^ } • Á - Á @ Á Ö ä ~ & æ f ; Á Ö ç æ f ~ æ æ f } Á Ú | æ } Á

Mini-observations: In order to provide useful, ongoing feedback, the evaluator will spend at least 15 minutes in a classroom/lesson or other area for a mini-observation (Form 10). The information gathered will be a part of the overall evaluation of an educator. There should be at least two (2) weeks between mini-observations and an effort should be made by the evaluator to vary the time of day when the mini-observations take place. Educators will receive written feedback for each mini-observation within five (5) working days.

Formal Observation Cycle:

A formal observation cycle consists of:

1. Educator is notified of the upcoming observation.
2. A pre-conference occurs in the week prior to the observation.
 - a. Educator completes a Pre-Observation Conference form ([Form 9](#)) in preparation.
3. The observation will encompass a full lesson ([Form 10](#)).
4. A post-conference occurs after the observation within five (5) working days.
5. A written draft ([Form 10](#)) is given within fifteen (15) working days following the observation.

If an additional formal observation is requested by either the educator or evaluator, it will become part of the annual evaluation. Such request should be made in writing and considerable effort should be made by the evaluator to schedule the observation within one month of the request.

Forms Required:

- [Form 9 - Pre-Observation Conference](#)
- [Form 10 - Observation \(Mini- & Formal\)](#)
- [Form 11 - Awareness Phase](#)
- [Form 12 - Improvement Phase: Professional Improvement Plan](#)

Other Evidence: Evidence is compiled and reviewed alongside established rubrics. The rubric clearly defines expected performance levels for each Danielson Domain Component area. Evidence can be any data or information that informs the educator about his/her practice or informs the evaluator about the educator's practice. The collection of evidence for areas outside of formal observations and/or mini-observations is an ongoing process. The MSD Educator Evaluation Master Plan Handbook is designed to be a collaborative process and encourage the collection and sharing of evidence by both the evaluator and the educator.

Improvement Track

At any time, if an area(s) of professional concern or deficiency is identified, including the evaluation process, the educator may be placed on an improvement track. An educator placed on the improvement track, either in the Awareness Phase or Improvement Phase, will have an individualized plan for support and improvement.

The primary intent is always that administrators and educators will engage in face-to-face conversations when concerns/deficiencies are noted. The Improvement Track will be implemented if conversations do not remedy the concerns/deficiencies.

The significance of the concern and/or the deficient area(s) will determine where the educator will begin the Improvement Track process.

Itinerant Educators: If an itinerant educator is recommended to be placed on an Improvement Track, it is the responsibility of the principal/Superintendent's designee to notify building administrators/Superintendent's designee in all district buildings where that educator works that a plan is being considered.

When developing the plan, as outlined in the Improvement Track section, a collaborative determination will be made to include other principals/Superintendent's designee, as appropriate. If more than one of the principals, or Superintendent's designee, share concerns, those administrators must be involved throughout the Improvement Track process. The itinerant educator will be notified in writing of all parties involved in the collaboration of their plan.

Ç È æ ^ } ^ • • Á Ú @ @ ^ Á Á

The Awareness Phase may be implemented by an evaluator when an area of concern/deficiency is noted at any point in time during the school year or any component being evaluated is rated as Ineffective (deficient). The intent is to call an area of concern/deficiency to the attention of the educator so that it may be remedied quickly without entering the more formal Improvement Phase. An issue that would be considered for the Awareness Phase would be one that could reasonably be resolved in a 10-week period or less.

When an evaluator notes an area of concern/deficiency that requires action, the evaluator will

- Immediately (within one work day) bring the concern/deficiency to the attention of the educator.
- Schedule and meet with the educator to have a professional conversation about the concern/deficiency, and provide assistance. A time frame and resolution will be discussed at this time.
- Follow up within two school days with a written summary ([Form 11](#)) of the conversation to the educator. The summary will include the agreed upon time frame for the concern/deficiency to be remedied by the educator.
- During the process, the administrator and educator must meet on a minimum of twice a month, preferably every other week, to review progress and complete a formal observation cycle.

At the conclusion of the established timeline (10 weeks or less), the administrator will review the progress and make one of the following recommendations:

- If the concern/deficiency is remedied within the time frame, the educator exits the Awareness Phase.
- If the concern/deficiency is not remedied within the identified time frame, the evaluator will meet with the educator to discuss barriers and determine next steps. The reasonable time frame should be no more than an additional six (6) weeks. If the concern/deficiency is remedied within the time frame, the educator will exit the Awareness Phase.
- If the concern/deficiency is not remedied within the identified time frame, the evaluator will meet with the educator to inform them that he/she will be placed in the Improvement Phase. At this time, the Awareness Phase plan becomes part of the Improvement Phase documentation.

Upon successful exiting of the Awareness Phase, all administrator copies of the Awareness Phase documents must be destroyed. Educators may keep a copy, if desired.

Q] ; [ç ^ { ^ } d Á @ e ^ Á

An educator will enter the Improvement Phase, which will include a [Professional Improvement Plan \(PIP\)](#), when:

- The educator fails to remedy a concern/deficiency through the Awareness Phase process
OR
- A concern/deficiency that requires more time to address than provided through the Awareness Phase
OR
- There is any Ineffective level of performance (deficiency) from the evaluation process.
OR
- A serious issue arises that is not a result of the evaluation process.
OR
- Directed by the Superintendent or Superintendent's designee.

All Professional Improvement Plans (PIP) will include targeted mentoring and support.

The evaluator will facilitate a discussion immediately with the educator about the concern being identified. A draft of the Professional Improvement Plan (PIP) will be created and a meeting will be held to discuss and finalize the specifics of the Professional Improvement Plan.

Professional Improvement Plan (PIP):

As a result of entering the Improvement Phase, an individual PIP ([Form 12](#)) will be developed as follows:

- A meeting will take place between the evaluator and the educator immediately when a concern is identified by an administrator. The educator has a right to invite a colleague/union representative to attend the meeting if desired.
- Another administrator may be invited by the evaluator to act as a note taker for the meeting.
- The administrator will discuss the issue that has resulted in the educator's entrance into the Improvement Phase and provides evidence supporting this designation.
- The educator will have the opportunity to respond in writing within 2 working days to the administrator. The written response must be signed and dated by both parties and attached to the PIP.
- A plan for improvement will be determined. The administrator may come to the meeting with a draft plan. Collaboration is an important factor in the preparation of a final improvement plan.
- The plan will include an agreed upon list of the supports and activities.
- The plan will focus on the area(s) in need of improvement or determined to be deficient.
- The plan will include a detailed timeline as to when the educator is expected to meet specific benchmarks along the way to moving toward satisfactory improvement.
- The plan will include detailed requirements for exiting the Improvement Phase.
- The final plan will be presented by the administrator to the educator within three (3) school days of the initial meeting.
- Both the administrator and the educator will sign the plan acknowledging agreement.
- During the process, the administrator and educator must meet, at a minimum, twice a month, preferably every other week, basis to review progress.
- All PIP meetings must be documented and signed by all parties involved. The educator has a right to invite a colleague/union representative to attend any and all meetings if desired. Another administrator may be invited by the evaluator to act as a note taker for any and all meetings.
- Copies are kept by the educator, evaluator, and building principal/Superintendent's designee during the PIP process.
- All parties involved must hold confidentiality in the highest regard.
- Human Resources must be notified when a PIP is being developed and receive a copy of the signed, in-progress plan.
- Upon completion of the PIP process a copy of the completed, signed PIP must be placed in the educator's personnel file.
- Upon successful exiting of the plan, the only copies to be kept are with the educator and the educator's personnel file. All other paper and electronic copies must be destroyed.

Ö ç ä ä * Á Ö] ! [ç ^ { ^ } ¢ Á @ • ^ Á

An educator who has a PIP will exit the plan when he or she has satisfactorily completed all of the requirements stated in the PIP, which will include being at least Basic in all domains. A formal observation is required in order to exit the Improvement Phase.

At the conclusion of the established timeline (20 weeks or less), the administrator will review the progress and make one of the following recommendations:

- A. The educator has resolved the concern(s) and will exit the improvement phase.
- B. The educator has made some improvement, as detailed in the plan, yet not resolved all of the concern(s), then the educator may continue on the PIP for no more than 10 additional weeks.
- C. The educator has not made adequate progress, as detailed in the plan, and may be recommended for non-renewal.
- D. If disciplinary issues arise, the administrator will move the educator to a disciplinary component.

Section 4: Timeline for Educator Evaluation Process

Deadlines	
October 30	Educator submits Student Learning Objectives Template, if applicable.
September - June 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evaluator completes 2 Mini-observations for each educator and provides written feedback within 5 working days of each observation. ● Mini-observations must be at least 2 weeks apart.
By the end of the First Trimester or Semester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evaluator completes a minimum of one Formal Observation for all first year educators ● Reminder: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pre-conference completed no more than 1 week prior ○ Post-conference within 5 working days after Formal Observation ○ Written draft of Formal Evaluation within 15 working days after Formal Observation
September - June 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evaluator completes a minimum of one Formal Observation of Beginning educators (2-5 years) ● Career Track educators may receive a Formal Observation upon request of educator or evaluator. ● Reminder: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pre-conference completed no more than 1 week prior ○ Post-conference within 5 working days after Formal Observation ○ Written draft of Formal Evaluation within 15 working days after Formal Observation
April 16 - June 11	Evaluator submits evaluations to Human Resources Department to be placed in the educator's personnel file.

Section 5: FORMS

There will be a series of forms or electronic collection pages for managing the Professional Development process. Forms can be accessed by clicking on the links below and on the following pages.

Educator Evaluation Forms:

- [Form 9 - Pre-Observation Conference](#)
- [Form 10 - Observation \(Mini- & Formal\)](#)
- [Form 11 - Awareness Phase](#)
- [Form 12 - Improvement Phase: Professional Improvement Plan](#)

T æ & @ • ¸ ! Á Ú & @ [| Ö ä d æ Ö Á
Ö ä ~ & æ [! Ö ç æ ~ æ æ } Á æ ¸ ! Á Ú | æ } Á æ } à à [\ Á Á
R | ^ Á Æ F Í Á Æ R } ^ Á Æ G F Á
Ö } | [ç ^ á Á ^ Á Ö U Ö Ö Æ | Æ Æ Æ Á

Evaluation Forms

[Ø | { Á Á Ú ! ^ È Ü à • ^ ! ç æ æ } Á Ö \[} - ^ ! ^ } & ^ Á](#)

PRINTOUT OF ONLINE GOOGLE FORM.

3/16/2016

Form 9 - Pre-Conference Observation

Form 9 - Pre-Conference Observation

(For use during Formal Observation Cycle)

Educators will be evaluated on each of the domains using the Danielson model, adapted from The Framework for Teaching. For more information on the Danielson model and evaluation expectations, educators may visit The Danielson Group website by clicking on one of the links below. Information is available for free download by registering on the site.

The Danielson Group: The Framework: <http://www.danielsongroup.org/framework/>

The Danielson Group: Special Education Scenarios: <http://www.danielsongroup.org/special-education/>

The Danielson Group: Specialist Rubrics: <http://www.danielsongroup.org/specialist-rubrics/>

Your username (sdevincent@mansd.org) will be recorded when you submit this form. Not sdevincent? [Sign out](#)

* Required

1. Educator's Name *

https://docs.google.com/a/mansd.org/forms/d/1YAFLuUoCcw1RHg7kT1e0l_HinHBH4hsTau3KR5DtRyE/edit?usp=drive_web

1/5

2. School *

Mark only one oval.

- Bakersville
- Beech
- Central
- Gossler Park
- Green Acres
- Hallsville
- Highland
- Hillside
- Jewett
- McDonough
- McLaughlin
- Memorial
- MST
- Northwest
- Parker-Vamey
- Parkside
- SAU
- Smyth Road
- Southside
- Webster
- West
- Weston
- Wilson

3. Evaluator

Proposed Observation Details

Specific date, time, and other information to be finalized at the pre-conference.

In order to thoroughly and effectively discuss the observation goals and expectations, please bring the following:

- the completed Pre-Observation Conference form
- your lesson plan book

T æ & @ • ¢ ; Á Ú & @ [| Á Ò ã d ð Ò Á
Á Ò ã ~ & æ [! Á Ò ç æ ~ æ æ] Á Á æ ¢ ! Á Ú | æ Á Á æ á à [\ Á Á
R | ^ Á Ò È F Í Á Á Á R } ^ Á Ò È G F Á
Ç È] ! [ç ^ á Á ~ Á Ú Ú Ó Æ Ì Ì F I Ì F Í Á

3/16/2016

Form 9 - Pre-Conference Observation

4. Observation Date *

Example: December 15, 2012

5. Observation Time *

Example: 8:30 AM

6. Observation Grade Level/Curriculum Area to be Observed *

7. Class/Subject Taught *

8. Number of Students Taught *

9. Grade(s) Taught *

10. Where are you in the course of this unit? (Unit, lesson, introductory or culminating activity) *

11. What are the objectives of this lesson?

12. What MSD curriculum standards and/or components of the school mission or expectations are addressed in this unit? *

13. What are the methods and activities that will be used to meet the objective? *

14. What assessment tools or strategies will you use to know if the students have mastered the stated objective? (Please provide a copy.) *

15. Are there any instructional strategies for which you would like feedback? *

16. Are there any individual characteristics or group dynamics that bear special consideration? *

17. What further information regarding your role as teacher inside and/or outside the classroom is worthy of consideration? (committees, extracurricular activities, professional development activities, volunteering community involvement.)

Sign & Date

Educator's Signature

Date

Send me a copy of my responses.



T æ & @ • ¢ ; Á Ú & @ [| Á ò d ð ò Á
Á ò ~ & æ [; Á Ò ç æ ¸ æ æ } Á ¸ æ ¢ ; Á Ú | æ } Á ¸ æ } á à [| \ Á
R | ^ Á Æ F Í Á Æ R } ^ Á Æ G F Á
Ø } ; [ç ^ á Á ^ Á Ú Ú Ó Æ i Æ Æ Á

[Ø | ; { Á Æ Á Ú à • ^ ! ç æ æ } • Á Ú á ä Æ Á Ø | ; { æ Á](#)

PRINTOUT OF ONLINE GOOGLE FORM.

3/16/2016

Form 10 - Observations (Mini- & Formal)

Form 10 - Observations (Mini- & Formal)

Educators will be evaluated on each of the domains using the Danielson model, adapted from The Framework for Teaching. For more information on the Danielson model and evaluation expectations, educators may visit The Danielson Group website by clicking on one of the links below. Information is available for free download by registering on the site.

The Danielson Group: The Framework: <http://www.danielsongroup.org/framework/>

The Danielson Group: Special Education Scenarios: <http://www.danielsongroup.org/special-education/>

The Danielson Group: Specialist Rubrics: <http://www.danielsongroup.org/specialist-rubrics/>

Your username (sdevincent@mansd.org) will be recorded when you submit this form. Not sdevincent? [Sign out](#)

* Required

1. Educator's Name *

2. School *

Mark only one oval.

- Bakersville
- Beech
- Central
- Gossler Park
- Green Acres
- Hallsville
- Highland
- Hillside
- Jewett
- McDonough
- McLaughlin
- Memorial
- MST
- Northwest
- Parker-Vamey
- Parkside
- SAU
- Smyth Road
- Southside
- Webster
- West
- Weston
- Wilson

3. Observation Date *

Example: December 15, 2012

4. Observation Type *

Mark only one oval.

- Mini-Observation
- Formal Observation

Observation Notes

Google Forms does not save until submitted. Recommended to take notes elsewhere and transfer into this section when completing observation comments.

5. Record observation notes per Danielson guidelines

6. Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

Mark only one oval per row.

	Ineffective	Basic	Effective	Highly Effective	Not observed
1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1e: Designing Coherent Instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1f: Designing Student Assessments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. Domain 1 Commendations

8. Domain 1 Recommendations

9. Domain 2: Learning Environment

Mark only one oval per row.

	Ineffective	Basic	Effective	Highly Effective	Not observed
2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2b: Establishing a culture for learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2c: Managing procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2d: Managing student behavior	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2e: Organizing physical space	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Domain 2 Commendations

11. Domain 2 Recommendations

12. Domain 3: Instruction

Mark only one oval per row.

	Ineffective	Basic	Effective	Highly Effective	Not observed
3a: Communicating with students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3b: Using appropriate pedagogy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3c: Engaging students in learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3d: Using assessment in instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. Domain 3: Commendations

14. Domain 3: Recommendations

15. Domain 4: Professional Responsibility

Mark only one oval per row.

	Ineffective	Basic	Effective	Highly Effective	Not observed
4a: Reflecting on teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4b: Maintaining accurate records	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4c: Communicating with families	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4d: Participating in a professional community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4e: Growing and developing professionally	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4f: Showing professionalism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16. Domain 4 Commendations

T æ & @ • ¢ ; Á Ú & @ [| Á Ö ä d ð o Á
Á Ò à ~ & æ [! Á Ö ç æ ~ æ æ] Á r æ ¢ ! Á Ú | æ } Á r æ } á à [| \ Á
R | ^ Á Æ F Í Á Æ R } ^ Á Æ G F Á
O F] | [ç ^ á Á ^ Á Ö U Ú Ö Á Æ i ð i ð i Á

3/16/2016

Form 10 - Observations (Mini- & Formal)

17. Domain 4 Recommendations

18. Additional Comments

Send me a copy of my responses.

Powered by
 Google Forms

Ö | ; Á F F Ä Ö E æ ^ } ^ • • Á Ú @ æ ^ Á

**MSD Educator Evaluation Master Plan
 Awareness Phase Form**

Name _____ School & Current Position _____
 License # _____ Certification expiration date: _____
 Certification Areas: 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____

Date (s) Concern/Deficiency Observed:

Initial Awareness Phase meeting to create an Action Plan:

Domain and Components of Concern/Deficiency:

Describe Concern that prompted Awareness Phase implementation:

Reminder the following activities are required and will be listed in Action Plan:

- Meetings twice a month, at a minimum, to review progress.
- Complete a formal observation cycle.
- Meeting notes & documentation must be attached.
- During the process, a copy of all documents, including meeting notes, should be kept by the Educator and by the Building Administrator/Superintendent's designee.

AWARENESS PHASE ACTION PLAN

Activities to be Completed in order to Satisfactorily exit Awareness Phase

	Description of Activity	Date Started	Date Completed	Staff Involved	Comments	Building Administrator/ Superintendent's designee & Educator Initials
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

MSD Educator Evaluation Master Plan
Awareness Phase Form

Signatures indicate agreement to implement activities outlined in this form. Signature does not indicate agreement with reason why Awareness Phase is being implemented.

Educator Signature Date

Building Administrator/Superintendent's Designee Signature Date

AWARENESS PHASE RECOMMENDATION:

- Exit Awareness Phase
- Continue Awareness Phase (no more than six additional weeks)
- Move to Improvement Plan Phase

Signatures indicate acknowledgement of recommendation. Signature does not indicate agreement with recommendation.

This form becomes part of the educator's personnel file upon the educator entering the Improvement phase; otherwise, all copies, paper and electronic, must be discarded once the educator successfully exits the Awareness Phase back into the Career or Novice Phase. The educator may keep a copy if desired.

Educator Signature Date

Building Administrator/Superintendent's Designee Signature Date

Ø | ; Á G Ä Ö [] | ; ç ^ ^ } Ö Ú @ ^ K Ú | [^ • • ä } æ / Ö [] | ; ç ^ ^ } Ö Ú æ Á

**MSD Educator Evaluation Plan
 Improvement Phase
 Professional Improvement Plan (PIP)**

Name _____ School & Current Position _____
 License # _____ Certification expiration date: _____
 Certification Areas: 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____

Date (s) Concern/Deficiency Observed:

Initial Improvement Phase meeting to create an Action Plan:

Domain and Components of Concern/Deficiency:

Describe Concern/Deficiency that prompted Improvement Phase implementation:

Reminder the following activities are required and will be listed in Action Plan:

- Meetings twice a month, at a minimum, to review progress.
- Meeting notes & documentation must be attached.
- During the process, a copy of all documents, including meeting notes, should be kept by the Educator and by the Building Administrator/Superintendent's designee.
- A formal observation is required in order to exit the Improvement Phase.

**IMPROVEMENT PHASE
 Professional Improvement Plan**

Activities to be Completed in order to Satisfactorily exit Improvement Phase

	Description of Activity	Date Started	Date Completed	Staff Involved	Comments	Building Administrator/ Superintendent's designee & Educator Initials
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

Revised July 31, 2017

**MSD Educator Evaluation Plan
Improvement Phase
Professional Improvement Plan (PIP)**

Signatures indicate agreement to implement activities outlined in this form. Signature does not indicate agreement with reason why Improvement Phase is being implemented.

Educator Signature Date

Building Administrator/Superintendent's Designee Signature Date

IMPROVEMENT PHASE RECOMMENDATION:

- The educator has resolved the concern(s), is at least Basic in all Domains and will exit the improvement phase.
- The educator has made some improvement, as detailed in the plan, yet not resolved all of the concern(s), then the educator may continue on the PIP for no more than 10 additional weeks.
- The educator has not made adequate progress, as detailed in the plan, and may be recommended for non-renewal.

Signatures indicate acknowledgement of recommendation. Signature does not indicate agreement with recommendation.

Upon exiting the Improvement Phase, this form becomes part of the educator's personnel file. The educator may keep a copy. All other paper and electronic copies must be destroyed.

Educator Signature Date

Building Administrator/Superintendent's Designee Signature Date

APPENDIX

Appendix A. Danielson’s Rubrics and Standards

Educators will be evaluated on each of the domains using the Danielson model, adapted from V@ÁÖ'æ ^, [| \ Á f ! Á ^ æ & @ * . For more information on the Danielson model and evaluation expectations, educators may visit The Danielson Group website by clicking on one of the links below. Information is available for free download by registering on the site.

The Danielson Group: The Framework: <http://www.danielsongroup.org/framework/>

The Danielson Group: Special Education Scenarios - <http://www.danielsongroup.org/special-education/>

The Danielson Group: Specialist Rubrics - <http://www.danielsongroup.org/specialist-rubrics/>

***Please note the differences in the wording of proficiency levels:**

<i>Manchester</i>	<i>Danielson</i>
Ineffective	Unsatisfactory
Basic	Basic
Effective	Proficient
Highly Effective	Highly Proficient

Please note The Danielson Group is constantly perfecting the Framework and rubrics. While the intent of the expectations will remain the same, there may be changes in language and format.