

Randolph Township Schools

Teacher Evaluation Handbook

This explanatory material is intended to accompany the revised (June, 2011) classroom teacher evaluation instrument. Along with the revised form itself, this document is intended to replace all existing materials (e.g. binders, pre-evaluation forms) heretofore associated with the evaluation process.

Upon implementation of the revised form (for the 2011-2012 school year), teachers and evaluators will use copies of the form to compile information needed to conduct the annual evaluation conference. In other words, they will use the form as a template for their notes to be used in completing a formal copy of the annual evaluation. In this way, the new evaluation form will also serve as an “agenda” for the evaluation conference.

A. Attendance Summary

This section records the number of sick, personal, compassionate leave and other days used by the staff member during the evaluation year. The actual numbers are provided to evaluators by the Personnel department of the district’s central office.

B. Professional Development Plan

Here, the staff member is asked to report on her/his PDP **and** her/his role in accomplishing building and district goals. Under the New Jersey State mandates planned for implementation beginning in September, 2012, a part of each staff member’s evaluation will be dependent upon the accomplishment of a school’s and a district’s student performance goals. *The same will apply to building principals.* In addition, it is in this section that the staff member reports on her/his success in achieving her/his individual PDP for the year just ending.

If there are reasons why the staff member’s role in accomplishing the individual, school or district goals has not been successful, it is in this area of the form that such an explanation would appear. This explanation should also reference supporting/explanatory documentation. Copies of such documentation should accompany the completed evaluation form.

C. Teacher Effectiveness Rating

A key component of the New Jersey State mandate on teacher evaluation mentioned in B. above is the assessment of all teachers on an “effectiveness” scale. In the absence (until the planned September, 2012 promulgation of the State evaluation plan) of a mandated form, this form asks the evaluator to rate

the teacher's overall performance in one of three categories – highly effective, effective, or ineffective.

It is anticipated that the State mandated evaluation system will be accompanied by a mechanism by use of which a teacher's contribution to student progress can be measured. In the absence of such a mechanism, the general definition of a **highly effective teacher** would include that the teacher's performance has been *commended* frequently (using the format of the revised observation form), that the teacher has substantively and efficiently addressed any *recommendations* made through the observation process and that the teacher has demonstrably contributed to the accomplishment of individual (PDP), school and district goals through consistently positive interactions with the other members of the school community (students, parents, colleagues). A teacher would be assessed as **effective** if at least some aspects of her/his performance had been *commended*, a demonstrable effort had been made to address any *recommendations* made in the observation process and if the teacher had successfully completed her/his PDP and made some contribution to the accomplishment of school and district goals through generally positive interactions with other members of the school community. A teacher would be assessed as **ineffective** if her/his (observed) performance was rarely *commended*, if *recommendations* were incompletely addressed and if her/his contributions to the accomplishment of her/his PDP and school/district goals were inadequate or lacking – at least in part as a result of less than positive interactions with the other members of the school community.

D. Performance Indicators

As is quickly realizable, the teacher performance indicators on the evaluation form are largely drawn from those on the *observation* form. The major difference is that the wording of the indicators on the evaluation form is meant to convey the idea that these "teacher behaviors" are demonstrable over the course of a school year and not just in the "snapshot" observation of a single class session.

Extensive explanations of the indicators "shared" by the observation and evaluation instruments can be found in the handbook which accompanies the observation form. In addition, the following two indicators, found on the evaluation form, are explained here.

Indicator # 1 – "The teacher demonstrates positive interactions with the school community"

Since positive interactions with the several segments of the school community (students, parents, colleagues) are so important in defining a teacher's overall effectiveness – particularly in contributing to the teacher's assistance in accomplishing school and district goals, this item has been included. Positive interactions would include accessibility of the teacher for student extra help, attendance at school/PTO sponsored events and parent contact. It would also

include the teacher's willingness to serve on committees or study groups formed to address school or district needs.

Indicator #15 – “The teacher uses effective instructional strategies”

While the observation instrument, not surprisingly, devotes considerable space to the area of instruction, this summary statement is meant to reinforce the idea that the effective teacher not only uses such (listed) strategies as *differentiation*, and *higher order questioning* but also *engages* students and provides them with timely *feedback* routinely- not just when being formally observed.

Moreover, it speaks again to the dictum (from Richard Elmore) that “*If the students haven't learned it, you haven't taught it.*” That the primary criterion for establishing a teacher's instructional effectiveness is whether or not students can demonstrate actual learning.

Like the observation instrument, the evaluation form asks evaluators to comment specifically on the list of (in this case) 19 teacher performance indicators. The three columns (*highly effective*, *effective* and *not effective*) are to be completed not only with statements addressing the groups of indicators but also with specific examples which support the placement of particular comments in particular columns.

For example, if an evaluator assesses a teacher as “not effective” according to the indicators in a particular group, it is expected that he/she will provide specific examples or will reference accompanying documentation to support such an assessment. The same will apply to assessments of “highly effective” and “effective.” In this way, the evaluation serves both summative and formative purposes.