



Douglas County
School District

EDUCATOR

Effectiveness

DCSD's Licensed Evaluation Guidebook

For Questions and Additional Information Contact:

Dr. Deanne Kirby

Director of Educator Effectiveness

dmkirby@dcsdk12.org

Table of Contents

<u>Section One: Purpose of Evaluation</u>	2
<u>Section Two: DCSD's Unique Licensed Employee Evaluation System</u>	5
<u>Section Three: DCSD's Digital Evaluation System Overview</u>	10
<u>Section Four: Goal Setting</u>	17
<u>Section Five: The Highly Effective Pathway</u>	20
<u>Section Six: Measures of Student Learning/Outcomes (CITE 6)</u>	22
<u>Section Seven: The Role of Observation Evidence and Artifacts in Licensed Evaluation</u>	24
<u>Section Eight: The Summative Snapshot</u>	26
<u>Section Nine: Calculation of a Summative Score</u>	27
<u>Section Ten: The Professional Growth Planning Process</u>	28
<u>Section Eleven: The Second Look Process</u>	28
<u>Section Twelve: Performance Evaluation Ratings Appeal Process</u>	29
<u>Section Thirteen: Probationary Status, Non-Probationary Status and Induction</u>	30
<u>Section Fourteen: Leaves of Absence</u>	32
<u>Appendix A: Resources</u>	34
<u>Appendix B: Final Score Calculation Guide</u>	35
<u>Appendix C: Performance Evaluation Rating Appeals Process</u>	36
<u>Appendix D: The Second Look Process</u>	38

Section One: Purpose of Evaluation

Douglas County School District (DCSD) is proud to employ some of the finest educators in Colorado. The DCSD evaluation system is designed to support licensed employees' professional growth. Licensed employees and evaluators are encouraged to engage in a process of collaborative goal setting, reflection, and observations. Evaluators support licensed employee growth and continuous improvement of educator effectiveness through ongoing, frequent observation, actionable feedback and coaching.

History

Licensed evaluation in Colorado is mandated by legislation ([Senate Bill 10-191](#) and [Senate Bill 22-070](#)). Senate Bill 10-191 was passed in 2010 to support school districts with the evaluation of educators. The law provides school districts with the autonomy to create evaluation systems and tools that meet the unique needs of their district so long as the system meets or exceeds the expectations set forth in legislation. Douglas County School District adopted the Continuous Improvement of Teacher Effectiveness (CITE) in 2012 to meet the unique needs of teachers and Specialized Service Providers (SSPs). Also introduced in 2012, Leadership Evaluation through Assessment and Data (LEAD) supports evaluation for principals, assistant principals and deans.

This guidebook is designed to describe DCSD's unique, locally designed licensed evaluation system and outline quality practices that support the growth of licensed employees.

Senate Bill 22-070, passed in 2022, coexists with Senate Bill 10-191 and adds some changes and additional mandates. Below is a general overview of both senate bills that govern the implementation of licensed evaluation in Colorado.

Senate Bill 10-191

- All licensed employees are evaluated each year using multiple, fair, transparent, timely, rigorous, and valid methods.
- All licensed employees receive adequate feedback and professional development support to provide them a meaningful opportunity to improve their effectiveness.
- Probationary teachers are observed at least two times resulting in a summative evaluation each year.
- Non-probationary teachers are observed at least one time resulting in a summative evaluation each year.
- All licensed employees must have a professional growth plan.
- Summative evaluations consist of standards for quality practice and measures of student learning (MSLs). (Note: Through the 2022-2023 school year, summative evaluations were based on fifty percent [50%] standards for quality practice and fifty percent [50%] MSLs.)

- MSLs for non specialized service professionals include individual and collective data. Collective data must include data from more than one licensed employee as well as data from the School Performance Framework and/or the Colorado Growth Model (when available).
- Probationary and Non-probationary status is gained or lost based on consecutive evaluations:
 - Probationary teachers must have three years of consecutive effective (or higher) summative evaluations to move to Non-probationary status.
 - Non-probationary teachers will lose status based upon two years of consecutive ineffective summative evaluations (partially effective or ineffective). The Appeals process is available for licensed employees in danger of losing Non-probationary status.

Senate Bill 22-070 - Implemented at the start of the 2023-2024 school year:

- Summative evaluations consist of seventy percent (70%) standards for quality practice and thirty percent (30%) measures of student learning (MSLs). This is a shift from the 50/50 calculation previously stipulated by SB 10-191.
- Licensed employees (teachers, Specialized Service Providers [SSPs], principals, assistant principals and deans) who have three consecutive highly effective summative evaluations will qualify for the Highly Effective Pathway (see Section Five: The Highly Effective Pathway for more information). Licensed employees with probationary status are excluded from the Highly Effective Pathway. The requirement of annual evaluations remains in place.
- Collective measures for licensed employees (teachers, principals and assistant principals) can only use data based on the performance of students enrolled at their school. Collective measures for any licensed employee who is new to a district/BOCES or new to a school cannot include data from before they were employed (i.e., employed for one year or less).
- A one-time training is required for any staff who evaluate licensed employees. Beginning August 2024, principal licensure will require proof of the one-time training.
 - New and non-licensed evaluators (i.e. deans) will still be required to be trained before evaluating staff. Training is offered for these employees each year.
- Expansion of the state's evaluation rubric collection.

Key Priorities of Evaluation

- Data always informs the process, but human judgment will always be a part of an effective evaluation system.
- The system encourages continuous improvement; both licensed employee and evaluator have a responsibility in the continuous improvement process.
- The system supports and encourages risk-taking and reflective dialogue between licensed employee and evaluator.
- The completion of the summative evaluation is only one part of a comprehensive evaluation

system.

- The process should be collaborative in nature and may include peer observations, input from parents, input from students, etc.
- The ultimate goal of any evaluation system is to impact student growth and achievement.

DRAFT

Section Two: DCSD's Unique Licensed Employee Evaluation System

DCSD has maintained a unique licensed employee evaluation system since the introduction of Senate Bill 10-191 in 2010. The evaluation system, referred to as CITE (Continuous Improvement of Teacher Effectiveness - for teacher-based and SSP-based roles) and LEAD (Leadership Effectiveness through Analysis and Data - for building and district leadership roles), is designed around descriptive rubrics which are the tools and frameworks used to provide feedback, coaching and evaluation ratings to licensed employees.

Rubric Creation

Any unique rubric created for use by licensed employees must meet or exceed the rubrics available in the Colorado State Model Evaluation System. Newly created or revised rubrics from DCSD's rubric collection must be crosswalked to the appropriate Colorado State Model Rubric and approved by the Educator Effectiveness division of the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) prior to use by licensed employees. This ensures that DCSD's unique evaluation system maintains the integrity set forth by state legislation: unique local systems must meet or exceed the Colorado State Model Evaluation System (See [Local Model Evaluation Systems: Overview](#) for more information).

The CITE Focus Group was introduced during the 2015-16 school year as an opportunity for professionals from all levels - licensed and administration - to work together to improve the efficacy of the evaluation rubrics used to measure licensed employee growth. Membership in the focus group is voluntary. The opportunity to serve is open to any licensed employee.

The LEAD Focus Group was introduced during the 2017-18 school year as an opportunity for licensed administrators from all levels to work together to improve the efficacy of the evaluation rubrics used to measure leader growth. Membership in the focus group is voluntary. The opportunity to serve is open to any building and district level leaders.

The SSP (Specialized Service Providers) Focus Group was introduced during the 2020-21 school year as an opportunity for Specialized Service Providers to work together to improve the efficacy of the evaluation rubrics used to measure provider's growth. Membership in the focus group is voluntary. The opportunity to serve is open to any licensed SSPs.

Rubrics are continuously evaluated for quality and relevance and are edited, revised, and/or created as needed to maintain a quality evaluation system.


Role of the Evaluation Council and DCSD's Focus Groups

As part of the 2018 Colorado Revised Statutes 22-9-107, all districts must maintain an evaluation council. The purpose of the council is to ensure that evaluation systems are fair, effective, credible and professional, as well as to provide continuous evaluation of unique evaluation systems. There are several options for how this council can be formed and how it operates. DCSD uses the above-mentioned CITE Focus Group (licensed employees from all levels and building leaders) and

LEAD Focus Group (leaders from all levels) in partnership with the District Accountability Committee (made up of teacher, principal, district, parent and community representatives) to fulfill the state expectations for the evaluation council.

The CITE Focus Group's main purpose is to support the creation and revision of CITE rubrics; the LEAD Focus Group does the same for the LEAD rubrics. Both groups communicate with the DAC and keep them apprised of any potential changes or additions with respect to rubrics, the evaluation system and measures of student learning (MSLs). Based on information from the CITE and LEAD Focus Groups, the DAC provides feedback and is the final step in recommending that the rubrics are presented to the Board of Education, who will provide district-level approval for a rubric's use in the DCSD evaluation system.

Once the Board of Education approves any rubric changes or additions, they are shared with the Educator Effectiveness division of the Colorado Department of Education for their feedback and approval.



DCSD's Rubric Revision and Creation Process

<p>DCSD's Department of Educator Effectiveness: Supports rubric revision and creation requests.</p> <p>Organizes the work and maintains the integrity of the process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rubrics play an important role in DCSD's evaluation system and therefore are created with purpose and intentionality. • Many rubrics in the DCSD evaluation rubric collection are established (i.e., the CITE Generalist Rubric). Once established, rubrics are used until there is an identified need for revision or adjustment. • Some rubrics are older and have outdated language which warrants further examination and either a revision or discontinued use of the rubric. • In some cases, a new rubric needs to be developed to support a licensed employee role. • All scenarios are accounted for individually.
<p>DCSD Rubric Focus Groups: Provide opportunities for licensed employee voices and support the revision and creation of rubrics according to specific roles.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CITE Focus Group: Teacher rubrics and rubrics for teacher related roles (Mild/Moderate or Center-Based Special Education teacher, English Language Development, Professional Learning Specialist) • SSP Focus Group: Specialized Service Professional rubrics • LEAD Focus Group: Rubrics for principals, AP, and deans. <p>These groups gather feedback from appropriate stakeholders and make adjustments as necessary. Feedback is collected in formal and informal settings.</p>
<p>DCSD's District Accountability Committee: Supports progress and provides feedback throughout the rubric revision and creation process..</p> <p>Makes recommendations to the DCSD Board of Education to support approval of the rubrics for use in the DCSD evaluation system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DAC serves as the district's evaluation council and as such is statutorily required to 'consult with the local board or board of cooperative services as to the fairness, effectiveness, credibility, and professional quality of the licensed personnel performance evaluation system and its processes and procedures and shall conduct a continuous evaluation of said system.' (C.R.S. § 22-9-107) • Throughout the process, the DAC receives regular updates regarding the progress of rubric revisions and/or creation and has the opportunity to provide feedback to the various focus groups to support the quality of the DCSD evaluation rubrics. • The DAC's ultimate responsibility is to provide recommendations that the board approve new or newly revised rubrics for use in the DCSD evaluation system.
<p>DCSD's Board of Education: Reviews and approves the rubrics for use in the DCSD evaluation system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board of Education is updated regarding any rubric approvals. Approval is typically requested in June.
<p>Colorado Department of Education's Educator Effectiveness Division: Reviews and approves any new or revised rubrics for use in the DCSD evaluation system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of CDE's Educator Effectiveness Division is to ensure that any evaluation rubric used by a local system meets or exceeds the Colorado State Model Evaluation System. • DCSD must provide the rubrics in full along with crosswalks to the appropriate rubrics from Colorado's State Model Evaluation System.

Rubrics

All DCSD licensed employee rubrics are all arranged in a similar format. The standards are divided into two sections that describe the professional and the practice. For example the Generalist Rubric describes professional practices for the Teacher and the Teaching.

The Teacher

Standard 1: Culture & Climate
Standard 2: Professionalism

The Teaching

Standard 3: Planning
Standard 4: Assessment
Standard 5: Instruction

Most rubrics are composed of five Standards. Each standard consists of various elements that describe the standards more deeply and each element has 4 levels of indicators that describe degrees of professional practice related to each rubric's practice.

Standards: A general description of the practices of the teacher and the teaching

Elements: Describe specific components within each standard.

Indicators: Describe a progression of best practices within each element.

Current DCSD CITE and LEAD Evaluation Rubrics

CITE Teacher Rubrics	CITE SSP Rubrics	LEAD and Department Leader Rubrics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CITE Generalist Rubric • CITE Educator Rubric • CITE Elementary Digital Librarian Rubric • CITE Professional Learning Specialist (PLS) Rubric • CITE Teacher Librarian Rubric • CITE Technology Teacher (Specialist) Rubric • CITE IEP and Assessment Specialist (IAS) Rubric 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CITE Audiologist Rubric • CITE Child Find Assessment Professional Rubric • CITE Counselor Rubric • CITE Occupational Therapist Rubric • CITE School Nurse Rubric • CITE School Psychologist/Social Worker Rubric • CITE Speech Language Pathologist Rubric • CITE Teachers of the Visually Impaired/Orientation Mobility Specialist Rubric 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAD Rubric • CITE Strategist Rubric

DRAFT

Section Three: DCSD's Digital Evaluation System Overview

The Douglas County School District employs a unique digital evaluation system designed and supported by internal digital technical engineers. The system is used to capture:

- Goal setting and goal progress
- Observation evidence
- Employee collected evidence
- Element ratings
- Progress monitoring
- Probationary and non-probationary status
- Highly Effective Pathway
- Measures of Student Learning (Student Learning Objectives and Student Outcome Objectives)

All licensed employees are evaluated in the digital system. Evaluators and licensed employees have the ability to upload evidence for review and rating. Evaluators use the system to provide the required end of year summative evaluation.

The digital evaluation system maintains an archive of evaluation data that is available to the evaluator and the licensed employee. The system helps guide the evaluation cycle each year by maintaining the integrity of the systematic process with deadlines embedded within the system. Data from the system are used to satisfy legislated reporting requirements for the Colorado Department of Education.

DCSD's Evaluation System Expectations

DCSD's evaluation system is organized into beginning, middle and end of the year tasks. The following matrices demonstrate the basic expectations and tasks that are required (and optional) at each time of the school year. Tasks that will be supported by the DCSD Digital Evaluation System are outlined in the sections following the matrices.

Beginning of the Year

Task	Description	Additional Information
Training for licensed employees new to DCSD	All new licensed employees participate in an initial training to acclimate them to DCSD's CITE and the Evaluation Process.	The purpose of the training is to provide additional time for new licensed employees to learn and begin to feel comfortable with DCSD's local evaluation system.
Annual Orientation to CITE and the Evaluation Process	All licensed employees participate in an orientation to the DCSD Orientation to CITE and the Evaluation Process.	The purpose of this orientation is to ensure that all licensed employees understand the evaluation system and its legal implications, know where to find important resources and are apprised of any changes to the system.
Log into the DCSD Digital Evaluation System	All licensed employees must log into the DCSD Digital Evaluation System, set their profile, and select the correct rubric.	It is important that these steps are checked for accuracy before any other tasks are completed (i.e., goal setting, self-evaluations or evidence uploads). If an incorrect rubric is selected, any previously completed tasks will be lost when the new rubric is selected and saved.
Goal Setting	<p>All licensed employees are required to set a SMART Goal.</p> <p>A student-focused SMART Goal with teacher-focused action steps is preferred.</p>	<p>Example: By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 80% of students will demonstrate proficiency in writing a scientific lab report for Biology as measured by the scientific lab report scoring rubric.</p> <p>Teacher-focused action steps for this goal example may include: selecting success criteria with students, direct instruction for lab reporting, peer feedback and peer grading opportunities, small group and one on one support</p>

		for students to target specific skills or skill gaps, and etc.
Set Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) or Student Outcome Objectives (SOOs)	Licensed employees consider measures of student learning/outcomes (preferably aligned to their SMART Goal) and upload a Student Learning Objective (SLO) or Student Outcome Objective (SOO).	Some licensed employees will not be required to submit SLO/SOOs as determined by their job title/code. See Which Rubric Do I Pick?
Beginning of the Year Self-Evaluation (Optional)	At the beginning of the school year, all licensed employees have the <i>option</i> of completing the beginning of the year self-evaluation.	Some evaluators may request that licensed employees (entire staff, groups, or individuals) complete the beginning of the year self-evaluation depending on differentiated needs (i.e., new staff, induction candidates, alternative licensure candidates, probationary staff, etc.)
Highly Effective Teacher Pathway	Licensed employees who qualify will collaborate with their evaluator to set the Highly Effective Pathway selection of elements in the DCSD Digital Evaluation System.	This pathway is available for all licensed employees who have three consecutive years of highly effective summative ratings. Some restrictions or exclusions may apply - See Section Five: The Highly Effective Pathway for more information.



Middle of the Year

Task	Description	Additional Information
Middle of the Year Self-Evaluation (Optional)	At the middle of the school year, all licensed employees have the <i>option</i> of completing the mid-year self-evaluation.	Some evaluators may request that licensed employees (entire staff, groups, or individuals) complete the middle of the year self-evaluation depending on differentiated needs (i.e., new staff, induction candidates, alternative licensure candidates, probationary staff, etc.)
Reflection on Goal Progress (Optional)	Licensed employees may reflect on the progress of their student-focused SMART Goal as part of their mid-year conference with an evaluator.	<p>Some evaluators may request that licensed employees (entire staff, groups, or individuals) complete a goal reflection depending on differentiated needs (i.e., new staff, induction candidates, probationary staff, etc.).</p> <p>This is often completed outside of the digital evaluation system, however, evaluators may request that reflections be uploaded as evidence in the digital evaluation system.</p>
Continue progress toward completing SLOs/SOOs	Licensed employees will continue to instruct and collect data aligned to their SLO or SOO, if applicable.	Some evaluators may request that licensed employees finalize their SLO/SOO submissions within the mid-year window.
Mid-Year Evaluation Connection	It is recommended that all licensed employees engage in a mid-year connection with their evaluator in order to understand their progress and to make any necessary adjustments to their practice and improve student outcomes.	<p>The formality and timing of these connections is up to the evaluator. Connections can be differentiated according to the individual needs of licensed employees.</p> <p>The mid-year connection may include a Summative Snapshot. This is an opportunity for an evaluator to share a progress report within the digital</p>

		evaluation system and support opportunities for professional growth.
Licensed Evaluation Second Look Process	<p>In order to further establish inter-rater reliability and integrity in the evaluations of licensed staff before a teacher receives a summative evaluation rating, the Second Look process shall be available to all teachers (probationary or non-probationary).</p> <p>For those who desire to participate, this process will provide additional feedback on a teacher's evidence and performance. It will also provide clarity and understanding of particular CITE elements and supporting evidence.</p>	<p>A teacher or the teacher's evaluator may request the Second Look process. In order to conduct a Second Look, there must be recorded and rated information from observation and other artifacts available in the DCSD Digital Evaluation System. The deadline for this request is February 7th.</p>

DRAFT

End of the Year

Task	Description	Additional Information
End of the Year Self-Evaluation (Required)	At the end of the school year, all licensed employees will complete a self evaluation.	This is the only required self-evaluation.
Reflection on Goal Progress and Mark Goal Complete (Recommended)	It is recommended that licensed employees reflect on the progress of their student-focused SMART Goal in the DCSD digital evaluation system and mark the goal complete for the school year.	<p>Some evaluators may request that licensed employees (entire staff, groups, or individuals) complete a goal reflection depending on differentiated needs (i.e., new staff, induction candidates, probationary staff, etc.).</p> <p>The end of the year goal reflection can be completed in the digital evaluation system.</p> <p>Goals will not roll over to the following year and will need to be reset with each new evaluation year.</p>
Submit SLO/SOO for Approval	All required licensed employees must submit their SLO/SOO for approval by their evaluator.	While the evaluator does not have access to edit or adjust any licensed employee's SLO/SOO, it can be returned with a request for adjustment by the licensed employee. Evaluators may request specific adjustments and may supervise the requested changes depending on the circumstances.
Summative Evaluation Connection	Licensed employees may participate in a summative evaluation connection at the request of their evaluator.	The formality and timing of these connections is up to the evaluator. Connections can be differentiated according to the individual needs of licensed employees.
Acknowledgement of Receipt of the Summative Evaluation	Licensed employees have the opportunity to review their summative evaluation and	The acknowledgement window is typically opened within 4 days after the summative

	<p>acknowledge receipt of the summative evaluation. At this time, licensed employees can provide a comment or a response to the evaluation (agreement or disagreement).</p>	<p>deadline for evaluators and is left open for 10 calendar days.</p>
<p>Performance Evaluation Ratings Appeal Process</p>	<p>A non-probationary teacher or SSP may appeal a rating of 1 or 2 on their summative overall (CITE 1-6) performance evaluation rating using the Performance Evaluation Rating Appeals Process.</p> <p>This process may only be used if a non-probationary teacher or SSP is in danger of losing their non-probationary status as a result of two (2) consecutive ineffective ratings (i.e., a 1 or 2 summative rating).</p>	<p>A non-probationary teacher or SSP who objects to a second consecutive ineffective or partially effective rating may file a written appeal to his or her evaluator within five (5) calendar days after receiving his or her summative performance evaluation rating.</p>

DRAFT

Section Four: Goal Setting

All licensed employees are responsible for setting and tracking a SMART goal at the beginning of each evaluation cycle. SMART goals are:

- Specific and Strategic
- Measurable
- Attainable and Actionable
- Realistic and Results Oriented
- Time Bound

Examples:

- By May 2024, 80% of third graders will meet grade level expectations for written expression in argument and opinion as measured by the third grade writing rubric for argument and opinion writing.
- By May 2024, 85% of biology students will pass the year end biology final with a 'C' or higher as measured by the end of second semester biology final.
- By the end of the school year, 80% of kindergarteners will demonstrate proficiency with nonsense syllables as measured by the iReady early literacy tasks.

The purpose of evaluation is to improve outcomes for students and goal setting plays an important role in the improvement of student outcomes. The vast majority of goals set by licensed employees should be student learning-focused and include teacher-focused action steps. In professional learning communities, individual licensed employee goals are aligned with the district, building, and team/department's goals.

Alignment of SMART Goals

District Continuous Improvement Plan Goal 10,000 Foot View

All students will be proficient in ___ by the end of the 20__/20__ school year.

School Continuous Improvement Plan (BLT Plan/UIP) Goal 100 Foot View

Last year, ___% of students achieved proficiency in ____. This year, ___% of students will achieve proficiency in ____, and all grades will improve upon last year's performance.

Grade Level/Department End-of-Year Team Goal (MSL/Os) 50 Foot View

Last year, ___% of our students were proficient in ___ according to the state (or third party) assessment. This year, ___% of our students will achieve proficiency in ___ on the state (or third party) assessment.

Grade Level/Department Team Translates the Team Goal into Short-Term Goals for Each Unit (MSL/Os) 10 Foot View

Last year, ___% of our students were able to demonstrate proficiency in **[fill in Priority Learning Outcome (PLO)]** at the end of this unit. This year, at least ___% of students will demonstrate proficiency in **[fill in PLO]** by the end of the unit.

Classroom Goal 1 Foot View

We will use results from our formative assessments and our systematic intervention process to provide additional time and support for any student who experiences difficulty in demonstrating proficiency.

Student Learning-Focused Goals

A student learning-focused goal is aimed at improving student learning by focusing on measurable outcomes (See - SMART goal samples above). The action steps aligned with student learning-focused goals provide the inputs, activities and actions that licensed employees will engage in to support student learning.

Action steps *may* include:

- Designing units of learning
- Collaborating with colleagues (to plan, to grade, to promote data-driven decision making, etc.)
- Collecting, curating, and/or writing assessments
- Designing rubrics
- Setting success criteria (designing rubrics with colleagues, examining examples of success with students, etc.)
- Conferencing with students
- Researching

Connection to Measures of Student Learning/Outcomes (MSL/Os) and CITE 6

It is recommended that when considering SMART goals for the school year that the licensed employee also consider the goal's connection to MSL/Os and CITE 6. Licensed employees should receive direction and support from their building/department leadership team or evaluator as they select Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) or Student Outcome Objectives (SOOs [used by SSPs]). Student Learning Objectives and SOOs are more powerful when they are connected to the licensed employee's overall goal for the school year.

Example:

- If a kindergarten teacher's end of year goal for students is tied to nonsense syllables, the kindergarten teacher will use multiple formative assessments that inform them of students' progress toward that larger goal as part of their SLO (i.e., letter naming fluency, letter sound fluency, etc.).
- If a science teacher's end of year goal for students is proficiency with writing a lab report, the teacher will use multiple formative assessments that inform them of students' progress and mastery toward that larger goal as part of their SLO (i.e., designing an experiment, knowledge of important terms, collection of data, analysis of data, summarizing results, and etc.).

For more information about the CITE 6 SLO/SOO expectations see - Section Six: Measures of Student Learning/Outcomes (CITE 6).

Reflection and Completion

All licensed employees have the opportunity to reflect on their goal cycle in the DCSD digital evaluation system at the end of the school year. This can happen with the close of the evaluation cycle or with the close of the school year and is dependent on the recommendation of the building leadership team or evaluator.

Section Five: The Highly Effective Pathway

In accordance with [Colorado Senate Bill 22-070](#) (C.R.S. 22-9-104(1.5)(a)), DCSD has identified a Highly Effective Pathway which honors the exemplary practice for all licensed employees who have received three consecutive summative ratings of Highly Effective. The pathway will streamline the evaluation process for licensed employees designated for the Highly Effective Pathway and is an opportunity for licensed employees to collaborate with their evaluator to differentiate and personalize the evaluation process.

Highly Effective Pathway Model

Any licensed employee (teacher, SSP, AP, dean, principal) who has had three consecutive Highly Effective summative evaluations for the same role will qualify for the Highly Effective Pathway. (Refer to the Frequently Asked Questions section of [THIS](#) document for additional clarification.) Consecutive evaluations are counted beginning with the 2020-2021 school year. Licensed employees who have received three consecutive summative ratings of Highly Effective (for the same role) will be identified in Workday and the DCSD Digital Evaluation System. Probationary staff do not qualify for the Highly Effective Pathway. All licensed employees are encouraged to verify their designation to ensure that it is accurate. If there are questions or issues with the designation, please contact Deanne Kirby (dmkirby@dcsdk12.org) for support.

How does the Highly Effective Pathway work?

- 1) The Highly Effective Pathway will be available via a controlled evaluator access window within the DCSD Digital Evaluation System. Licensed employees who are identified for the Highly Effective Pathway must confirm participation by the last day of the first month of school. This confirmation allows the Educator Effectiveness department to ensure accurate eligibility records and evaluator access to the Highly Effective Pathway task in the evaluation system.
- 2) Based on the previous year's summative evaluation, the licensed employee and their evaluator will collaborate to select approximately 50% of the elements from their assigned rubric in the DCSD Digital Evaluation System. In cases where rubrics have an odd number of elements, the number of elements may be slightly less than 50%. These selected elements will be defaulted to a '4' on the employee's Summative Evaluation. The unselected elements will constitute the Highly Effective licensed employee's evaluation and will be rated as part of the Highly Effective Pathway summative evaluation.
- 3) Selection of the elements for the Highly Effective Pathway will align with the closure of the yearly goal setting window in the DCSD Digital Evaluation System (typically the end of September for teachers/SSPs and the end of October for principals, assistant principals and deans). Once that window closes, it will only be accessible upon request by the licensed employee's evaluator.
- 4) At least one element from each standard must be left unselected and will be rated as part of the employee's summative evaluation.
- 5) Any elements rated as '4' from the previous school year should be considered for the Highly

Effective Pathway element selection.


- 6) Once selected and saved by the evaluator, the licensed employee's summative evaluation page will display the selections with a symbol.
- 7) Elements not designated for the Highly Effective Pathway on the summative evaluation page will be evaluated and rated for that evaluation cycle.
- 8) The evaluator and the Highly Effective Pathway eligible employee will collaborate throughout the school year to support a fair, reliable and valid evaluation based on a body of evidence aligned with the selected elements.
- 9) Only those elements **not selected** as part of the Highly Effective Pathway will be available to rate on the Summative Evaluation page. **NOTE:** All elements will be included in the calculation of the summative rating for the CITE standards 1-5.
- 10) Any element can be selected and rated as part of the observation and evidence collection process.

DRAFT

Section Six: Measures of Student Learning/Outcomes (CITE 6)

Most licensed employees are responsible for Measures of Student Learning/Outcomes (MSL/Os), referred to as CITE 6 in DCSD, as part of their summative evaluation. Whether or not a licensed employee completes MSL/Os is dependent on their role and job code (See [Which Rubric Do I Pick?](#) for more information).

Beginning the 2023-2024 school year, MSL/Os will account for thirty percent (30%) of a licensed employee's evaluation. This change was set forth in statute with the introduction of Senate Bill 22-070.



It is important to note that different educator/licensed employee roles have different requirements:

- Teachers and those with related teacher roles (i.e., ELD teachers, mild/moderate SPED, center-based SPED, some interventionists, etc.) are required to have:
 - At least one (1) individual measure of student learning (equaling 24% of the total MSL).
 - At least one (1) collective measure of student learning based on the School Performance Framework and/or the Colorado Growth Model, when available (equaling 6% of the total MSL).
- Specialized Services Providers (i.e., Audiologist, School Counselor, School Nurse, School Psychologist, Social Worker, Occupational Therapist, Speech Language Pathologist, School Orientation and Mobility Specialists) are required to have:
 - At least two (2) individual measures appropriate to the roles and responsibilities of the licensed person.
- Principals and assistant principals must include at least two (2) measures, to include one collective measure (Deans are exempt from MSLs):
 - Data from the school performance framework (SPF)
 - Data from the MSLs used for the evaluation of teachers in each principal's school

Measures of Student Learning/Outcomes for teacher roles and SSP roles are captured as Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) or as Student Outcome Objectives (SOOs).

Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)

- The SLO is used by teachers and those in related teacher roles (i.e., ELD teachers, mild/moderate SPED, center-based SPED, some interventionists, etc.)
- SLOs are designed to allow licensed employees in teacher roles to progress monitor their impact on student learning using multiple measures based on the Colorado Academic Standards and/or the DCSD Priority Learning Outcomes.
 - **Short Cycle SLOs** - based on formative assessment practices; typically encompasses a 3 to 6 week span of time.
 - **Longer Cycle SLOs** - based on summative assessment practices; may encompass a unit, a quarter, a semester or a year of learning.
- MSLs (CITE 6) MUST include at least one SLO to capture student learning for the individual attribute.
 - Teachers and those in related teacher roles *may* provide several SLOs to demonstrate student learning and *should* provide one for each subject area taught:
 - Elementary classroom teachers *should* provide one SLO for math and one for reading
 - A high school teacher who teaches a math class and a science class *should* provide a SLO for each class
- The SLO *may* be used by SSPs to demonstrate student learning.
- Student Learning Objectives are directly related to Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Common formative assessments (CFAs), which provide the context for collaborative teamwork, can and should directly support MSLs and SLOs.

Student Outcome Objectives (SOOs)

- The SOO is used by SSPs and *may* be used by specific teacher roles (i.e., teacher librarians).
 - The specific teacher roles authorized to use the SOO are determined at the District level.
- SOOs are designed to allow SSPs to collect data points which directly measure licensed employee impact on students.
- Data points in SOOs are often tied to non-academic skills that support student learning such as use of self-monitoring strategies, use of appropriate core or hand strength, use of intelligible speech/language skills, growth toward IEP goals, school-wide program improvement, etc.
- SSPs *must* include at least two (2) measures of student outcomes and are *not* required to have a collective measure.
 - SSPs who select the Wilcox SSP model will be required to submit two (2) MSOs.
 - SSPs who select their predominant school model will be required to submit one (1) MSO and will use the school's collective attribute based on data from the school performance framework and the Colorado Growth Model, when available.

Section Seven: The Role of Observation Evidence and Artifacts in Licensed Evaluation

Evaluation in DCSD is designed to be a collaborative process with both evaluator and evaluatee taking collective responsibility for the collection or demonstration of evidence that shows proficiency towards the CITE 1-5 standards and professional practices. “Evidence towards proficiency may be collected through ongoing observation, measures required through SB. 10-191 and other optional additional measures.”

Observations	DESCRIPTION: According to SB 10-191, “The frequency and duration of the evaluations shall be on a regular basis and of such frequency and duration as to ensure the collection of a sufficient amount of data from which reliable conclusions and findings may be drawn. ” Principals should determine the schedule, format, frequency, and duration of observations needed to gather sufficient data in the most effective manner for their school.	
What is Required?	Probationary	Non-Probationary
	At least two documented observations and at least one evaluation that results in a written summative evaluation report each year.	At least one documented observation every year and one evaluation that results in a written summative evaluation report each year.
Observation data is stored in the DCSD Digital Evaluation System. This allows the licensed employee to view the evidence as well as an opportunity for the licensed employee and evaluator to collaborate.		

Types of Observation

There are several ways for evaluators to collect observation data to support the growth of licensed employees and contribute to their summative evaluations. The two main types are formal and informal observations.

A **formal observation** may consist of a pre-conference, observation, and post-conference. Evaluators determine the process and timelines for the formal observation cycle at their school. Formal observation cycles are often planned and scheduled, however some evaluators may offer opportunities for modified versions of the formal cycle (i.e., elimination of the pre-conference, identifying a week in which the formal observation will occur rather than planning for a single day/time, etc.). An evaluator will often stay in a learning environment for an entire lesson or class person when conducting a formal observation. Most pre- and post-observation meetings are guided by inquiry questions to support conversations and provide context for the formal observation.

Informal observations are not typically planned/scheduled and are sometimes called drop ins or walkthroughs. Informal observation evidence is collected from shorter time periods in the learning environment - typically between 10 and 20 minutes. Several shorter informal observations can be compiled to build a body of evidence and used to support summative evaluations in lieu of *or* in coordination with a formal observation cycle.

Evaluators may also collect observational evidence from other settings such as staff meetings, professional development, collaborative team meetings, school wide events and activities, or committee and leadership teamwork.

As per Senate Bill 10-191, observations must be documented. The system we use for documentation in DCSD is the DCSD Digital Evaluation System. Evidence of formal and informal observations are uploaded and rated against the evaluation rubric appropriate for each licensed employee's job responsibilities. Any uploaded evidence should directly support what is included in the licensed employee's summative evaluation.

Evidence and Artifacts

Evidence is an observational and/or anecdotal description or measure of licensed employee practice that illustrates a licensed employee's proficiency towards standards and elements of professional practice. Evidence may include artifacts such as documents, photographs, rubrics, lesson plans, assessment plans, student data, peer observation feedback, student surveys, parent/guardian feedback, etc. that may be uploaded into the DCSD Digital Evaluation System to further illustrate how a licensed employee is meeting each of the standards and/or elements of professional practice.

There are no requirements for licensed employees to upload additional evidence. Individual school principals or evaluators may ask licensed employees to provide evidence if they feel additional information is needed to accurately determine levels of proficiency. Licensed employees have the opportunity to upload evidence that they would like the evaluator to consider as part of a body of evidence when determining proficiency toward standards and elements of professional practice, especially when there is a lack of agreement between evaluator and the licensed employee.

Section Eight: The Summative Snapshot

The Summative Snapshot is an optional tool that evaluators may use throughout the year, and especially at mid-year, to provide licensed employees with feedback about their performance. The snapshot is based on the summative evaluation and is primarily designed to support mid-year growth and improvement oriented conversations with licensed employees. Evaluators have the opportunity to rate some or all of the elements.


Even though DCSD does not currently require mid-year evaluations for licensed employees, it is best practice to:

- Connect,
- Share progress,
- Discuss goals, and
- Consider areas of growth at mid-year

DRAFT

Section Nine: Calculation of a Summative Score

Summative scores, also called Final Effectiveness Ratings, are calculated based on a 4-point scale. Beginning the 23-24 school year, professional practices captured in CITE 1-5 will account for seventy percent (70%) and MSL/Os will account for thirty percent (30%) of a licensed employee's summative evaluation.



CITE 1-5 and CITE 6 Scoring Outcome Combinations for Final Effectiveness Ratings

		CITE 1-5 Score (70%)			
		4	3	2	1
CITE 6 Score (30%)	4	CITE 1-5 = 4 CITE 6 = 4	CITE 1-5 = 3 CITE 6 = 4	CITE 1-5 = 2 CITE 6 = 4	CITE 1-5 = 1 CITE 6 = 4
	3	CITE 1-5 = 4 CITE 6 = 3	CITE 1-5 = 3 CITE 6 = 3	CITE 1-5 = 2 CITE 6 = 3	CITE 1-5 = 1 CITE 6 = 3
	2	CITE 1-5 = 4 CITE 6 = 2	CITE 1-5 = 3 CITE 6 = 2	CITE 1-5 = 2 CITE 6 = 2	CITE 1-5 = 1 CITE 6 = 2
	1	CITE 1-5 = 4 CITE 6 = 1	CITE 1-5 = 3 CITE 6 = 1	CITE 1-5 = 2 CITE 6 = 1	CITE 1-5 = 1 CITE 6 = 1

See Appendix B for a more detailed matrix of scores based on the 70:30 summative model.

Section Ten: The Professional Growth Planning Process

All licensed employees are required to have a professional growth plan - this is satisfied with the annual goal setting process for all licensed employees within the DCSD Digital Evaluation System. There are times when the annual goal setting process is not sufficient to support the amount of growth a licensed employee needs to make to demonstrate effectiveness against the standards and elements of professional practice.

In instances where additional growth is necessary, evaluators will use a more intensive Professional Growth Plan, sometimes called a Performance Improvement Plan, or PIP. The purpose of a formalized growth plan is to provide more intensive and targeted support to impact student outcomes. A growth plan generally follows a template (see the appendix for the Educator Effectiveness supported Professional Growth Plan template) to ensure that expectations are explicit and understood by all professionals involved in the plan. Plans are meant to be collaborative and can last from a quarter to a full school year and are designed to produce growth and be discontinued when goals are achieved.

Professional Growth Plans are formal plans and as such will be uploaded in the DCSD Digital Evaluation System and shared with appropriate DCSD personnel (i.e., Executive Directors of Schools, department directors, and/or Human Resources).

If a licensed employee receives below effective ratings on the professional practices portion of the summative evaluation, the evaluator will be prompted to provide at least one goal aligned with an area of below effective practice prior to finalizing the summative evaluation. This goal will roll into the following year and can be edited, if necessary.

Section Eleven: The Second Look Process

A licensed employee or the licensed employee's evaluator may request additional input into the rating of CITE Standards 1-5 prior to the summative evaluation rating, referred to as a Second Look. The purpose of the Second Look is to provide an opportunity to establish inter-rater reliability and integrity in the evaluations of licensed employees before summative evaluations are finalized. This process occurs at mid-year and must be requested before February 7th in order to ensure that reviews may be completed in a timely manner and inform the summative evaluation outcome. (See the appendix for the full Second Look Process).

This opportunity is available for any licensed employee, probationary or non-probationary, and will be based on any information available in the DCSD Digital Evaluation System for the current school year. For those who desire to participate, this process will provide additional feedback on a licensed employee's evidence and performance. It will also provide clarity and understanding of particular Continuous Improvement of Teacher Effectiveness (CITE) elements and supporting evidence.

Note: If there is no evidence available in the DCSD Digital Evaluation System at the time of the Second Look request, it will be denied. The Second Look Process is a review of evidence only.

Section Twelve: Performance Evaluation Ratings Appeal Process

A non-probationary teacher or SSP may appeal a rating of 1 or 2 on their summative overall (CITE 1-6) performance evaluation rating using the Performance Evaluation Rating Appeals Process. This process may only be used if a non-probationary teacher or SSP is in danger of losing his or her non-probationary status as a result of two (2) consecutive ineffective ratings (i.e., a 1 or 2 summative rating).

A non-probationary teacher or SSP who objects to an ineffective or partially effective rating may file a written appeal to his or her evaluator within five (5) calendar days after receiving his or her summative performance evaluation rating. See Appendix C for full details of the Performance Rating Appeal Process

The grounds for an appeal will be limited to the following:

- The evaluator did not follow evaluation procedures that adhere to the requirements of state statute or District policy and that failure had a material impact of the final performance evaluation rating (e.g., an observation was never completed) and/or
- The data relied upon was inaccurately attributed to the teacher or SSP (e.g., data included in the evaluation was from students for whom the teacher or SSP was not responsible).

There are no other processes besides the Second Look Process and the Performance Rating Appeal Process by which licensed employees may grieve their evaluation rating.

Section Thirteen: Probationary Status, Non-Probationary Status and Induction

According to SB 10-191, teachers who are new to the teaching profession, new to the state of Colorado, or new to a Colorado school district shall be probationary for a minimum of 3 years. Additionally, teachers with probationary status are subject to non-renewal as per Colorado School Law (§ 22-63-203 (4)(a), C.R.S.). This does not apply to principals, assistant principals and deans. In DCSD SSPs are eligible to earn non-probationary status.

A probationary licensed teacher or SSP must receive three (3) years of consecutive effective summative evaluations (see Calculation of a Summative Score section) to earn non-probationary status. A licensed teacher or SSP must teach for at least 120 days prior to the end of a school year in order for the year to count toward the three years. Board approved leaves do not count against the 120 days of teaching. There can be no breaks in service/employment while earning non-probationary status; leaves of absence are exceptions and are handled case by case - contact the Director of Educator Effectiveness to discuss leaves of absence and implications for evaluation. If a probationary licensed teacher or SSP does not teach 120 days or more during the school year (leaves of absence notwithstanding), they will begin the following school year at probationary year one status.

If a probationary licensed teacher or SSP does not receive an effective, or higher, summative evaluation in year one, two or three of their probationary status, they shall be moved back to probationary year one status and will need to demonstrate three consecutive years of effective summative evaluations to move to non-probationary status (see examples below).

According to the Colorado Revised Statutes (§ 22-63-203 (I)) licensed employees who are part of an Alternative Licensure Program (DCSD's or otherwise) are eligible to earn years toward probationary status.

Examples of Probationary Status and Pathways to Non-Probationary Status

Example 1	Example 2	Example 3
Year 1 = partially effective (P1) Year 2 = effective (P1) Year 3 = effective (P2) Year 4 = effective (P3) Year 5 = Non-probationary status granted (NP)	Year 1 = effective (P1) Year 2 = partially effective (P2) Year 3 = effective (P1) Year 4 = effective (P2) Year 5 = effective (P3) Year 6 = Non-probationary status granted (NP)	Year 1 = effective (P1) Year 2 = effective (P2) Year 3 = effective (P3) Year 4 = Non-probationary status granted (NP)

Portability of Non-Probationary Status

A current, non-probationary Colorado licensed teacher or SSP who moves from one Colorado school district to another may port their status. This means that with sufficient evidence of consecutive

effective evaluations and effective measures of student learning data, a receiving district may grant *portability of non-probationary status* to a licensed teacher or SSP. Districts have varying procedures and policies for this process.

Due to the variability of evaluation systems at charter schools, licensed teachers and SSPs who come to DCSD from a Colorado or DCSD charter school will start at probationary year one status.

Maintaining Non-Probationary Status

Non-probationary status is maintained with consecutive effective, or higher, summative evaluations (see Calculation of a Summative Score section). If a non-probationary licensed teacher or SSP experiences a break in service, not explained by a board approved leave of absence, and returns to DCSD, they will begin as a probationary year one licensed teacher or SSP.

If a non-probationary licensed teacher or SSP receives 2 years of consecutive summative evaluation ratings of partially effective or lower (see Calculation of a Summative Score section), the licensed teacher or SSP will move to probationary year one for the following school year. To earn non-probationary status, the licensed teacher or SSP will need to demonstrate 3 years of consecutive summative evaluations of effective or higher. Licensed teachers and SSPs in danger of losing non-probationary status have the opportunity to file an appeal with the office of Educator Effectiveness (See Appendix D for details of the Performance Evaluation Ratings Appeal Process).

Viewing Status

Probationary and non-probationary status can be viewed in two places:

- **Workday:** A licensed employee and those with approved Workday access can view status on the 'Job' page under 'Additional Data.'
- **DCSD's Digital Evaluation System:** Licensed employees can view status at the top of the landing page.

It is recommended that all licensed teachers and SSPs double-check their status each year and elevate any queries about the accuracy of their status to the Director of Educator Effectiveness.

Induction

Induction is the process by which all licensed employees earn a professional educator's (including SSPs and principals) license with the Colorado Department of Education. Licensed employees who receive a three year initial license from the Colorado Department of Education are required to participate in a state approved induction program within those three initial years in order to qualify for a professional license. Induction is unrelated to earning or losing non-probationary status.

Section Fourteen: Leaves of Absence

In cases of DCSD Board of Education approved licensed employee leave, it is important to put measures in place to protect both the employee and the employer. It is also important to understand the impact summative evaluation ratings may have on a licensed employee's status and portability.

In all cases where a licensed employee is taking an approved leave of absence, evaluators should collaborate with the licensed employee to ensure that sufficient evaluation data have been collected to complete the CITE 1-5 summative rating - especially if the leave of absence is at or near the end of the school year.

- If a licensed employee is present during any formal part of the evaluation process—regardless of when they began or ended leave—every effort should be made by both parties to complete all steps in the evaluation process. The only time that the evaluation should not proceed as usual is when an evaluator does not feel that they have sufficient evidence to support the assignment of end of year ratings. In those instances, evaluators shall collaborate with the Director of Educator Effectiveness to ensure a fair evaluation for licensed employees on leave.

Licensed employees planning for a leave of absence should make every effort to collaborate with their evaluator and have a plan in place for the completion of measures of student learning (CITE 6) - especially if the leave of absence is at or near the end of the school year.

- State statute describes minimum expectations for the number of MSLs that any licensed employee must have as part of their final evaluation rating. Each licensed teacher must have a minimum of one collective measure and one individual measure and SSPs must have a minimum of 2 individual measures.
- If there is not sufficient data or evidence to attribute student data to a licensed employee on leave, a score will not be assigned to the measure of student learning for this licensed employee. This will result in a report of a 'no score' for the overall effectiveness rating.

Licensed employees on leave have certain rights and obligations that protect them from leave negatively reflecting on performance. In no circumstances can leave be considered as part of a licensed employee's evaluation. Additionally, written evaluations shall not make mention of a leave of absence in a manner which negatively reflects on performance as a result of the leave or does not protect confidentiality. (e.g., 'If your year had not been interrupted by a leave of absence, you would have reached your student achievement goal.' or 'Your leave of absence negatively impacted your ability to attain effective ratings on the following elements...') Instead, comments and ratings should be focused on the time the licensed employees were present in their position and not make any mention of a leave of absence.

Common Leave of Absence Scenarios:

Leave of Absence Timeline	CITE 1-5 Expectations	CITE 6 Expectations
Licensed Employee on an extended (long term) leave. (i.e., August through March or April)	Depending on the return date for the licensed employee, sufficient opportunities to collect evaluation data may be limited. It is recommended that the evaluator collaborate with the Director of Educator Effectiveness to determine the best plan. If it is determined that the licensed employee is 'excused' from evaluation due the timing and/or length of the leave, the licensed employee will receive a 'no score.'	As with CITE 1-5, sufficient opportunities to collect student data for the CITE 6 individual measure may be limited. It is recommended that the evaluator collaborate with the Director of Educator Effectiveness to determine the best plan. If it is determined that the licensed employee is 'excused' from evaluation due the timing and/or length of the leave, the licensed employee will receive a 'no score.'
Licensed Employee on partial (short term) leave (i.e., August through December; October through February) but returns prior to spring break.	A summative rating for CITE 1-5 is required.	A completed CITE 6 individual measure is required.
Licensed Employee on leave at the end of the year (i.e., March through April; March through May).	A summative rating for CITE 1-5 is required.	<p>A completed CITE 6 individual measure may or may not be required.</p> <p>This will be handled on a case-by-case decision. It is recommended that the evaluator collaborate with the Director of Educator Effectiveness to determine the best plan. However, wherever possible, a licensed employee should make every effort to provide a completed individual measure for CITE 6 - including collaborating with an evaluator to use an alternate assessment.</p> <p>If it is determined that the licensed employee is 'excused' from evaluation due to the timing and/or length of the leave, the licensed employee will receive a 'no score.'</p>

*In any instance that data for MSLs are not reported, an overall effectiveness rating cannot be generated.

Appendix A

Resources

- [DCSD's Educator Effectiveness Website](#)
 - Refer to this website for all of the updated information for each school year.
- [Which Rubric Do I Pick?](#)
 - Refer to this document to ensure accurate rubric selections and to determine which roles are responsible for MSL/Os (CITE 6)
- [DCSD Evaluation Cut Scores by Rubric](#)
- [DCSD's Coaching and Reflection Guide based on the CITE Generalist Rubric](#) - Website
- [DCSD's Coaching and Reflection Guide based on the CITE Generalist Rubric](#) - Doc
- [English Language Development Look Fors - Based on the Educator Rubric](#)
- [CITE Generalist Rubric Aligned with NCTM's Effective Math Practices: Teacher/Student Recommendations](#)
- [DCSD Student Performance Website](#)
- [CIA Key Assessment Resources](#)
 - Refer to this document to explore resources to support staff through the lens of Standard 4: Assessment of the CITE Generalist and Educator Rubrics.

Appendix B

CITE 1-5 and CITE 6 Scoring Outcome Combinations for Final Effectiveness Ratings (70% - 30%)

		CITE 1-5 Score			
		4	3	2	1
CITE 6 Score	4	CITE 1-5 = 4 CITE 6 = 4 2.8 + 1.2 = 4 → 4	CITE 1-5 = 3 CITE 6 = 4 2.1 + 1.2 = 3.3 → 3	CITE 1-5 = 2 CITE 6 = 4 1.4 + 1.2 = 2.6 → 3	CITE 1-5 = 1 CITE 6 = 4 0.7 + 1.2 = 1.9 → 2
	3	CITE 1-5 = 4 CITE 6 = 3 2.8 + 0.9 = 3.7 → 4	CITE 1-5 = 3 CITE 6 = 3 2.1 + 0.9 = 3 → 3	CITE 1-5 = 2 CITE 6 = 3 1.4 + 0.9 = 2.3 → 2	CITE 1-5 = 1 CITE 6 = 3 0.7 + 0.9 = 1.6 → 2
	2	CITE 1-5 = 4 CITE 6 = 2 2.8 + 0.6 = 3.4 → 3	CITE 1-5 = 3 CITE 6 = 2 2.1 + 0.6 = 2.7 → 3	CITE 1-5 = 2 CITE 6 = 2 1.4 + 0.6 = 2 → 2	CITE 1-5 = 1 CITE 6 = 2 0.7 + 0.6 = 1.3 → 1
	1	CITE 1-5 = 4 CITE 6 = 1 2.8 + 0.3 = 3.1 → 3	CITE 1-5 = 3 CITE 6 = 1 2.1 + 0.3 = 2.4 → 2	CITE 1-5 = 2 CITE 6 = 1 1.4 + 0.3 = 1.7 → 2	CITE 1-5 = 1 CITE 6 = 1 0.7 + 0.3 = 1 → 1

Base Math*		
	70% CITE 1-5	30% CITE 6 (MSLs)
4	2.8	1.2
3	2.1	0.9
2	1.4	0.6
1	0.7	0.3

***How to use this table:** For each potential score (1-4), a point value has been determined based on the 70/30 split. For example if a licensed employee has a score of 4 on CITE 1-5, 70% of that 4 will equal 2.8. If they scored a 3 on CITE 6, 30% of that score will equal 0.9. When added together 2.8 and 0.9 will equal 3.7, which rounds up to a 4.

Appendix C

Performance Evaluation Rating Appeals Process

1. A non-probationary Teacher may appeal a rating of 1 or 2 on their summative overall (CITE 1-6) performance evaluation rating using the Performance Evaluation Rating Appeals Process.
 - a. The Performance Evaluation Rating Appeals Process may only be used if a non-probationary Teacher is in danger of losing his or her non-probationary status as a result of two (2) consecutive ineffective ratings (i.e., a 1 or 2 summative rating).
 - b. Any Teacher (probationary or non-probationary), may take advantage of the Second Look Process in the event that he or she disagrees with written evaluation feedback from an Evaluator prior to the summative evaluation rating. This opportunity is offered at mid-year.
2. A non-probationary Teacher who objects to an ineffective or partially effective rating may file a written appeal to his or her Evaluator within five (5) calendar days after receiving his or her summative performance evaluation rating.
 - a. All grounds for the appeal must be included in the written document.
 - b. Any grounds not raised at the time the written appeal is filed shall be deemed waived.
 - c. All appeals must use the Licensed Evaluation Appeal forms.
 - i. [Performance Evaluation Appeal Form for Certified Staff](#)
 - ii. [Performance Evaluation Appeal Evaluator/Principal Decision Form](#)
 - iii. [Performance Evaluation Appeal Review Panel Decision Form](#)
3. The grounds for an appeal will be limited to the following:
 - a. The Evaluator did not follow evaluation procedures that adhere to the requirements of state statute or District policy and that failure had a material impact of the final performance evaluation rating (e.g., an observation was never completed) and/or
 - b. The data relied upon was inaccurately attributed to the Teacher (e.g., data included in the evaluation was from students for whom the Teacher was not responsible).
4. The burden of proof shall be on the Teacher to demonstrate that a rating of 3 or 4 was appropriate.
5. The Evaluator will review the Teacher's evidence and determine if it warrants a decision to uphold or modify the evaluation rating. The Evaluator will communicate his or her decision in writing within five (5) business days after receiving an appeal.
6. If a Teacher is not satisfied with the Evaluator's decision, he or she may file a second- level appeal within five (5) business days after receiving the Evaluator's decision.
7. If the Evaluator is the Teacher's Principal:

- a. The second-level appeal will be conducted by a Review Panel, composed of teachers and administrators that were not directly involved in the evaluation process for the appealing Teacher, and shall include no more than six (6) panel members total.
 - b. The Teacher will be notified in writing within seven (7) calendar days of the recommendation from the Review Panel with a copy also sent to the Superintendent. The report will contain the following items:
 - i. CITE standard elements that were revised from 1 or 2 to 3 or higher, if any; based on findings that:
 1. The Evaluator did not follow evaluation procedures that adhere to the requirements of state statute or District policy and that failure had a material impact of the final performance evaluation rating or,
 2. The data relied upon was inaccurately attributed to the Teacher
 - ii. An updated Teacher Evaluation report and Overall Professional Practice rating reflecting the revision, if any; or
 - iii. An indication that no revision is warranted after the review of the presented evidence with an explanation of the decision.
 - c. In order to overturn a summative rating of 1 or 2, the Review Panel must unanimously find that the rating was inaccurate.
8. If the Evaluator is someone other than the Teacher's Principal, the second-level appeal will be conducted by the Teacher's Principal. The Principal will communicate his or her decision in writing within five (5) business days after receiving an appeal. If the Teacher is not satisfied with the Principal's decision, he or she may file a final appeal to the Review Panel within five (5) business days after receiving the Principal's decision.
 - a. The Review Panel will follow the same process outlined above (see number 7).
 9. The appealing Teacher will be given the opportunity to address and provide evidence to the Review Panel in writing or in person. The Review Panel may invite the Teacher or the Teacher's Evaluator to present in writing or in person where clarification is necessary.
 10. Any documents and/or proceedings related to the appeals process shall be confidential. The appeals process shall not be conducted in a public forum.
 11. The Superintendent will make the final decision on the appeal based on input from the Review Panel. The appeals process will conclude no more than forty-five (45) calendar days after the Teacher receives his or her final rating for the completed school year. The time requirements described herein may be waived, by mutual agreement of both the Teacher and the District.
 12. This appeals process will remain effective unless and until legal requirements change and/or sound basis exists to modify it. In any case, this process is intended to comply with C.R.S. 22-9-105.5 and CDE guidance.

Appendix D

Second Look Process

In order to further establish inter-rater reliability and integrity in the evaluations of licensed staff before a teacher receives a summative evaluation rating, the following process shall be available to all teachers (probationary or non-probationary).

For those who desire to participate, this process will provide additional feedback on a teacher's evidence and performance. It will also provide clarity and understanding of particular Continuous Improvement of Teacher Effectiveness (CITE) elements and supporting evidence.

SITE-BASED INTERNAL REVIEW

A teacher or the teacher's evaluator may request additional input ("Second Look") into the rating of CITE Standards 1-5 prior to the teacher's evidence and/or summative evaluation rating. The deadline for this request is February 7th. Such request shall be made in writing (via email) to the Principal, the Executive Director of Schools assigned to the location, and the Director of Educator Effectiveness. After the Principal is notified about a request for a Second Look review, the teacher submits the following:

[Teacher Second Look Request Form](#)

The school administrator may also request a Second Look review for a teacher. The administrator submits the following:

[Administrator Second Look Request Form](#)

Site-Based Internal Review:

1. The site-based internal review of specific evidence will be conducted in one of two ways:
 - a. If the teacher's evaluator is the Assistant Principal, the Principal shall conduct the review.
 - i. The feedback from this review, including identification of any resources and areas for improvement, shall be provided to the teacher.
 - ii. The teacher may choose to share the feedback with his or her evaluator to be added to the summative body of evidence and considered in a final review rating.
 - iii. If the teacher chooses to share the feedback with his or her evaluator, then the feedback shall be shared in its entirety.

- iv. The site-based internal review shall be completed by February 21st.
 - v. Once the Second Look process is completed, the teacher is required to submit the following: [**Second Look Feedback and Reflection Form**](#).
 - vi. If the teacher disagrees with the internal review, he or she may request an external review (described below). The external review shall be limited to the standards reviewed during the internal review and must be requested in writing by February 28th using the following form: [**Teacher External Review Second Look Request Form**](#)
- b. If the teacher's evaluator is the Principal, the Second Look process shall move to an external review.
- i. The external review shall be undertaken by a team of either two external evaluators or two trained external reviewers chosen from a pool by the Executive Director of Schools and the Director of Educator Effectiveness.
 - ii. The External Review Team shall be "blind", meaning that the External Review Team shall not be provided with the original evaluator's or internal reviewer's ratings previously given to the teacher on the standards to be reviewed.
 - iii. The review may include a "paper" review of evidence and/or formal observation of the standards to be reviewed. The teacher may provide existing evidence to the External Review Team regarding the standards to be reviewed. With assistance from the Executive Director of Schools and the Director of Educator Effectiveness, the External Review Team shall work with the teacher to schedule the paper review and/or formal observation (if requested).
 - iv. The review of data/evidence shall use the same protocol that an evaluator would use.
 - v. If a formal observation is requested, the same protocol, including a post-observation conference with the External Review Team, the teacher and assigned evaluator, shall be held.
 - vi. The External Review Team shall prepare a report which shall be included in the teacher's body of evidence for the summative evaluation. The report shall be limited to the standards reviewed through the external review process, and shall include identification of strengths, areas needing improvement, and areas needing additional evidence. The report shall also include any recommendations for resources, coaching or professional development to assist the teacher.
 - vii. The External Review Team shall provide feedback to the teacher and shall assign ratings for the standards reviewed. The External Review Team shall meet with the teacher and the assigned evaluator to review the report results.

- viii. The report and any ratings shall be shared with the Executive Director of Schools, the Director of Educator Effectiveness and the evaluator. The external review shall be completed by March 28th.

Superintendent File: [GCN-R-1, 12-3-2015](#)

LAST UPDATED: 6/2023

DRAFT