**Washington County School District**
121 West Tabernacle Street
Saint George, Utah 84770
435-673-3553

# District Policy 1432

## Educator Evaluation

*Washington County School District - Approved 3-9-04; 5-8-07; 3-18-08; 8-12-08; Revised 10-8-13; Revised 10-14-14; Revised 6-14-16; Revised 10-14-24.*

---

### 1. Purpose:

The purpose of the formal educator evaluation system of the Washington County School District (referred to as District in this policy) is to ensure that the best possible instruction and learning are accomplished and to provide feedback to the educator in order to promote professional growth in conjunction with the educator's plan for professional development. The evaluation process is also intended to establish behaviors that contribute to student progress.

### 2. Policy

The Washington County School District Board of Education understands the importance of guaranteeing that every child has an effective educator. Research shows that educator quality affects student achievement greater than any other school-based variable. It is the policy of the Washington County School District to focus on preparing, recruiting, and retaining quality educators as primary strategies to boost academic achievement. By linking educator evaluation with academic standards for students and professional standards for educators, the District intends to transform educator evaluation into a more effective tool for improving instructional practice and raising student achievement.

### 3. Procedure for Educator Evaluation:

3.1. References/Definitions: definitions found here are in alignment with UTC 53G-11-501.

3.1.1. "Career Educators" means a licensed employee who has a reasonable expectation of continued employment under the policies of the local school board.

3.1.2. "Designee" as it pertains to a principal's designee in this specific policy, is a district or school administrator holding an active School Leadership License.

3.1.3. "Educator" means any employee required to hold a professional license issued by the Utah State Board of Education, except the superintendent or an individual who works less than three hours per day or who is hired for less than half of a school year.

3.1.4. “Effectiveness Standards”means the Utah Effective Teaching and Educational Leadership Standards and additional educator standards found in Utah Administrative Code R277-330 located at: https://www.schools.utah.gov/administrativerules/_administrative_rules_/_effective_rules/R277330EffectiveOctober2023.pdf.

3.1.5. “Formative Evaluation” means a planned, ongoing process which allows educators to engage in reflection and growth of professional skills at related to the Effectiveness Standards. It is designed and used to promote growth in a person's performance. The Administrator conducting a Formative Evaluation may review applicable and available evidence to include, but not limited to observations, evidence of professional growth related to Effectiveness Standards, stakeholder input, and evidence of student growth. This information may be used as a basis to carry forward a summative evaluation rating from the most recent summative evaluation or serve as the basis to conduct a formal Summative Evaluation.

3.1.6. “Joint Educator Evaluation Committee” has the meaning given that term by UCA 53G-11-520.

3.1.7. "Misconduct" means conduct that is designated as a cause for termination or disciplinary action, a violation of District Policy or a reason for license discipline by the State Board of Education or as a basis for action recommended by the Utah Professional Practices Advisory Commission. Misconduct also includes, but is not limited to, a violation of work rules; a violation of Board policies, State Board of Education rules, directives issued by an administrator or supervisor, or law; a violation of standards of ethical, moral, or professional conduct; or insubordination.

3.1.8. “Observation” means a process of gathering evidence of an educator’s classroom instructional skills and providing feedback to the educator based on the Effectiveness Standards. An observation may be formal or informal, announced, or unannounced, depending on the purpose and context of the observation.

3.1.9. “Probationary Educator” means an Educator employed by the District who has been advised by the District that the Educator’s performance is inadequate and is placed on a Plan of Assistance. The term may also include an Educator who is placed on “Formal Probation” for Misconduct. Educators placed on Formal Probation for Misconduct are not granted additional entitlements, rights, opportunities, or benefits as a condition of this policy.

3.1.10. “Professional Growth Plan” means a plan that serves to document annual Formative Evaluation measures through goal setting and reflection. The Professional Growth Plan documents the educator’s goals and growth related to student learning and professional skills.

3.1.11. "Provisional Educator" means an employee who is in their first 3 years of employment within the district. Specifically, a provisional employee must work for the Washington County School District on at least a half-time basis for three consecutive years to obtain career employee status. The District may extend the provisional status of an employee up to an

additional two consecutive years as specified in this policy.

3.1.12. “Summative Evaluation” means evaluations that are conducted by a supervisor, are used to make annual decisions or ratings of Educator performance and may inform decisions on salary, continued employment, personnel assignments, transfers, or dismissals.

3.1.13. "Temporary Educators" has the meaning given that term in District Policy 1100. While temporary educators will be evaluated annually, temporary Educators serve at the will of the District and may be terminated at any time at the sole discretion of the District regardless of evaluation outcome. Compliance or failure to comply with this policy will not provide an expectation of continued employment or provide additional rights for at-will or temporary Educators.

3.1.14. “Unsatisfactory performance” means a deficiency in performing work tasks which may be due to insufficient or undeveloped skills, lack of knowledge or aptitude, poor attitude, or insufficient effort; and remediated through training, study, mentoring, practice, or greater effort. A level one designation in a summative evaluation is considered unsatisfactory performance. Unsatisfactory performance does not include Misconduct.

3.1.15. “Utah Effective Teaching Standards” identified in Utah Administrative Rule R277-330.

3.2. Educator Evaluation Training and Notification

3.2.1. The District will explain the evaluation process and provide comprehensive training and implementation guidance to principals, with follow-up training to maintain their knowledge and skills at least once every three years. The assistant superintendents over secondary and elementary education will monitor and enforce compliance and intervene as necessary.

3.2.2. Principals will notify Educators of the evaluation process, provide a copy of the instrument, and conduct a group meeting to explain the purpose, procedure, and the methods used to evaluate Educators at least 15 days before an Educator's first summative evaluation. Summative evaluations may not occur prior to the orientation.

3.2.3. All Educators, to include Career Educators, shall complete a self-assessment and Professional Growth Plan using the Effectiveness Standards no later than October 1st, following an orientation from the principal.

3.3. Provisional Educator Evaluation and Mentor Assistance

3.3.1. The principal of a Provisional Educator shall assign a mentor teacher to work with the Provisional Educator. The mentor shall assist the Provisional Educator to become effective and competent in the teaching profession and school system. The mentor teacher shall not serve as an evaluator of the Provisional Educator. While the mentor teacher shall provide reasonable guidance and direction, based on observation and knowledge, it shall be the ultimate responsibility of the Provisional Educator to seek advice and assistance as necessary from the mentor teacher.

3.3.2. An Administrator will conduct observations with the Provisional Educator at least 3 times during the year. The Provisional Educator will receive written or verbal feedback after each observation. Administrative or non-administrative designees, including peers, teacher leaders,

mentors, instructional coaches, or others, may provide additional observations with feedback to support educators with ongoing goals and growth.

3.3.3. Provisional Educators will receive two Summative Evaluations per year using the District Educator Summative Evaluation Document. The first Summative Evaluation shall occur no later than **December 15th**, and the second Summative Evaluation no later than **April 1st**. Summative Evaluations may be completed more frequently, as needed for communication of effectiveness and ratings. Administrators shall share and discuss Summative Evaluation ratings with provisional educators within 15 days of the observation.

3.3.4. If a Provisional Educator receives a rating of "partially" effective, or a level two, it shall not result in a withholding of advancement on the salary schedule.

3.4. Career Educator Evaluation:

3.4.1. Career Educators shall participate in and receive a Summative Evaluation at least once every four years. A Career Educator may be subject to additional Summative Evaluations at any time based on information obtained during the Formative Evaluation process, if any of the Lines of Evidence suggests a need for a Summative Evaluation, or if the Educator's Administrator has reason to believe it would helpful.

3.4.2. All Career Educators shall participate in an annual Formative Evaluation process.

3.4.3. If a Career Educator receives a rating of "partially" effective, or a level two, it shall not result in a withholding of advancement on the salary schedule.

3.4.4. An administrator will conduct observations with the Career Educator a minimum of twice per year. The Career Educator will receive written or verbal feedback after the instructional observation. Administrative or non-administrative designees, including peers, teacher leaders, mentors, instructional coaches, or others, may provide additional observations with feedback to support educators with ongoing goals and growth.

3.5. Educator Evaluation Process

3.5.1. The District's Evaluation Instrument shall be based on the Utah Effectiveness Standards:

3.5.2. **Educator Evaluation Multiple Lines of Evidence**:

**3.5.2.1. Self Evaluation**: Each Educator shall engage in a self-assessment and develop a Professional Growth Plan using the Effectiveness Standards no later than October 1st, following the principal's group meeting to explain the purpose of, and the methods used to evaluate Educators. Educators shall use the District's evaluation resource documents to conduct their self-assessment and document their Professional Growth Plan.

**3.5.2.2. Instruction Growth**: The District will measure effective, consistent, and meaningful instruction using the principles and guidelines outlined in the Effectiveness Standards. This is primarily accomplished and documented through a reasonable number of observations, evidence of application of professional learning, and other indicators of instructional knowledge, skill, and ability.

**3.5.2.3. Student Achievement**: The District will measure student growth using assessment data as required by Administrative Rule and State Code, and will not include end-of-level assessment scores or the data of a student that is chronically absent. UTC 53G-11-520

**3.5.2.4. Parent and Student Input**: Parents and students may be given the opportunity to provide input using available tools and other forms of stakeholder feedback collected by the teacher, school, or District. Data will be recorded and measured for both elementary and secondary schools to provide feedback on school climate and educator effectiveness.

**3.5.2.5. Observations:** At any time, the principal or administrative designee may randomly and informally observe an Educator and record observations as aligned to the applicable Effectiveness Standards. Non-administrative designees, including peers, teacher leaders, mentors, instructional coaches, or others, may provide observations with feedback to support educators with ongoing goals and growth.

**3.5.2.6. Additional Evaluation Evidence**:

- Portfolio Evidence
- Lesson Plans
- Completed Professional Development
- Student or parent expressed praise or concerns
- Peer feedback or expressed praise or concerns
- Student growth-data from professional learning collaboration

3.5.3. Summative Evaluation:

3.5.3.1. Differentiated Levels of Performance**:**

- One- (Not Effective) The educator did not meet performance expectations.
- Two- (Partially Effective) The educator partially met performance expectations by demonstrating evidence of continued professional growth or demonstrating evidence of student academic growth.
- Three- (Effective) The educator partially met performance expectations by demonstrating evidence of continued p

3.5.3.2. Educators shall receive a Summative Evaluation score, in alignment with the levels and definitions noted and based on the preponderance of evidence for measures of the following:

- Professional growth related to the Effective Standards
- Stakeholder Input, and
- Student academic growth.

Each component will be measured by one or more of the Multiple Lines of Evidence. The Summative Evaluation system shall align with the above three differentiated levels of performance:

3.5.3.3. The administrator responsible for an Educator's Summative Evaluation shall allow the Educator to make a written response to any part of the Summative Evaluation and attach the Educator's response to the evaluation.

3.5.3.4. Within 15 calendar days after the Summative Evaluation process is completed, the administrator shall discuss the written evaluation with the Educator and any revision of the written evaluation made after the discussion.

3.5.3.5. Administrators shall share and discuss summative ratings with career educators by **June 1st** of a year when a summative evaluation is done as part of the four-year evaluation cycle. The evaluating administrator may conduct further Formative or Summative Evaluations throughout the school year and if needed hold a teacher conference, develop a performance improvement plan, a Plan of Assistance, or adjust the Summative Evaluation rating as needed.

3.5.4. Summative Rating Review:

3.5.4.1. A career educator who is not satisfied with a Summative Evaluation rating may request a review of the evaluation within 15 days after receiving the written evaluation.

3.5.4.2. If a review is requested, the Superintendent or the Superintendent's Designee shall appoint a person not employed by the District who has expertise in teacher or personnel evaluation to review the evaluation procedures and make recommendations to the superintendent regarding the Educator's Summative Evaluation in accordance with USBE guidelines.

3.5.5. Wage Increase and Legislative Supplemental Salary Adjustments

3.5.5.1. An Educator that receives the lowest level (“Not Effective”) on the most recent evaluation may not advance on the salary schedule pursuant to UCA § 53G-11-518. A “Not Effective” Rating shall constitute a summative rating of less than satisfactory and 3 consecutive “Not Effective” ratings shall subject the Educator to withholding of the most recent legislative allocated salary adjustment pursuant to UCA § 53F-2-405, and Administrative Rule R277-110.

3.5.5.2. A Career Educator who receives a level one, or a level two Summative Evaluation rating, will have another Summative Evaluation within 6 months following the designation of “Not Effective” or “Partially Effective”.

3.5.5.3. A Career Educator who receives a level three “Effective” Summative Evaluation rating, will have that score carried forward annually, for up to four years, or until their next Summative Evaluation.

3.6. Educator Deficiencies:

3.6.1. Notice of Improvement:

3.6.1.1. The administrator shall give an Educator whose performance is inadequate or in need of improvement a written document clearly identifying:

- specific, measurable, and actionable deficiencies;
- the available resources that will be provided for improvement; and
- a recommended course of action that will improve the Educator's performance.

3.6.1.2. The Educator is responsible for improving performance, including using any resources identified by the District, and demonstrating acceptable levels of improvement in the designated areas of deficiencies.

3.6.1.3. An administrator is not required to remediate an Educator with a Notice of Improvement if the Educator's unsatisfactory performance was documented for the same deficiency within the previous three years and a plan of assistance was implemented.

3.6.2. Plan of Assistance:

3.6.2.1. If the District intends to not renew a career employee's contract for unsatisfactory performance or terminate a career employee's contract during the contract term for unsatisfactory performance, the District shall:

- provide and discuss with the career employee written documentation clearly identifying the deficiencies in performance;
- provide written notice that the career employee's contract is subject to non-renewal or termination if, upon a reevaluation of the career employee's performance, the career employee's performance is determined to be unsatisfactory;
- develop and implement a plan of assistance in an attempt to allow the career employee an opportunity to improve performance;
- re-evaluate the career employee's performance; and
- if the career employee's performance remains unsatisfactory, give notice of intent to not renew or terminate the career employee's contract.

3.6.2.2. The period of time for implementing a Plan of Assistance:

- may not exceed 120 school days, except as provided in this policy;
- may continue into the next school year;
- should be sufficient to successfully complete the plan of assistance; and
- shall begin when the career employee receives the written notice provided under and end when the determination is made that the career employee has successfully remediated the deficiency.

3.6.2.3. An administrator may extend the period of time for implementing a plan of assistance beyond 120 school days if:

• a career employee has been approved and qualifies for leave under the Family Medical Leave Act during the time period the plan of assistance is scheduled to be implemented; or

• For other compelling reasons as approved by the Board if the leave was scheduled before the employee was placed on a Plan of Assistance.

3.6.2.4. If upon a reevaluation of the career employee's performance, the District determines the career employee's performance is satisfactory, and within a three-year period after the initial documentation of unsatisfactory performance for the same deficiency, the career employee's performance is determined to be unsatisfactory, the District may elect to not renew or terminate the career employee's contract without implementing a new Plan of Assistance.

3.6.2.5. If the District intends to not renew or terminate a career employee's contract for performance under this section, the District will provide written documentation of the career employee's deficiencies in performance; and give notice of intent to not renew or terminate the career employee's contract.

3.7. **Nothing in this Policy shall prevent the District from taking appropriate disciplinary action for Misconduct defined in this Policy, the Utah Code, Utah Administrative Rule, or District Policy 1450**.