



Jefferson County Public Schools Certified Evaluation Plan

2016-2017

May 3, 2016

William Allen, Principal (Butler Traditional High School)

John Ansman, Evaluation Transition Coordinator (R-5)

Tiffeny Armour, Director of Human Resources – *Chair*

Chris Burba, Principal (Meyzeek Middle School)

Beverly Chester-Burton, Teacher (Stuart Middle School)

Karen Cash, Teacher (Liberty High School)

Margie Eckerle, Director of Administrator Recruitment and Development

Justin Elliott, Teacher (Maupin Elementary School)

Tony Prince, Teacher (Atherton High School)

Alan Young, Teacher – *Project Manager*

Table of Contents

JCPS Certified Evaluation Plan

District Professional Growth and Effectiveness System – TPGES (and OPGES)	3
<u>Roles and Definitions</u>	3
<u>The Kentucky Framework for Teaching</u>	6
<u>Kentucky Professional Growth & Effectiveness System Model</u>	7
<u>Sources of Evidence/Framework Teaching Alignment</u>	8
<u>Professional Practice</u>	9
<u>Self-Reflection and Professional Growth Planning</u>	9
<u>Observation</u>	10
<u>Observation Model</u>	10
<u>Observation Schedule</u>	10
<u>Peer Observation</u>	12
<u>Observation Conferencing</u>	13
<u>Observer Certification</u>	14
<u>Observer Calibration</u>	15
<u>Student Voice</u>	16
<u>Products of Practice/Other Sources of Evidence</u>	17
<u>Student Growth</u>	18
<u>State Contribution – Student Growth Percentiles (MSGPs)</u>	19
<u>Local Contribution – Student Growth Goals (SGGs)</u>	19
<u>Rigor of SGGs</u>	19
<u>Comparability of SGGs</u>	19
<u>JCPS Rubric for Student Growth Goals</u>	21
<u>Determining Growth for a Single SGG</u>	22
<u>Determining Growth for Multiple SGGs</u>	24
<u>Determining the Overall Performance Category</u>	24
<u>Rating Professional Practice</u>	24
<u>Rating Overall Student Growth</u>	25
<u>Determining the Overall Performance Category Decision Rules Matrix</u>	28
<u>TPGES and OPGES Professional Growth Plan and Summative Cycle</u>	29
<u>Counselor Professional Growth Plan and Summative Cycle</u>	30
Professional Growth and Effectiveness System – Principal and Assistant Principal	31
<u>Sources of Evidence/Framework Principal Alignment</u>	32
<u>Principal Professional Growth and Effectiveness System Components</u>	33
<u>Principal Performance Standards</u>	34
<u>Professional Practice</u>	35
<u>Professional Growth Plan and Self-Reflection</u>	35
<u>Site-Visits</u>	36
<u>Val-Ed 360^o</u>	36
<u>Working Conditions Goal</u>	37
<u>Products of Practice/Other Sources of Evidence</u>	38
<u>Student Growth</u>	39
<u>State Contribution</u>	39
<u>Local Contribution</u>	39
<u>Determining the Overall Performance Category</u>	40
<u>Rating Overall Professional Practice</u>	40
<u>Rating Overall Student Growth</u>	41
<u>Determining Overall Performance Category Decision Rules Matrix</u>	43
<u>Professional Growth Plan and Summative Cycle</u>	44
District Certified Personnel	45
Appeals Process	48

District Professional Growth and Effectiveness Plan

Professional Growth and Effectiveness System

The vision for the Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) is to have every student taught by an effective teacher and every school led by an effective leader. The goal is to create a fair and equitable system to measure educator and leader effectiveness and act as a catalyst for professional growth.

Roles and Definitions

1. **Artifact:** A product of a certified school personnel's work that demonstrates knowledge and skills.
2. **Assistant Principal:** A certified school personnel who devotes the majority of employed time in the role of assistant principal, for which administrative certification is required by EPSB.
3. **Certified Administrator:** A certified school personnel, other than principal or assistant principal, who devotes the majority of time in a position for which administrative certification is required by EPSB.
4. **Certified School Personnel:** A certified employee, below the level of superintendent, who devotes the majority of time in a position in a district for which certification is required by EPSB.
5. **Conference:** A meeting between the evaluator and the evaluatee for the purposes of providing feedback, analyzing the results of an observation or observations, reviewing other evidence to determine the evaluatee's accomplishments and areas for growth, and leading to the establishment or revision of a professional growth plan.
6. **Evaluatee:** A certified school personnel who is being evaluated.
7. **Evaluator:** The primary evaluator as described in KRS 156.557(5)(c)2.
8. **Formative Evaluation:** Is defined by KRS 156.557(1)(a).
9. **Full Observation:** An observation conducted by a certified observer that is conducted for the length of a full class period or full lesson.
10. **Improvement Plan:** A plan for improvement up to twelve months in duration for:
 - a. Teachers and other professionals who are rated ineffective in professional practice and have a low overall student growth rating.
 - b. Principals who are rated ineffective in professional practice and have high, expected, or low overall student growth rating.
11. **Job Category:** A group or class of certified school personnel positions with closely related functions.
12. **Local Contribution:** A rating based on the degree to which a teacher, other professional, principal, or assistant principal meets student growth goals and is used for the student growth measure.
13. **Local Formative Growth Measures:** Is defined by KRS 156.557(1)(b).
14. **Mini Observation:** An observation conducted by a certified observer for 20-30 minutes in length.
15. **Observation:** a data collection process conducted by a certified observer, in person or through video, for the purpose of evaluation, including notes, professional judgments, and examination of artifacts made during one (1) or more classroom or worksite visits of any duration.

16. **Observer Certification:** A process of training and ensuring that certified school personnel who serve as observers of evaluatees have demonstrated proficiency in rating teachers and other professionals for the purposes of evaluation and feedback.
17. **Observer calibration:** The process of ensuring that certified school personnel have maintained proficiency and accuracy in observing teachers and other professionals for the purposes of evaluation and providing feedback.
18. **Other Professionals:** Certified school personnel, except for teachers, administrators, assistant principals, or principals.
19. **Overall Student growth Rating:** The rating that is calculated for a teacher or other professional evaluatee pursuant to the requirements of Section 7(9) and (10) of this administrative regulation and that is calculated for an assistant principal or principal evaluatee pursuant to the requirements of Section 10(8) of this administrative regulation.
20. **Peer observation:** Observation and documentation by trained certified school personnel below the level of principal or assistant principal.
21. **Performance Criteria:** The areas, skills, or outcomes on which certified school personnel are evaluated.
22. **Performance Rating:** The summative description of a teacher, other professional, principal, or assistant principal evaluatee's performance, including the ratings listed in Section 7(8) of this administrative regulation.
23. **Principal:** A certified school personnel who devotes the majority of employed time in the role of principal, for which administrative certification is required by the Education Professional Standards Board pursuant to 16 KAR 3:050.
24. **Professional Growth and Effectiveness System:** An evaluation system to support and improve the performance of certified school personnel that meets the requirements of KRS 156.557(1)(c), (2), and (3) and that uses clear and timely feedback to guide professional development.
25. **Professional Growth Plan:** An individualized plan for a certified personnel that is focused on improving professional practice and leadership skills, aligned with performance standards and the specific goals and objectives of the school improvement plan or the district improvement plan, built using a variety of sources and types of data that reflect student needs and strengths, evaluatee data, and school and district data, produced in consultation with the evaluator as described in Section 9(1), (2), (3), and (4) and Section 12(1), (2), (3), and (4) of this administrative regulation, and includes: (a) Goals for enrichment and development that are established by the evaluatee in consultation with the evaluator; (b) Objectives or targets aligned to the goals; (c) An action plan for achieving the objectives or targets and a plan for monitoring progress; (d) A method for evaluating success; and (e) The identification, prioritization, and coordination of presently available school and district resources to accomplish the goals.
26. **Professional Practice:** The demonstration, in the school environment, of the evaluatee's professional knowledge and skill.
27. **Professional Practice Rating:** The rating that is calculated for a teacher or other professional evaluatee pursuant to Section 7(8) of this administrative regulation and that is calculated for a principal or assistant principal evaluatee pursuant to the requirements of Section 10(7) of this administrative regulation.
28. **Self-Reflection:** The process by which certified personnel assesses the effectiveness and adequacy of their knowledge and performance for the purpose of identifying areas for professional learning and growth.

29. **Sources of Evidence:** The multiple measures listed in KRS 156.557(4) and in Sections 7 and 10 of this administrative regulation.
30. **State Contribution:** The student growth percentiles, as defined in 703 KAR 5:200, Section 1(11), for teachers and other professionals, and the next generation learners goal for principals and assistant principals.
31. **Student Growth:** Is defined by KRS 156.557(1)(c).
32. **Student Growth Goal:** A goal focused on learning, that is specific, appropriate, realistic, and time-bound, that is developed collaboratively and agreed upon by the evaluatee and evaluator, and that uses local formative growth measures.
33. **Student Growth Percentile:** each student's rate of change compared to other students with a similar test score history.
34. **Student Voice Survey:** The student perception survey provided by the department that is administered annually to a minimum of one (1) district-designated group of students per teacher evaluatee or a district designated selection of students and provides data on specific aspects of the instructional environment and professional practice of the teacher or other professional evaluatee.
35. **Summative Evaluation:** Is defined by KRS 156.557(1)(d).
36. **Teacher:** A certified school personnel who has been assigned the lead responsibility for student learning in a classroom, grade level, subject, or course and holds a teaching certificate under 16 KAR 2:010 or 16 KAR 2:020.
37. **Working Condition's Survey Goal:** a school improvement goal set by a principal or assistant principal every two (2) years with the use of data from the department-approved working conditions survey.

For Additional Definitions and Roles, please see 704KAR 3:370 Professional Growth and Effectiveness System

Intensive Support: At any time, when significant deficiencies in work performance have been observed, an employee may be placed in Intensive Support, as specified in the JCBE-JCTA labor agreement. At that time, the district-designed process will be instituted which includes a specific timeline for observations, support, and conferences. At the end of the specified timeline, the evaluator will provide a written summary of the conferences to the employee.

PGES Implementation for 2016-17

For 2016-17, JCPS will fully implement the Kentucky Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES) with accountability in accordance with state statutes and regulations as outlined in this Certified Evaluation Plan (CEP).

OPGES Differences

Unless otherwise noted within the text of this CEP, Other Professionals will follow similar timelines and protocols of those in TPGES (although tailored to their respective frameworks and forms).

The Kentucky Framework for Teaching with Specialist Frameworks for Other Professionals

The Kentucky Framework for Teaching and Specialist Frameworks for Other Professionals are designed to support student achievement and professional practice through the domains of:

Framework for Teaching

Planning and Preparation
Classroom Environment
Instruction
Professional Responsibilities

Specialist Frameworks for Other Professionals

Planning and Preparation
Environment
Instruction/Delivery of Service
Professional Responsibilities

The Frameworks also include themes such as equity, cultural competence, high expectations, developmental appropriateness, accommodating individual needs, effective technology integration, and student assumption of responsibility. They provide structure for feedback for continuous improvement through individual goals that target student and professional growth, thus supporting overall school improvement. Evidence documenting professional practice is situated within one or more of the four domains of the framework. Performance is rated for each component according to four performance levels: Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished, and Exemplary. The summative rating is a holistic representation of performance, combining data from multiple sources of evidence across each domain.

The use of professional judgment based on multiple sources of evidence promotes a holistic and comprehensive analysis of practice, rather than over-reliance on one individual data point or rote calculation of practice based on predetermined formulas. Evaluators also take into account how educators respond to or apply additional supports and resources designed to promote student learning, as well as their own professional growth and development. Finally, professional judgment gives evaluators the flexibility to account for a wide variety of factors related to individual educator performance, such as: school-specific priorities that may drive practice in one domain, an educator's number of goals, experience level and/or leadership opportunities, and contextual variables that may impact the learning environment, such as unanticipated outside events or traumas.

Evaluators must use the following categories of evidence in determining overall ratings:


KDE Required Sources of Evidence

- Professional Growth Planning and Self-Reflection
- Observation
- Student Voice
- Student Growth Goals and/or Median Student Growth Percentiles (4-8 - Math & ELA)

Local District Decision

All components and sources of evidence related to supporting an educator's professional practice and student growth ratings will be completed and documented to inform the Overall Performance Category. All Summative Ratings will be recorded in the department-approved technology platform.

KENTUCKY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND EFFECTIVENESS SYSTEM MODEL FOR SUMMATIVE EVALUATION OF TEACHERS



SOURCES OF EVIDENCE/FRAEMWORK FOR TEACHING ALIGNMENT

SOURCES OF EVIDENCE To Inform Professional Practice				FRAMEWORK for TEACHING (FfT)																			
Domain	Component	Planning & Preparation						Classroom Environment					Instruction				Professional Responsibility						
		1a -Knowledge of content/pedagogy	1b-Demonstrate knowledge of students	1c- Setting Instructional Outcomes	1d-Demonstrates knowledge of resources	1e-Designing Coherent Instruction	1f- Designing Student Assessment	2a-Creating Env. of Respect & Rapport	2b-Establish Culture of Learning	2c-Maintainaing Classroom Procedures	2d-Managing Student Behavior	2e-Organizing Physical Space	3a-Communicating with Students	3b-Questioning & Discussion Techniques	3c-Engaging Students in Learning	3d-Using Assessment in Learning	3e-Demonstrating Flexibility & Responsive	4a-Reflecting On Teaching	4b-Maintaining Accurate Records	4c-Communicating With Families	4d-Participating in Profess. Learning Comm.	4e-Growing & Developing Professionally	4f-Showing Professionalism
Supervisor Observation	Evidence (pre and post conferences)																						
		Student Voice	Observation	Evidence (pre and post conferences)	Kentucky Student Voice Survey																		
Professional Growth	Professional Growth Planning and Self Reflection																						
		Self-Reflection	Observation																				
Peer Observation	Observation																						

Professional Practice

Self-Reflection and Professional Growth Planning

Reflective practices and professional growth planning are iterative processes. Each TPGES and OPGES educator (1) reflects on his or her current growth needs based on multiple sources of data and identifies an area or areas for focus; (2) collaborates with his or her administrator to develop a professional growth plan and action steps; (3) implements the plan; (4) regularly reflects on the progress and impact of the plan on his or her professional practice; (5) modifies the plan as appropriate; (6) continues implementation and ongoing reflection; (7) and, finally, conducts a summative reflection on the degree of goal attainment and the implications for next steps.

The Professional Growth Plan addresses realistic, focused, and measurable professional goals. The plan connects data from multiple sources including classroom observation or site visit feedback, data on student growth and achievement, and professional growth needs identified through self-assessment and reflection. In collaboration with the administrators, TPGES and OPGES educators identify explicit goals which drive the focus of professional growth activities, support, and on-going reflection.

KDE Required

- ♦ **All Teachers and Other Professionals participate in self-reflection and professional growth planning each year.**

Local District Decision

- ♦ All teachers and other professionals will complete a Self-Reflection and Professional Growth Plan (PGP), the latter of which is produced in consultation with the evaluator. Both shall be completed within the first 30 calendar days of reporting for employment. This includes late hires. While self-reflection is ongoing, it shall occur formally in the Fall and in the Spring. A PGP must be recorded on a district-approved E2 form. A paper copy of the PGP, signed by both parties, shall be provided to the evaluatee. This process will be completed on an annual basis.

Observation

The observation and site-visit processes provide one source of evidence to determine educator effectiveness that includes supervisor and peer observation for each certified TPGES and OPGES educator. The supervisor observation provides *documentation and feedback* to measure the effectiveness of professional practice. Only the supervisor observation(s) will be used to inform a summative rating. Peer observation is used only for formative feedback on professional practice in a collegial atmosphere of trust and common purpose. NO ratings are given by the peer observer. The purpose of observation(s) is to encourage continuous professional growth in the teaching and learning process.

Observation Model

The observation model must fulfill the following minimum criteria:

KDE Required

- ◆ **Four observations in the summative cycle. A minimum of three observations conducted by the supervisor and one observation conducted by the peer.**
- ◆ **The required peer observation must occur in the final year of the summative cycle.**
- ◆ **Final observation is conducted by the supervisor and is a full observation.**
- ◆ **Address any differences for Other Professionals.**

Local District Decision

- For TPGES:
 - ◆ Observers will conduct three mini observations (two by the supervisor and one by the peer observer) of approximately 20-30 minutes each. The final observation is a full observation conducted by the supervisor consisting of a full class or lesson observation.
- For Both TPGES and OPGES:
 - ◆ Other professionals may use a similar process above to those in TPGES or may use modified “site-visit” approach if more fitting to the appropriate OPGES framework and the role of the observee.
 - ◆ All observations must be documented (evidence, feedback) on district-approved observation forms.

Observation Schedule

KDE Required

- ◆ **Observations may begin after the evaluation training takes place within 30 calendar days of reporting for employment each school year.**

Local District Decision

- ◆ All observations are conducted openly and with full knowledge of the TPGES or OPGES educator being observed.*
- ◆ At least one full observation or site-visit, if appropriate, by the evaluator will be scheduled and occur no less than 15 school days after the peer observation.
- ◆ The peer observation will always be scheduled between the peer observer and observee.
- ◆ Peer observations will occur in the summative year between Oct. 15 and March 1.
- ◆ TPGES or OPGES educators who miss 60 or more contract days (e.g. late hires/individuals on leave) may have one fewer evaluator mini-observation.
- ◆ For TPGES or OPGES educators who miss 90 or more contract days (e.g. late hires/individuals on leave), supervisors may postpone the summative evaluation until the following year.

For those TPGES or OPGES educators on a continuing (tenured) contract, the cycle is a three (3) year cycle, consisting of at least the following:

CHART 1.0 Tenured TPGES or OPGES educators

Year 1	Mini Observation	Supervisor	Observation Window - September 15 – April 15
Year 2	Mini Observation	Supervisor	Observation Window - September 15 – April 15
Year 3 – Summative	Mini Observation Full Observation	Peer Observer Supervisor	Observation Window - October 15 – March 1 Observation Window - November 5 – April 15 (no less than 15 school days after peer observation)

For those TPGES or OPGES educators on a limited (non-tenured) contract or ~~those teachers~~ whose most recent overall performance rating places them on a one year PGP and evaluation cycle, the cycle is a one (1) year cycle, consisting of at least the following:

CHART 1.1 Non-Tenured Teachers (or Tenured TPGES or OPGES educators on One Year PGP and Summative Cycle)

Every Year	Mini Observation	Supervisor	Suggested Observation Window - September 15 - November 30
Every Year	Mini Observation	Supervisor Peer Observer	Suggested Observation Window - October 15 – March 1
Every Year	Full Observation	Supervisor	Observation Window - January 10 - April 15 ¹ (no less than 15 school days after peer observation)

*Observations by evaluators must be documented on appropriate district-approved observation forms.

Peer Observation

A Peer Observer observes, collects, shares evidence, and provides feedback for formative purposes only. Peer Observers do not score an educator's practice, nor is peer observation data shared with anyone other than the observee unless permission is granted. Peer Observers are trained certified school personnel.

KDE Required

- ◆ **All TPGES and OPGES educators will receive a peer observation in their summative year.**
- ◆ **All Peer Observers participating during the summative year observations will complete the department approved training once every three years.**
- ◆ **All peer observation documentation will be accessed only by the observee.**

Local District Decision

- All TPGES or OPGES educators are eligible to participate in the department-approved peer observation certification training to increase understanding of the peer observation component.
- Peer observers should have completed a minimum of three years of teaching or other professional experience.
- Peer observers must complete the state approved peer observation certification training every three years. Completion of training will be monitored by the building principal or designee.
- Each year the principal, in collaboration with the school PGES Implementation Team, will select and assign peer observers.
- Peer observers shall have no more than five educators to observe, and the recommendation is three or fewer.
- Peer observers will be in the same PGES framework as the peer observee.
- Peer observers for OPGES educators may use a similar process to those in TPGES or may use a modified "site-visit" approach if more fitting to the appropriate OPGES framework and the role of the observee.
- All peer observation feedback and communication will only be between the observee and peer observer.
- Peer observation feedback must not be shared with the administrator and is never used as part of the evaluation.
- The time and date of peer observations and conferences must be reported to the principal.

Observation Conferencing

Observers will adhere to the following observation conferencing requirements for teachers and other professionals:

KDE Required

- ◆ **Conduct observation post-conference within five working days following each observation.**

Local District Decision

- ◆ The summative evaluation conference shall be held at the end of the summative evaluation cycle by May 1st.
- ◆ A post-observation conference is not a summative evaluation conference.

- ◆ Pre-observation conferences, between the administrator and teacher, if conducted, will be held one to three school days prior to the observation. The pre-observation conference may be conducted in person, electronically, or not at all. Post-observation conferences between the administrator and the teacher will be conducted in person within five school days after the observation.
- ◆ Either teacher or administrator may request a pre-observation conference that must be conducted if requested.
- ◆ The required peer observer's pre-observation conference must be conducted in person or electronically one to three school days prior to the observation. Post-observation conferences between the peer observer and the teacher will be conducted in person within five school days after the observation.
- ◆ An initial evaluation meeting to explain the evaluation process, as detailed in the JCPS CEP, will be held within the first 30 working days of the school year. This information will be included in the initial meeting regarding the evaluation process each year so that all participants are aware of the evaluation process for their school. Each teacher will sign an evaluation statement indicating they have received and understand the evaluation procedures.

Observer Certification

All administrators serving as a primary evaluator must complete the Initial Certified Evaluation Training prior to conducting observations for the purpose of evaluation.

To ensure consistency of observations, evaluators must also be trained, tested and approved using the Proficiency Observation Training for the current approved state platform. The system allows observers to develop a deep understanding of how the four domains of the Kentucky Framework for Teaching (FfT) are applied in observation. There are three sections of the proficiency system:

- Framework for Teaching Observer Training
- Framework for Teaching Scoring Practice
- Framework for Teaching Proficiency Assessment

KDE Required

The established cycle for observation certification is as follows:

Year 1	Certification
Year 2	Calibration
Year 3	Calibration
Year 4	Recertification

- ♦ **Only supervisors who have passed the proficiency assessment can conduct mini and full observations for the purpose of evaluation. In the event that a supervisor has yet to complete the proficiency assessment, or if the supervisor does not pass the assessment, the district will provide the following supports:**
 - **Observation data provided by a substitute observer is considered a valid source of evidence only if the supervisor is present in the observation.**
 - **In cases where the supervisor is not certified through the proficiency system and is therefore unable to conduct observations during the observation window, the district will determine how to ensure TPGES or OPGES educators have access to observations as follows:**

Local District Decision

- All certified evaluation supervisors will complete observation certification and initial certified evaluation training. The completion of this certification and training will be monitored by the Director of Administrator Recruitment & Development and the Achievement Area Assistant Superintendents.

- All late hire, certified evaluation supervisors will complete observation certification and initial certified evaluation training within the first 45 calendar days of employment.
- If the building supervisor is not certified, the Achievement Area Assistant Superintendent will assign a certified observer to the school until the building supervisor completes certification. The building supervisor will still participate in observations.
- The district will provide technology support and make available study partners for the uncertified observers to aid in the successful completion of the certification process.

Observer Calibration

As certified observers may tend to experience “drift” in rating accuracy, the district completes a calibration process each year where certification is not required (see chart under *Observer Certification*). This calibration process is completed in years two and three after certification. Calibration ensures ongoing accuracy in scoring teaching practice; an awareness of the potential risk for rater bias; and ensures observers refresh their knowledge of the training and scoring practice. All calibration processes must be conducted through the state approved technology platform.

Required

- ◆ **Observer calibration during years two and three of the Observer Certification process based on the department approved platform.**
- ◆ **Re-certification after year three.**

Local District Decision

The district will provide recalibration training in principal and assistant principal sub-groups and PLCs before Oct. 1 each school year. For administrators who have difficulty with consistent scoring during calibration, additional support and training will be provided. Those administrators who score a Red or Yellow rating will be provided a certified mentor with a Green rating. The administrators will repeat the calibration process. Late hires will be provided a calibration license and immediately begin the process.

Student Voice

The Student Voice Survey is a confidential survey collecting student feedback on specific aspects of the classroom experience and teaching practice.

KDE Required

- ◆ **All teachers will participate in the state-approved Student Voice Survey annually with a minimum of one identified group of students.**
- ◆ **Student selection for participation must be consistent across the district.**
- ◆ **Results will be used as a source of evidence for Professional Practice.**
- ◆ **Formative years' data will be used to inform Professional Practice in the summative year.**
- ◆ **All teachers and appropriate administrative staff will read, understand, and sign the district's Student Voice Ethics Statement.**
- ◆ **The Student Voice Survey will be administered between the hours of 7:00 AM and 5:00 PM local time.**
- ◆ **The survey will be administered in the school.**
- ◆ **Survey data will be considered only when ten or more students are respondents.**

Local District Decision

- ◆ The District Student Voice Survey Point-of-Contact will be the Chief of Data Management/Designee.
- ◆ The Student Voice Teacher Leader with the assistance of the school TPGES Implementation Team will schedule student groups for the student voice surveys and ensure equal access to all students, with necessary IEP/504 accommodations.
- ◆ Only one class/section per teacher will participate in the survey, as it fits the school schedule.
- ◆ Schools will monitor to ensure each student has the opportunity to participate, but no one student is overburdened with surveys on multiple teachers.
- ◆ The survey will be completed each year by March 30th.
- ◆ Teachers will only have access to their own student voice survey data.
- ◆ Principals and assistant principals will have access to all student voice survey data.
- ◆ Only certified staff members with ten or more students will have student voice survey results, which may be utilized as a source of evidence.
- ◆ Certified staff members with less than ten students may participate using a paper/pencil version.
- ◆ Due to the variations in services provided by other professionals and by teachers in alternative settings, administration of the student voice survey will be collaboratively determined between the employee and the supervisor.

Products of Practice/Other Sources of Evidence

TPGES or OPGES educators may provide additional evidences to support assessment of their own professional practice. These evidences should yield information related to the educator’s practice within the domains.

KDE Required

- ◆ **observations conducted by certified supervisor observer(s)**
- ◆ **student voice survey(s)**
- ◆ **self-reflection and professional growth plans**

Local District Decision

TPGES or OPGES educators may provide additional evidence to support assessment of their own professional practice. The evidence should yield information related to the educator’s practice within the domains of the role-specific Kentucky Frameworks. Products of practice/other sources of evidence may include, but are not limited to:

- program review evidence
- team-developed curriculum units
- lesson plans
- communication logs
- timely, targeted feedback from mini or informal observations
- student data records
- student work
- student formative and/or summative course evaluations/feedback
- minutes from PLCs
- educator reflections and/or self-reflections
- educator interviews
- committee or team contributions
- student perception/voice survey(s) or data
- student/parent engagement surveys
- records of student and/or teacher attendance
- video lessons
- engagement in professional organizations
- action research
- self-reflection and professional growth plans
- other sources of evidence determined through collaboration between the educator and administrator.

Student Growth


The student growth measure is comprised of two possible contributions: a state contribution and a local contribution. The state contribution pertains only to teachers in the following content areas and grade levels participating in state assessments:

- 4th – 8th Grade
 - ELA/Reading
 - Math

The state contribution is reported as Median Student Growth Percentiles (MSGP).

The local contribution uses the Student Growth Goal Setting Process and applies to all teachers and other professionals in the district, including those who receive MSGP.

The following graphic provides a roadmap for determining which teachers receive which contributions:



State Contribution – Median Student Growth Percentiles (MSGP) – (Math/ELA, Grades 4-8)

The state contribution for student growth is a rating based on each student’s rate of change compared to other students with a similar test score history (“academic peers”) expressed as a percentile. The rating will be calculated using the MSGPs for the students attributed the teacher of grades 4-8 math and ELA classes. The scale for determining acceptable growth will be determined by the Kentucky Board of Education and provided to the district by the Kentucky Department of Education.

Local Contribution – Student Growth Goals (SGG) –All teachers and Other Professionals

The local contribution for the student growth measure is a rating based on the degree to which a teacher or other professional meets the growth goal for a set of students over an identified interval of instruction (i.e. trimester, semester, year-long) as indicated in the teacher’s Student Growth Goal (SGG). All teachers and other professionals will develop an SGG for inclusion in the student growth measure. All Student Growth Goals will be determined by the teacher or other professional in collaboration with the principal and will be grounded in the fundamentals of assessment quality (Clear Purpose, Clear Targets, Sound Design, Effective Communication, and Student Involvement). SGGs should address:

Rigor-congruency to the Kentucky Core Academic Standards

Comparability- Data collected for the Student Growth Goal must use comparable criteria across similar classrooms (classrooms that address the same standards) to determine progress toward mastery of standards/enduring skills. Examples of similar classrooms might be 6th grade science classrooms, 3rd grade classrooms, English 1 classrooms, band or art classes. For similar classrooms, teachers would be expected to use common measures or rubrics to determine competency in performance at the level intended by the standards being assessed. Although specific assessments may vary, the close alignment to the intent of the standard is comparable.

To fulfill the criteria of measuring student growth at the local level, a protocol must be established to ensure rigorous and comparable growth measures used for all teachers.

KDE Required

- ◆ **Identify all criteria for Student Growth Goals.**
- ◆ **All teachers and other professionals will write a Student Growth Goal based on the criteria.**
- ◆ **Protocol for ensuring rigor**
- ◆ **Protocol for ensuring comparability**

Local District Decision

JCPS Protocol for Ensuring Rigor and Comparability of TPGES Student Growth Goals*

The district adopted a rubric that addresses both *rigor* and *comparability* of criteria. Teachers and administrators will apply the rubric to assist them in creating teacher-developed rubrics and SGGs. Teacher PLC/Grade-Level/Group/Department teams utilize the JCPS Rubric for Student Growth Goals (see below), for assessing the rigor and comparability of each teacher's SGG(s). Teacher teams may consult with district/other support staff/documents to ensure the rubric assesses the following:

- The SGG is congruent with core academic standards or role appropriate standards for the grade level and content area for which it was developed.
- The SGG represents or encompasses an enduring skill, process, understanding, or concept that students are expected to master by taking a particular course(s) in school.
- The SGG will allow high and low achieving students to adequately demonstrate their knowledge.
- The SGG provides access and opportunity for all students, including students with disabilities, ELLs, and gifted/talented students.

Teacher teams (PLC/Grade-Level/Group/Department) will implement a *Peer Review Process* to ensure each teacher's SGG(s) and rubric(s) is/are rigorous and comparable.

Supervisors will approve the teacher-developed and peer-reviewed SGG(s).

The *JCPS Rubric* and *Peer Review Process* will ensure the rigor, comparability, and quality of student growth goals across teachers and classrooms in the district.

Teacher teams (PLC/Grade-Level/Group/Department) will also ensure comparable scoring processes and data collection by collaborating/reaching consensus on:

- What student mastery of the enduring skills looks like using approved scoring measures identified in teacher SGG statements.
- Calibration of scoring, to ensure consistency using the measures/rubrics identified in growth goal statements, in order to determine baseline data, interim growth data, and student progress toward mastery of the identified enduring skills in teacher SGG statements.

*OPGES teams who deliver instruction to students will operate using the same process. However, due to the variations in services provided by other professionals and the variance in the amount of regular contact they have with a consistent group of students, how the student growth component is implemented will be collaboratively decided between the evaluatee and evaluator.

JCPS Rubric for Student Growth Goals

Structure of the Goal		
<i>Requirements: The Student Growth Goal</i>	<i>is acceptable if it . . .</i>	<i>needs revision if it. . .</i>
<p>Focuses on a standards-based enduring skill which students are expected to master.</p> <p>Identifies an area of need pertaining to current students' abilities.</p> <p>Includes growth and proficiency targets that establish and differentiate expected performance for ALL students.</p> <p>Identifies appropriate sources and kinds of evidence for base-line, mid-course, and end-of-year/course data collection.</p> <p>Explicitly states year-long/course-long interval of instruction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ┆ focuses on a standards-based enduring skill. ┆ identifies a specific area of need related to the enduring skill, supported by evidence for current students. ┆ includes a growth target for ALL students and a proficiency target that establishes the mastery expectation for students. ┆ identifies appropriate sources and kinds of evidence for collecting baseline, mid-course, and end-of-year/course data that matches the skill being assessed. ┆ specifies a year-long/course-long interval of instruction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ┆ Contains a skill that is not standards-based or does not match enduring skill criteria. ┆ does not identify a specific area of need or the area of need is not related to the enduring skill. ┆ is missing one of the targets or fails to differentiate expected performance for one or both targets. ┆ fails to identify appropriate sources and kinds of evidence for data collection, or they are not well-matched to the skill being assessed. ┆ fails to specify an interval of instruction, or the interval is less than year-long/course-long.
Rigor of the Goal and Sources and Kinds of Evidence		
<i>Requirements: The rigor of the Student Growth Goal</i>	<i>is acceptable if it . . .</i>	<i>needs revision if it. . .</i>
<p>It is congruent to KCAS grade level/content area standards for which it was developed.</p> <p>The growth and proficiency targets are challenging for students, but attainable with support.</p> <p>The identified sources and kinds of evidence of learning/growth allow for students to demonstrate where they are in meeting or exceeding the intent of the standards in which the enduring skill is being assessed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ┆ is congruent and appropriate for grade level/content area standards ┆ has growth and proficiency targets that are doable, but stretch the outer bounds of what is attainable. ┆ has identified sources and kinds of evidence that allow students to demonstrate their competency in performing at the level intended by the standards in which the enduring skill is being assessed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ┆ is congruent to content but not to grade level standards, or it is not congruent ┆ has growth and proficiency targets that are not achievable or the targets are achievable, but fail to stretch attainability expectations ┆ has identified sources and kinds of evidence that only allow students to demonstrate competency of a portion or none of the aspects intended by the standards being assessed in which the enduring skill is being assessed.
Comparability of Data and Evidences of Student Learning/Growth		
<i>Requirements: The comparability of the Student Growth Goal</i>	<i>is acceptable if it. . .</i>	<i>needs revision if . . .</i>
<p>Uses comparable criteria across similar classrooms (addressing the same standards) to determine progress toward mastery of the standards-based enduring skill being assessed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ┆ reflects collaborative development of common criteria (sources and kinds of evidence/rubrics) to determine competency in performance at the level intended by the standards in which the enduring skill is being assessed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ┆ it does not reflect common criteria used to determine progress.

Determining Growth for a Single Student Growth Goal (SGG)

The process for determining the result of student growth (high, expected, low) requires districts to explain how they will use rigorous and comparable (see above) goals and assessments for that rating. Districts have several options to consider – none of which are mutually exclusive – for determining student growth.

KDE Required

- ◆ Describe the protocol or process for using multiple sources of data and evidence to determine student growth ratings as low, expected, and high for both growth and proficiency.
- ◆ Describe the protocol or process for using multiple sources of data and evidence to determine student growth ratings as low, expected, and high for other professionals and alternative settings.

Local District Decision

PROCESS TO IDENTIFY GROWTH AND PROFICIENCY TARGET RATINGS

The proficiency target rating and the growth target rating will be combined for one overall local student growth goal rating. The decision rule charts below provide information on the criteria for the ratings and combined overall local student growth goal rating. *ALL STUDENTS (100%) ARE EXPECTED TO SHOW GROWTH TOWARD AN ENDURING SKILL FOCUSED STUDENT GROWTH GOAL.* Showing demonstrable growth, however, is *not* the same as all students reaching the student growth goal **target**. To keep the SGG *target* meaningful and challenging and not reduce the SGG *target* to something so easy that all children will reach it with minimal effort, a high percentage window (70% - < 85%) is used in our SGG target rating matrix.

GROWTH TARGET RATING		
LOW	EXPECTED	HIGH
<70% of students meet growth target	70% - < 85% of students meet growth target	≥ 85% of students meet growth target

PROFICIENCY TARGET RATING		
LOW	EXPECTED	HIGH
Does not meet proficiency target within 10%	Meets proficiency target within 10% (of the established target)	Exceeds proficiency target

LOCAL STUDENT GROWTH GOAL DECISION RULES MATRIX AND OVERALL STUDENT GROWTH RATING		
Growth TARGET	Proficiency TARGET	OVERALL SG RATING
High	High	High
	Expected	High
	Low	Expected
Expected	High	High
	Expected	Expected
	Low	Expected
Low	High	Expected
	Expected	Expected
	Low	Low

Sources and Kinds of Evidence for Determining Student Growth:

Educators will utilize multiple sources and kinds of evidence to demonstrate student growth by implementing one or more choices, as decided by the educator, to be reviewed and approved by her/his administrator. Likely sources and kinds of evidence may include, but are not limited to, the use of pre-/post-assessments, running records/repeated measures, analytical/holistic growth rubrics, and/or any combination therein or evidence source that addresses criteria on the JCPS Rubric for Student Growth Goals when the SGGs are developed. Sources of evidence that reach the rigor and comparability criteria can be used as a measure to determine student growth. Three likely categories of measures are described below.

Pre-/Post-Assessments

Educators may use pre-/post-assessments to determine the student growth identified in the SGG. These assessments can be identical or comparable versions. Assessment used in this option must meet the district assurance of rigor and comparability as defined in the previous section.

Repeated Measures Design

Educators may maintain a record of results on short measures, demonstrations, and/or performances that allow students to act on the information obtained from each measure, repeated throughout the length of the SGG. These measures will accompany descriptive feedback rather than evaluative feedback, student involvement in the assessment process, and opportunities for students to communicate their evolving learning while the teaching is in progress. The teacher and principal will then look at the pattern across the repeated administrations, illustrating change over time, to determine the growth rating for the SGG. Educators will not utilize repeated measures on which students may demonstrate improvement over time simply due to familiarity with the assessment.

Holistic Evaluation

Educators may use peer-reviewed developed, adopted and/or adapted “growth rubrics” for a holistic evaluation designed to compare two or more examples of student work.

Determining the Overall Performance Category

Supervisors are responsible for determining an Overall Performance Category for each teacher educator at the conclusion of the summative evaluation year.* The Overall Performance Category is informed by the educator's ratings on professional practice and student growth. The evaluator determines the Overall Performance Category based on professional judgment informed by evidence that demonstrates the educator's performance against the Domains, district-developed rubrics (see local contribution for student growth), and decision rules that establish a common understanding of performance thresholds to which all educators are held.

Rating Professional Practice


The Kentucky Framework for Teaching and Other Specialists Frameworks stands as the critical rubric for providing educators and evaluators with concrete descriptions of practice associated with specific domains. Each element describes a discrete behavior or related set of behaviors that educators and evaluators can prioritize for evidence gathering, feedback, and eventually, evaluation. Supervisors organize and analyze evidence for each individual educator based on these concrete descriptions of practice.

The process concludes with the evaluator's analysis of evidence and the final assessment of practice in relation to performance described under each Domain at the culmination of an educator's cycle.

Required

- ◆ **Provide a summative rating for each domain based on evidence.**
- ◆ **All ratings must be recorded in the department-approved technology platform**

**At any time, when significant deficiencies in work performance have been observed, an employee may be placed in Intensive Support. At that time, the district-designed process will be instituted which includes a specific timeline for observations, support, and conferences. At the end of the specified timeline, the evaluator will provide a written summary of the conferences to the employee. All employees included in the JCTA bargaining unit will follow the process as specified in the JCBE-JCTA labor agreement.*




Rating Overall Student Growth

The overall Student Growth Rating is a result of a combination of professional judgment and the district-developed instruments for summative student growth ratings. The designed instruments aid the supervisor in applying professional judgment to multiple evidences of student growth over time. The Student Growth Rating must include data from SGG and MSGP (where available), and will be considered in a three year cycle (when available).

Required

- ◆ **SGG and MSGP (when available) will be used to determine overall Student Growth Rating.**
- ◆ **Determine the process for using up to three years of student growth data (when available) to determine overall Student Growth Rating for teachers.**



Local District Decision

Local Student Growth Goal (SGG) only - Single Year

LOCAL STUDENT GROWTH GOAL DECISION RULES MATRIX AND OVERALL STUDENT GROWTH RATING		
Growth TARGET	Proficiency TARGET	OVERALL SG RATING
High	High	High
	Expected	High
	Low	Expected
Expected	High	High
	Expected	Expected
	Low	Expected
Low	High	Expected
	Expected	Expected
	Low	Low

State Median Student Growth Percentile (MSGP) - Single Year

- ◆ If a teacher has both Math and ELA MSGPs, the following district decision rules will be used to guide professional judgment in determining combined State MSGP rating.

JCPS Decision Rules for Combining State Math/ELA MSGP Ratings	
Teacher has a LOW MSGP Rating	<i>Overall MSGP rating cannot be HIGH</i>
Teacher has an EXPECTED or HIGH MSGP Rating	<i>Overall MSGP rating cannot be LOW</i>

- ◆ If a teacher has a state MSGP rating, the following district decision rules will be used to guide professional judgment regarding how to combine SGG with MSGP to determine Overall SG rating.

COMBINED LOCAL AND STATE CONTRIBUTION STUDENT GROWTH RATING (Applies only to teachers of Math/ELA grades 4-8)		
LOCAL SGG RATING	STATE MSGP RATING (provided by the state)	OVERALL SG RATING
High	High	High
	Expected	High
	Low	Expected
Expected	High	High
	Expected	Expected
	Low	Expected
Low	High	Expected
	Expected	Expected
	Low	Low

Combining SG Category Ratings - Multiple Years

- ◆ The following district decision rules will be used to guide professional judgment when combining multiple years (up to 3 most recent years) of SG category ratings to determine combined multiple-year SG category ratings.
- ◆ To be used with each SG category (Local SGG, State MSGP, and Overall SG) separately.

JCPS Decision Rules for Combining MULTIPLE YEARS of SG Category Ratings (up to 3 most recent years)	
Teacher/Other Professional has any LOW SG category ratings	SG category rating CANNOT be rated as HIGH
Teacher/Other Professional has half (two-year) or the majority (three-year) of SG category ratings as EXPECTED or HIGH	SG category rating CANNOT be rated as LOW

Determining the Overall Performance Category

An educator's Overall Performance Category is determined using the following steps:

- ◆ Determine the individual domain ratings through the use of sources of evidence and professional judgment.
- ◆ Apply State Decisions Rules for determining an educator's Professional Practice rating.
- ◆ Use Local Student Growth Goal instrument to determine overall Student Growth Rating.

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING TEACHER'S/OTHER PROFESSIONAL'S PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE RATING

IF...	THEN...
Two Domains are rated ACCOMPLISHED and two Domains are rated EXEMPLARY	Professional Practice Rating shall be Exemplary
Two Domains are rated DEVELOPING and two Domains are rated EXEMPLARY	Professional Practice Rating shall be Accomplished
Two Domains are rated DEVELOPING and two Domains are rated ACCOMPLISHED	Professional Practice Rating shall be Accomplished
Domains 1 OR 4 are rated INEFFECTIVE	Professional Practice Rating shall NOT be Exemplary
Domains 2 OR 3 are rated INEFFECTIVE	Professional Practice Rating shall be Developing or Ineffective
Domains 2 and 3 are rated INEFFECTIVE	Professional Practice Rating shall be Ineffective

~~Local Student Growth Goal Instruments to Determine Overall Student Growth Rating.~~

LOCAL STUDENT GROWTH GOAL DECISION RULES MATRIX AND OVERALL STUDENT GROWTH RATING		
Growth TARGET	Proficiency TARGET	OVERALL SG RATING
High	High	High
	Expected	High
	Low	Expected
Expected	High	High
	Expected	Expected
	Low	Expected
Low	High	Expected
	Expected	Expected
	Low	Low

COMBINED LOCAL AND STATE CONTRIBUTION STUDENT GROWTH RATING (Applies only to teachers of Math/ELA grades 4-8)		
LOCAL SGG RATING	STATE MSGP RATING (provided by the state)	OVERALL SG RATING
High	High	High
	Expected	High
	Low	Expected
Expected	High	High
	Expected	Expected
	Low	Expected
Low	High	Expected
	Expected	Expected
	Low	Low

Apply State Overall Decision Rules for determining educator’s Overall Performance Category.

KDE Required

- ◆ All summative ratings must be recorded in the department-approved technology platform.

Determining the Overall Performance Category Decision Rules Matrix

KDE Required

- ◆ Implement the Overall Performance Category for determining effectiveness.

Decision Rules Matrix for Determining Teacher/Other Professional Overall Performance Category

TEACHER/OTHER PROFESSIONAL OVERALL PERFORMANCE CATEGORY		
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE RATING	STUDENT GROWTH RATING	OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING
EXEMPLARY	High	Exemplary
	Expected	Exemplary
	Low	Developing
ACCOMPLISHED	High	Exemplary
	Expected	Accomplished
	Low	Developing
DEVELOPING	High	Accomplished
	Expected	Developing
	Low	Developing
INEFFECTIVE	High	Developing
	Expected	Ineffective
	Low	Ineffective

TPGES and OPGES Professional Growth Plan and Summative Cycle*

For tenured educators, based on the overall Professional Practice rating and Student Growth rating, the type of Professional Growth Plan and the length of the summative cycle is determined using the chart below. A one year, directed professional growth plan and summative cycle will apply for all non-tenured educators. *Counselors will follow the one year Professional Growth Plan and Summative Cycle chart on p. 30.

		PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN AND SUMMATIVE CYCLE FOR TENURED TPGES AND OPGES EDUCATORS		
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE RATING	EXEMPLARY	<p>THREE-YEAR CYCLE SELF-DIRECTED GROWTH PLAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal set by educator with evaluator input • One goal must focus on low student growth outcome • Formative review annually 	<p>THREE-YEAR CYCLE SELF-DIRECTED GROWTH PLAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals set by educator with evaluator input • Plan activities are teacher directed and implemented with colleagues. • Formative review annually • Summative occurs at the end of year 3. 	
	ACCOMPLISHED			
	DEVELOPING	<p>ONE-YEAR CYCLE DIRECTED GROWTH PLAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal(s) Determined by evaluator • Goals focus on professional practice and student growth • Plan activities designed by evaluator with teacher input • Summative review annually 	<p>THREE-YEAR CYCLE SELF-DIRECTED GROWTH PLAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal(s) set by educator with evaluator input; one must address professional practice or student growth. • Formative review annually. 	<p>THREE-YEAR CYCLE SELF-DIRECTED GROWTH PLAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal(s) set by educator with evaluator input • Formative review annually
	INEFFECTIVE	<p>UP TO 12-MONTH IMPROVEMENT PLAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal(s) determined by evaluator • Focus on low performance • Summative at end of plan 	<p>ONE YEAR DIRECTED GROWTH PLAN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal determined by evaluator • Goals focused on low performance/outcome area • Plan activities designed by evaluator with educator input • Formative review at midpoint • Summative at end of plan 	
		LOW	EXPECTED	HIGH
		STUDENT GROWTH RATING		

Counselor Professional Growth Plan and Summative Cycle

Based on the overall Professional Practice rating and Student Growth rating, supervisors will determine the type of Professional Growth Plan required of the counselor.

		PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN AND SUMMATIVE CYCLE FOR COUNSELORS		
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE RATING	EXEMPLARY	Shall have a minimum of a Professional Growth Plan developed by Evaluator	Shall have a minimum of a Professional Growth Plan developed by Evaluatee	
	ACCOMPLISHED			
	DEVELOPING	Shall have a minimum of a Professional Growth Plan developed by Evaluator		Shall have a minimum of a Professional Growth Plan developed by Evaluatee
	INEFFECTIVE	Shall have a minimum of a Professional Growth Plan, for a duration of up to one (1) year, developed by the Evaluator.		
		LOW	EXPECTED	HIGH
		STUDENT GROWTH RATING		

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND EFFECTIVENESS SYSTEM

—

PRINCIPAL AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL


SOURCES OF EVIDENCE/FRAMWORK FOR PRINCIPAL/ASST PRINCIPAL ALIGNMENT

		Instructional Leadership	School Climate	Human Resources Management	Organizational Management	Communication and Community Relations	Professionalism
		Standards	<p><i>The principal fosters the success of all students by facilitating the development, communication, implementation, and evaluation of a shared vision of teaching and learning that leads to student academic growth and school improvement.</i></p>	<p><i>The principal fosters the success of all students by developing, advocating, and sustaining an academically rigorous, positive, and safe school climate for all stakeholders.</i></p>	<p><i>The principal fosters effective human resources management by assisting with selection and induction, and by supporting, evaluating, and retaining quality instructional and support personnel.</i></p>	<p><i>The principal fosters the success of all students by supporting, managing, and overseeing the school's organization, operation, and use of resources.</i></p>	<p><i>The principal fosters the success of all students by communicating and collaborating effectively with stakeholders.</i></p>
SOURCES OF EVIDENCE To Inform Professional Practice	Site Visits	Observation; District Identified Evidence (conferences)	Observation		District Identified Evidence (conferences)		
	Professional Growth	Professional Growth Planning and Self Reflection					
	Self-Reflection	Instructional Leadership	School Climate	Human Resources Management	Organizational Management	Communication and Community Relations	Professionalism
	Working Conditions Goal	TELL Kentucky & Other District Identified Feedback					
		Time; Professional Development; Instructional Practices & Support; School Leadership	Time; Managing Student Conduct	Instructional Practices & Support; Facilities & Resources; Teacher Leadership; New Teacher Support	Facilities & Resources; Teacher Leadership; School Leadership	Community Support & Involvement	Time; PD; Instructional Practices & Support; Facilities & Resources; Teacher Leadership; New Teacher Support
Val-Ed360 Survey	Superintendent & Teacher Feedback						
	High Standards for Student Learning; Rigorous Curriculum; Quality Instruction	Culture of Learning & Professional Behavior	Quality Instruction; Performance Accountability	Quality Instruction	Culture of Learning & Professional Behavior; Connections to External Communities	Culture of Learning & Professional Behavior	

Principal Professional Growth and Effectiveness System Components

Overview and Summative Model

The following graphic outlines the summative model for the Principal Professional Growth and Effectiveness System.



Evaluators will look for trends and patterns in practice across multiple types of evidence and apply their professional judgment based on this evidence when evaluating a principal. The role of evidence and professional judgment in the determination of ratings on standards and an overall rating is paramount in this process. However, professional judgment must be grounded in the common framework identified: The Principal Performance Standards.

Principal Performance Standards

The Principal Performance Standards are designed to support student achievement and professional best-practice through the standards of Instructional Leadership; School Climate; Human Resource Management; Organizational Management; Communication & Community Relations; and Professionalism. Included in the Performance Standards are Performance Indicators that provide examples of observable, tangible behaviors that provide evidence of each standard. The Performance Standards provide the structure for feedback for continuous improvement through individual goals that target professional growth, thus supporting overall student achievement and school improvement. Evidence supporting a principal's or assistant principal's professional practice will be situated within one or more of the six standards. Performance will be rated for each standard according to the four performance levels: Ineffective, Developing, Accomplished, and Exemplary. The summative rating will be a holistic representation of performance, combining data from multiple sources of evidence across each standard.

The use of professional judgment based on multiple sources of evidence promotes a more holistic and comprehensive analysis of practice, rather than over-reliance on one individual data point or rote calculation of practice based on predetermined formulas. Evaluators will also take into account how principals respond to or apply additional supports and resources designed to promote student learning, as well as their own professional growth and development. Finally, professional judgment gives evaluators the flexibility to account for a wide variety of factors related to individual principal performance. These factors may include school-specific priorities that may drive practice in one standard, an educator's number of goals, experience level and/or leadership opportunities. Contextual variables may also impact the learning environment, such as unanticipated outside events or traumas.

Evaluators must use the following categories of evidence in determining overall ratings:

KDE Required Sources of Evidence

- ◆ **Professional Growth Planning and Self-Reflection**
- ◆ **Site-Visits**
- ◆ **Val-Ed 360°**
- ◆ **Working Conditions Goal**
- ◆ **State and Local Student Growth Goal data**

Evaluators may use the following categories of evidence in determining overall ratings:

- ✓ **Other Measures of Student Learning**
- ✓ **Products of Practice**
- ✓ **Other Sources**

Professional Practice

The following sections provide a detailed overview of the various sources of evidence used to inform Professional Practice Ratings.

Professional Growth Planning and Self-Reflection

Completed by principals & assistant principals

The Professional Growth Plan will address realistic, focused, and measurable professional goals. The plan will connect data from multiple sources including site-visit conferences, data on student growth and achievement, and professional growth needs identified through self-assessment and reflection. Self-reflection improves principal practice through ongoing, careful consideration of the impact of leadership practice on student growth and achievement.

KDE Required:

- ♦ **All principals will participate in self-reflection and professional growth planning each year.**
- ♦ **All assistant principals will participate in self-reflection and professional growth planning each year.**

Local District Decision:

Administrator and Superintendent/Designee will work together to implement the steps for self-reflection/PGP as indicated on the timeline below.

Timeline for Self-Reflection/PGP/Site Visits	
Timeline	Action
First 30 calendar days	Evaluation criteria and process used to evaluate shall be explained
By Oct. 15* (or within 15 calendar days of the release of state testing results)	Develop PGP and SGG- Administrator reflects on his/her current growth needs and collaborates with supervisor to develop growth plan. This will be documented on the approved district form. *New hires will complete PGP and SGG within 30 calendar days of employment.
Fall semester	Site visit(s)/observations, ongoing self-reflection
Mid-Year Review	Review progress/reflections on growth and modify plan as appropriate
Spring Semester	Site visit(s)/observations, ongoing self-reflection
By June 30	Summative reflection and Evaluation – annual summative evaluation submitted for official personnel record, copy provided to employee who may include written response

Site-Visits/Observations

Completed by supervisor of principal – *formal site visits are not required for assistant principals*

Site visits/observations are a method by which the superintendent or designee may gain insight into the principal's practice in relation to the standards. During site visits/observations, the superintendent or designee will discuss various aspects of the job with the principal, and will use the principal's responses to determine issues to further explore with the faculty and staff. Additionally, the principal may explain the successes and trials the school community has experienced in relation to school improvement.

KDE Required:

- ◆ **Conducted at least twice each year. (Formal site-visits are not required for the assistant principal.)**

Local District Decision:

- ◆ Site-visits/observations conducted twice during the instructional year, regardless of hire date, will be documented on the district-approved observation/site visit conference form – PPGES-2.
- ◆ During the post-visit conference professional growth plan progress, evidence toward Principal Performance Standards, as well as student growth goal monitoring will be reviewed.
- ◆ A district-approved form will be used during the conferences and mid-year review to guide and document the reflections and any modifications to the plan.

Val-Ed 360°

Completed for principals – *not completed for assistant principals*

The VAL-ED 360° is an assessment that provides feedback on a principal's learning-centered behaviors by using input from the principal, his/her supervisor, and teachers. All teachers will participate in the Val-Ed 360°. The results of the survey will be included as a source of data to inform each principal's professional practice rating.

Required:

- ◆ **Conducted at least once every two years in the school year that TELL Kentucky is not administered.**

Local District Decision:

- ◆ Director of Administrator Recruitment & Development will oversee the administration of Val-Ed 360°.
- ◆ The Val-Ed 360° and TELL Surveys will be administered in alternating years.
- ◆ The Val-Ed 360° will be completed by April 1, regardless of the principal hire date.
- ◆ Val-Ed 360° results will be analyzed by the principal and supervisor.
- ◆ The Superintendent, Assistant Superintendents, and Director of Administrator Recruitment & Development will also have access to Val-Ed 360° results.

Working Conditions Goal

Goal inherited by Assistant Principal

Principals are responsible for setting a two-year Working Conditions Growth Goal based on the most recent TELL Kentucky Survey.

KDE Required:

- ◆ **Developed following the completion of the TELL Kentucky Survey.**
- ◆ **Minimum of one two-year goal.**

Local District Decision:

- A minimum of one Working Conditions Goal will be developed in collaboration with the supervisor of the principal using sources of evidence, including the TELL Survey results, and documented on the district-approved form.
- Progress toward meeting the Working Conditions Goal will be discussed during mid-point review.

Working Conditions Growth Goal Ratings		
LOW	EXPECTED	HIGH
Does not meet goal within 10 percentage points	Meets goal within 10 percentage points	Exceeds goal

Products of Practice/Other Sources of Evidence

Principals/Assistant principals may provide additional evidences to support assessment of their own professional practice. These evidences should yield information related to the principal's/assistant principal's practice within the standards.

Local District Decision:

Products of Practice may include, but are not limited to:

- ✓ SBDM Minutes
- ✓ Faculty Meeting Agendas and Minutes
- ✓ Principal and/or school PLC Agendas and Minutes
- ✓ Delivery Planning
- ✓ CSIP
- ✓ Department/Grade Level Agendas and Minutes
- ✓ Leadership Team Agendas and Minutes
- ✓ Walk-through documentation
- ✓ Budgets
- ✓ EILA/Professional Learning Experience Documentation
- ✓ Other Surveys
- ✓ Professional/Community Organization Memberships
- ✓ Parent/Community Events
- ✓ School Schedules

Student Growth

The following sections provide a detailed overview of the various sources of evidence used to inform Student Growth Ratings. At least one of the Student Growth Goals set by the principal must address gap populations. **Assistant principals will inherit the SGG (both state and local contributions) of the Principal.**

State Contribution

ASSIST/Next Generation Learners (NGL) Goal Based on Trajectory –

Goal inherited by Assistant Principal

Principals are responsible for setting at least one Student Growth Goal that is tied directly to the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan located in ASSIST. The superintendent and the principal will meet to discuss the trajectory for the goal and to establish the year’s goal that will help reach the long-term trajectory target.

Required:

- ♦ **Selection based on ASSIST/NGL trajectory.**
- ♦ **Based on Gap population unless local goal is based on Gap population.**
- ♦ ***If the school does not receive state level data, the principal will construct two local student growth goals.***

Local District Decision:

State Student Growth Goal Rating Rubric (Based on ASSIST/Next Generation Learners (NGL) Trajectory - Applies to Gap and Non-Gap Goals) <i>Goal inherited by Assistant Principal</i>		
LOW	EXPECTED	HIGH
Does not meet identified Trajectory <i>increase</i> (baseline to target) within 50%	Meets identified Trajectory <i>increase</i> (baseline to target) within 50%	Exceeds identified Trajectory <i>increase</i> (baseline to target)

Local Contribution

Based on School Need - *Goal inherited by Assistant Principal*

The local goal for student growth should be based on school need. It may be developed to parallel the State Contribution or it may be developed with a different focus.

Required:

- ♦ **Based on gap population unless State goal is based on Gap population.**

Local District Decision:

Each Principal will create a minimum of one local growth goal, developed in collaboration with, and approved by, his/her supervisor. If the school does not receive state level data, the principal will construct two local student growth goals. The process of determining high, expected, or low growth will be set by the superintendent or designee and the principal.

Local Student Growth Goal Rating Rubric (Based on School Need - Applies to Gap and Non-Gap Goals) <i>Goal inherited by Assistant Principal</i>		
LOW	EXPECTED	HIGH
<70% of identified increase target met	70% - < 85% of identified increase target met	≥ 85% of identified increase target met

Determining the Overall Performance Category

Superintendents/designees are responsible for determining an Overall Performance Category for each principal at the conclusion of their summative evaluation year and recorded on the department-approved technology platform by June 30.* The Overall Performance Category is informed by the principal’s ratings on professional practice and student growth.


Rating Overall Professional Practice

Required:

- ◆ Use decision rules to determine an overall rating.
- ◆ Record ratings in the department-approved technology platform.

Local District Decision:

- ✓ Describe timelines for rating professional practice.



Professional practice ratings will be discussed during site visits. Evidence and feedback for professional practice ratings may occur at each observation/site visit, and will occur at the midyear growth plan reflection meeting.

**At any time, when significant deficiencies in work performance have been observed, an employee may be placed in Intensive Support. At that time, the district-designed process will be instituted which includes a specific timeline for observations/site visits, support, and conferences. At the end of the specified timeline, the evaluator will provide a written summary of the conferences to the employee.*

A principal's/assistant principal's Overall Performance Category is determined by the evaluator based on the principal's ratings on each standard, as well as student growth. Using the sources of evidence for principals/assistant principals, evaluators will use professional judgment to determine a rating for each standard. Next, the evaluator will use the following decision rules for determining the Professional Practice Category:

Determining Professional Practice

- ◆ **Apply the State Decision Rules for determining an Overall Professional Practice Rating.**

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING A PRINCIPAL OR OTHER BUILDING-LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR'S PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE RATING

IF...	THEN...
Principal or other building level administrator is rated Exemplary in at least four of the standards and no standard is rated Developing or Ineffective	Professional Practice Rating shall be Exemplary
Principal or other building level administrator is rated Accomplished in at least four of the standards and no standard is rated Ineffective	Professional Practice Rating shall be Accomplished
Principal or other building level administrator is rated Developing in at least five standards	Professional Practice Rating shall be Developing
Principal or other building level administrator is rated Ineffective in two or more standards	Professional Practice Rating shall be Ineffective


Rating Overall Student Growth

Overall Student Growth Rating results from a combination of professional judgment and the district-developed instrument. The instrument is designed to aid the evaluator in applying professional judgment to multiple evidences of student growth over time. Student growth ratings must include data from both the local and state contributions.

Required:

- ◆ **Determine the rating using both state and local growth.**
- ◆ **Determine the rating using multiple years of data up to 3 years (when available).**
- ◆ **Record ratings in the department-approved technology platform by June 15.**

Local District Decision:



Combining Student Growth Category Ratings – Single Year

- ◆ The following district decision rules will be used to guide professional judgment regarding how to combine Local SGG rating with State ASSIST/NGL Goal rating to determine Overall SG rating.

PRINCIPAL AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL COMBINED STUDENT GROWTH RATING		
LOCAL SGG RATING	STATE ASSIST/NGL GOAL RATING	OVERALL SG RATING
High	High	High
	Expected	High
	Low	Expected
Expected	High	High
	Expected	Expected
	Low	Expected
Low	High	Expected
	Expected	Expected
	Low	Low

Combining Student Growth Category Ratings - Multiple Years

- ◆ The following district decision rules will be used to guide professional judgment when combining multiple years (up to 3 most recent years) of SG category ratings to determine combined multiple-year SG category ratings.
- ◆ To be used with each SG category (Local SGG, State Assist/NGL Rating, and Overall SG) separately.

JCPS Decision Rules for Combining MULTIPLE YEARS of SG Category Ratings (up to 3 most recent years)	
Administrator has any LOW SG category ratings	SG category rating CANNOT be rated as HIGH
Administrator has half (two-year) or the majority (three-year) of SG category ratings as EXPECTED or HIGH	SG category rating CANNOT be rated as LOW

Determining the Overall Performance Category Decision Rules Matrix

A principal's/assistant principal's Overall Performance Category is determined by the evaluator based on the principal's ratings on Professional Practice and Student Growth. Next, the evaluator will use the following decision rules for determining the Overall Performance Category.

- ◆ Apply State Overall Decision Rules for determining a principal's/assistant principal's Overall Performance Category.

KDE Required


- ◆ All summative ratings must be recorded in the department-approved technology platform by June 30.

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING A BUILDING LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR'S OVERALL PERFORMANCE CATEGORY

PRINCIPAL AND ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL OVERALL PERFORMANCE CATEGORY		
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE RATING	STUDENT GROWTH RATING	OVERALL PERFORMANCE RATING
EXEMPLARY	High	Exemplary
	Expected	Exemplary
	Low	Developing
ACCOMPLISHED	High	Exemplary
	Expected	Accomplished
	Low	Developing
DEVELOPING	High	Accomplished
	Expected	Developing
	Low	Developing
INEFFECTIVE	High	Ineffective
	Expected	Ineffective
	Low	Ineffective

Professional Growth Plan and Summative Cycle

Based on the overall Professional Practice rating and Student Growth rating, supervisors will determine the type of Professional Growth Plan required of the principal.



Other District Certified Personnel

INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATION OF DISTRICT LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS AND OTHER CERTIFIED DISTRICT PERSONNEL

I. Purpose

The job performance evaluation is designed to be a growth-oriented process to meet the following objectives:

- A. promote improved job performance and job satisfaction,
- B. recognize employees whose performance warrants commendation,
- C. identify employees who need assistance, and
- D. establish documentation for personnel action.

II. The Evaluation Process and Instructions

- A. An **annual**, formal, written summative evaluation of the performance of **administrative** other district certified personnel will normally be completed near the end of the academic year.
- B. **Limited contract non-administrative** other district certified personnel will be evaluated **annually**. **Continuing contract non-administrative** other district certified personnel **may be evaluated on a three year cycle**. Observations of non-administrative other district certified personnel will be documented on Formative Evaluation E-2 Teacher.
- C. The evaluation will be made by the supervisor to whom the evaluatee reports as indicated in the evaluatee's current job description.
 - 1. Near the beginning of the work year, a pre-observation conference is to be held with each evaluatee to discuss job expectations and applicable evaluation criteria, forms and procedures. The conference is to be summarized on the appropriate Formative Evaluation Form E-2.
 - 2. A Professional Growth Plan (a plan for personal professional growth related to the assignment or to characteristics of effective leadership and the criteria for assessing the degree to which progress is made), which the employee has helped develop, is to be established for each administrator during the year.
 - 3. The Professional Growth Plan may be either for professional enrichment or for professional skill growth. The evaluative criteria or characteristic of effective leadership in which growth is desired, the specific performance objective/desired outcome, the procedures/strategies for reaching the objective, the method for appraising when the objective is reached, and the timelines/target dates for reaching the objective or parts of the objective are to be clearly stated in narrative style on the Growth Plan Form G (administrators) or Formative E2 (non-administrators).

4. At mid-year, a conference may be held to identify strengths and areas needing improvement and to review performance standards, objectives, and progress on the Growth Plan. The conference is to be summarized on Formative Evaluation Form E-2 (properly checked in upper left corner).
- D. When the supervisor determines that there is sufficient discrepancy between the administrative standards (JCPS policies and/or State procedures), the job description, and the administrator's performance, the Intensive Support process will be initiated ensuring that due process procedures are followed. ***Note that the process for non-administrative other district certified personnel will follow the Intensive Support procedure as set forth in Article 8 – Employee Evaluation of the JCTA/JCBE 2013-2018 Agreement.**
1. The Administrative Intensive Support process is initiated by the supervisor based on administrative standards and responsibilities outlined in the job description. The supervisor will have a conference with the administrator to identify substandard performance in writing and discuss significant deficiencies. Deficiencies and suggested corrective action will be noted in writing. Form A will be completed to document this conference.
 2. The supervisor will assign two (2) qualified, professional staff members with evaluative authority to assist the administrator during the Intensive Support period. A peer administrator, preferably in the same job category, will also be assigned as support.
 3. The team of supervisor, professional staff members, and peer administrator will conduct a conference with the administrator within the first ten (10) days of the Intensive Support period. During this conference, a process will be determined by the team to address the areas of concern as outlined in Form A. Form E-2 will be completed to document this conference. Another conference will be conducted before recommendations are made available to the supervisor. The administrator or the collegial team may request additional conferences between the initial conference and the final conference. Such requests will be honored and conferences will be documented on Form E-2.
 4. It is expected that support for the administrator during the Intensive Support process could also come from sources of the administrator's choosing. Support will be provided to the administrator to improve in areas that are identified as deficient.
 5. Recommendations will be made by the professional staff members to the supervisor within twelve (12) weeks of the initial conference. Depending on the nature of the deficiency, recommendations may be for a resumption of the normal evaluation process, an extension of time for the Intensive Support process or disciplinary action up to and including demotion or termination. The supervisor, as the primary evaluator, will make a determination based upon recommendations received and will

complete the summative evaluation, utilizing Form A.2.

6. Confidentiality will be maintained within the bounds of statues and regulations pertaining to professional evaluation.
- E. A conference is to be held to discuss the summative evaluation, documented on Form A.2 (administrators) or Form D2 (other district certified teachers), when it is received by the evaluatee, focusing on strengths and areas needing improvement.
- F. Completed evaluation forms should be distributed as follows: one(1) copy retained by the evaluator, one(1) copy provided to the evaluatee, and the original to be included in the personnel file.

III. Review and Appeal Instructions

- A. All deficient work performance evaluations are to be reviewed by the unit director/school center head/or next in authority relationship, before presentation to the evaluatee to ensure that:
 1. Evaluations are based upon job performance and related activities,
 2. Any deficiencies noted have been brought to the attention of the employee and supporting documentation is available, and
 3. The appropriate evaluation process ~~have~~ has been followed.
- B. All unsatisfactory evaluations used as a basis for discharge/demotion of an administrator are to be submitted to the appropriate department head for informational purposes.
- C. Evaluations with a recommendation of RETENTION are to be reviewed by the evaluator's supervisor to ensure that performance of all employees is properly reported and that evaluations within the department are consistent.
- D. The evaluatee may submit a written response within ten (10) days of the receipt of the evaluation to Personnel Services. The response is to be attached to the evaluation.
- E. The evaluatee may appeal an evaluation through the JCPS Local Evaluation Appeal Panel (LEAP) according to the procedures set forth in the JCPS Certified Evaluation Plan.

Appeals

Required

- ◆ **Districts shall have an appeals process established.**

According to 156.557 Section 9,

Section 9. (1) A certified employee who feels that the local district is not properly implementing the evaluation plan according to the way it was approved by the Kentucky Department of Education shall have the opportunity to appeal to the Kentucky Board of Education.

(2) The appeal procedures shall be as follows:

(a) The Kentucky Board of Education shall appoint a committee of three (3) state board members to serve on the State Evaluation Appeals Panel. Its jurisdiction shall be limited to procedural matters already addressed by the local appeals panel required by KRS 156.557(5). The panel shall not have jurisdiction relative to a complaint involving the professional judgmental conclusion of an evaluation, and the panel's review shall be limited to the record of proceedings at the local district level.

(b) No later than thirty (30) days after the final action or decision at the local district level, the certified employee may submit a written request to the chief state school officer for a review before the State Evaluation Appeals Panel. An appeal not filed in a timely manner shall not be considered. A specific description of the complaint and grounds for appeal shall be submitted with this request.

(c) A brief, written statement, and other document which a party wants considered by the State Evaluation Appeals Panel shall be filed with the panel and served on the opposing party at least twenty (20) days prior to the scheduled review.

(d) A decision of the appeals panel shall be rendered within fifteen (15) working days after the review.

(e) A determination of noncompliance shall render the evaluation void, and the employee shall have the right to be reevaluated. (11 Ky.R. 1107; Am. 1268; eff. 3-12-85; 12 Ky.R. 1638; 1837; eff. 6-10-86; 15 Ky.R. 1561; 1849; eff. 3-23-89; 17 Ky.R. 116; eff. 9-13-90; 19 Ky.R. 515; 947; 1081; eff. 11-9-92; 20 Ky.R. 845; eff. 12-6-93; 23 Ky.R. 2277; 2732; eff. 1-9-97; 27 Ky.R. 1874; 2778; eff. 4-9-2001.)

Appeals/Hearings

All certified employees shall have the right to appeal a summative evaluation to the Local Evaluation Appeals Panel ("LEAP").

Formation of LEAP

A LEAP shall be established in accordance with KRS Chapter 156 and 704 KAR 3:345. The responsibility of the LEAP is to review and/or hear appeals from certified employees in reference to employees' summative evaluations.

JCPS Local Evaluation Appeals Panels (LEAPs)

LEAPs shall have the responsibility to review and/or hear appeals from certified employees regarding their summative evaluations. The names and positions of individuals elected to serve on LEAPs shall be maintained on the JCPS web site.

Certified Personnel (non-administrative):

The pool of employees for the **certified personnel (non-administrative) LEAP** shall consist of 12 individuals elected from and by employees eligible for JCTA membership and 6 certified employees appointed by the superintendent/designee.

- Four of the 12 certified employees elected from the JCTA employee group shall be elected each year by the end of September. Once elected, employees will serve on the LEAP pool for three years or until the individual is no longer employed by JCPS in a JCTA eligible employee group.
- Two of the 6 certified employees appointed by the superintendent/designee shall be appointed each year by the end of September. Once appointed, employees will serve on the LEAP pool for three years or until the individual is no longer employed by JCPS.
- All LEAP members will be jointly trained by JCPS and JCTA.

Formation of a 3-person LEAP when a certified personnel (non-administrative) evaluation is appealed:

- The LEAP will consist of 3 individuals chosen mutually from the elected LEAP pool by the JCPS superintendent/designee and the JCTA president.
 - One member of the 3-person LEAP shall be chosen from the 6 appointed to the pool by the superintendent/designee.
 - Two members of the 3-person LEAP shall be chosen from the 12 elected to the pool by the JCTA eligible employee group.
- No individual shall be selected for a specific 3 person LEAP if the evaluation appeal is made by an employee at the individual's school/site (or achievement area for ETCs), the appeal is made by a relative of the evaluatee or the evaluator (as defined by JCBE policy 3.11), or the individual has been prejudiced in the appeal being considered.
- Once the 3-member panel is constituted, the LEAP shall select a chairperson. The chair person shall ensure that all procedures are followed and timelines are met.

Certified Personnel (administrative):

The pool of employees for the **certified personnel (administrative) LEAP** shall consist of 12 certified employees elected by employees eligible for JCASA membership and 6 certified employees appointed by the superintendent/designee.

- Four of the 12 certified employees in the LEAP pool elected from the JCASA employee group shall be elected each year by the end of September. Once elected, employees will serve on the LEAP pool for three years or until the individual is no longer employed by JCPS in a JCASA eligible employee group.
- Two of the 6 certified employees in the LEAP pool who are appointed by the superintendent/designee shall be appointed each year by the end of September. Once appointed, employees will serve on the LEAP pool for three years or until the individual is no longer employed by JCPS.
- All LEAP members will be jointly trained by JCPS and JCASA.

Formation of a 3-person LEAP when a certified personnel (administrative) evaluation is appealed:

- The LEAP will consist of 3 individuals chosen mutually from the pool by the JCPS superintendent/designee and the JCASA president.
 - One member of the 3-person LEAP shall be chosen from the 6 certified employees appointed to the pool by the superintendent/designee.
 - Two members of the 3-person LEAP shall be chosen from the 12 certified employees elected to the pool by the JCASA eligible employee group.
- No individual shall be selected for a specific 3 person LEAP if the evaluation appeal is made by an employee at the individual's school/site (or achievement area for ETCs), the appeal is made by a relative of the evaluatee or the evaluator (as defined by JCBE policy 3.11), or the individual has been prejudiced in the appeal being considered.
- Once the 3-member panel is constituted, the LEAP shall select a chairperson. The chairperson shall ensure that all procedures are followed and timelines are met.

Appeals Procedure

All certified school personnel shall receive written notice of their right to appeal, including applicable deadlines and the right to request a hearing, at the time summative evaluation results are provided to the certified school personnel.

1. Certified personnel shall have the right to appeal to a LEAP within fourteen (14) calendar days after receiving a summative evaluation. The LEAP will have no jurisdiction unless an appeal is filed with the LEAP. Appeals must be submitted in writing to the superintendent/designee.
2. If an employee chooses to appeal an evaluation via a LEAP, the employee shall not be eligible to grieve the evaluation.
3. If an employee chooses to grieve an evaluation, the employee shall not be eligible to appeal the evaluation via a LEAP and the contractual timeline for grievances must be followed.
4. Appeals to a LEAP may be based upon evaluation process or evaluation content concerns.
5. An employee placed in "Intensive Support" may appeal the resulting summative evaluation to LEAP at the conclusion of the Intensive Support process, but employment decisions based on the Intensive Support process cannot be appealed to a LEAP.
6. Certified personnel shall submit their written appeals to the superintendent/designee using the Certified Evaluation Appeals Form. As directed by the Certified Evaluation Appeals Form, Certified school personnel shall specifically indicate whether or not a hearing is requested. If a hearing is not requested by the certified personnel, the LEAP will decide the matter on written documents submitted by the evaluatee and evaluator.

7. Upon receipt of an appeal from a certified employee, the superintendent/designee shall notify the appropriately-constituted LEAP. The Certified Evaluation Appeals Form, along with any accompanying documentation, will be reviewed by the LEAP within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt by the superintendent/designee. At the time the LEAP conducts its initial review within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt by the superintendent/designee, the following shall occur:
 - If a hearing is requested, a hearing date not to exceed forty-five (45) calendar days from the date the appeal was received by the superintendent/designee shall be set and all parties shall be notified in writing of the hearing date.
 - Written notification to all parties regarding the appeal procedure, including all applicable submission deadlines shall be sent.
 - If a hearing is requested, written notification of the hearing procedures, including all applicable submission deadlines and the right to have a chosen representative, including an attorney, present at the hearing shall be sent.
 - The evaluatee and the evaluator shall be advised in writing to submit a copy of all documentation that concerns the summative evaluation.

Hearing

1. If a hearing is requested, all documentation, including witness statements, must be submitted to the superintendent/designee no later than ten (10) calendar days prior to the scheduled hearing. Copies of all documentation, including witness statements, must also be made available to all parties to the appeal no later than five (5) calendar days prior to any scheduled hearing.
2. Any hearing will be held within forty-five (45) calendar days from receipt of appeal by the superintendent/designee unless the timeline is extended by mutual agreement of both parties (JCPS and JCTA or JCASA).
3. The evaluatee and evaluator have the right to have a chosen representative, including an attorney, present at the hearing.
4. The hearing will adhere to the following format and order:
 - a. Reading of the written appeal by the LEAP Chairperson.
 - b. Presentation of relevant evidence by the evaluatee and/or designee in support of the appeal (up to 45 minutes).
 - c. Presentation of relevant evidence by the evaluator and/or designee in support of the summative evaluation (up to 45 minutes).
 - d. Questioning by panel of the evaluatee and/or evaluator.
 - e. Closing arguments by the evaluator (up to 15 minutes).
 - f. Closing arguments by the evaluatee (up to 15 minutes).
 - g. Conclusion of hearing.
5. No party shall be allowed to present any documentation that has not been submitted to the superintendent/designee at least ten (10) calendar days prior to the hearing.
6. No new evidence may be introduced in closing arguments.
7. At any time, either the appellant or the evaluator may concede in writing to the LEAP Chairperson, and the LEAP process will be terminated.
8. Based on the issues identified in the certified personnel's appeal documentation and presented during the hearing, the LEAP shall determine whether the employee has demonstrated that a procedural violation has occurred under the District's evaluation plan

and/or whether the summative evaluation is supported by the evidence. The LEAP may decide to do one or more of the following:

- Uphold the evaluation; or
 - Call for an additional or a replacement evaluation by the same or a different trained evaluator; or
 - Rule in favor of the appellant; either in whole or in part. (If the LEAP rules in favor of the appellant, the LEAP shall have the authority to modify the evaluation or to delete/remove some or all of the evaluation.)
9. The superintendent/designee must take appropriate action consistent with the Appeal Panel's decision.
 10. The decision of the LEAP shall be given in writing to both the appellant and the evaluator within thirty (30) calendar days of the hearing date. The decision of the LEAP shall include written notification of the right to appeal to the State Evaluation Appeals Panel pursuant to KRS Chapter 156 and 704 KAR 3:345, including the applicable timeline for such an appeal.

Appeal Without A Hearing

1. Within five (5) calendar days of the filing of the appeal, the superintendent/designee shall request all supporting document for the evaluatee and the evaluator. All such supporting documentation must be submitted within five (5) calendar days of notification.
2. If a hearing is not requested by the certified personnel on the Certified Evaluation Appeals Form, the LEAP will decide the matter based on written documents submitted by the evaluatee and evaluator.
3. At any time, either the appellant or the evaluator may concede in writing to the superintendent/designee, and the LEAP process will be terminated.
4. Based on the issues identified in the certified personnel's appeal documentation the LEAP shall determine whether the employee has demonstrated that a procedural violation has occurred under the District's evaluation plan and/or whether the summative evaluation is supported by the evidence. The LEAP may decide to do one or more of the following:
 - Uphold the evaluation; or
 - Call for an additional or a replacement evaluation by the same or a different trained evaluator; or
 - Rule in favor of the appellant; either in whole or in part. (If the LEAP rules in favor of the appellant, the LEAP shall have the authority to modify the evaluation or to delete/remove some or all of the evaluation.)
5. The superintendent/designee must take appropriate action consistent with the Appeal Panel's decision.
6. The decision of the LEAP shall be given in writing to both the appellant and the evaluator within thirty (30) calendar days from receipt of appeal by the superintendent/designee. The decision of the LEAP shall include written notification of the right to appeal to the State Evaluation Appeals Panel pursuant to KRS Chapter 156 and 704 KAR 3:345, including the applicable timeline for such an appeal.