

Achieving Equity in Teacher and Principal Distribution

Summary

To enable State officials, parents, the Department of Education, local educators and other key stakeholders to measure States' progress towards improving teacher effectiveness and achieving equity in the distribution of teachers and principals, States will need to collect, publish, and analyze basic information about how districts evaluate teacher and principal effectiveness and distribute their highly qualified and effective teachers among schools. The objective is to highlight inequities that result in low-income and minority students being taught by inexperienced, unqualified, out-of-field or ineffective teachers at higher rates than other students. Similarly, because principals play a critical role in teaching and learning, it is important to highlight inequities that result in low-income and minority students being taught in schools overseen by ineffective principals at higher rates than other students.

General Instructions:

In this section, as appropriate, please update the information that was submitted as part of the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) supplement to the Bridge to Excellence Master Plan Guidance. in December 2009. You should use the December 2009 report as a starting point and update as needed.

Citation	Description	Rationale
Descriptor (a)(1)	Describe, for each local education agency (LEA) in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.	Teacher evaluation systems should reflect a comprehensive review of the established criteria and are an important information source for assessing the distribution of effective teachers.

Directions

Include the following information on the local school system's designated website reporting the evaluation systems of teachers. The description of the teacher evaluation system must explain how evaluation results are used in decisions regarding each of the following: teacher professional development, compensation, promotion, retention and removal. If this information has already been included and updated on your school system's website, please indicate so below and provide the link.

1. Please provide the link to this information on the school system's designated website below:

<http://www.hcpss.org/employees/>

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(3)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.	Evaluation systems that include student achievement outcomes yield reliable assessments of teacher performance. Knowing if an evaluation system includes these outcomes informs the value of teacher performance ratings.

Directions:

1. Do your evaluation systems include achievement outcomes or student growth? (Mark "Yes" or "No")
 - a. Yes, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.
 - b. If Yes, please respond (check one):

 Student achievement outcomes are included as an evaluation criterion.

 Student growth is included as an evaluation criterion.
 - c. No, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers do not include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.

The Guide to Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development, which is currently under revision, provides direction to administrators in the supervision and evaluation of all teachers. The Guide is based on the Frameworks of Excellence in Teaching and Learning which delineates the standards by which teachers are to be supervised and evaluated. The current standards include Interpersonal Skills, Planning and Preparation, the Classroom Environment, Delivery of Instruction and Professional Responsibilities. Principals set expectations and monitor progress using these standards as a foundation. Central Office administrators and content supervisors observe teachers to facilitate their continuous improvement and achievement of the standards.

This observation includes a focus on student learning and results that are achieved within a classroom lesson. The revised edition of this document will expand the standards to include a commitment to cultural proficiency and accountability for student growth and achievement. These expectations are used to assist in the evaluation and retention of teachers in the HCPSS. Additionally, we are in our third year of implementation of Purposeful Observation as an evaluation tool. This process gives principals and teachers common language to leverage student results through teacher performance.

Our response to teacher evaluation is governed by law, research, best practices, and negotiated agreements. The HCPSS supports and encourages the use of student data tools in leveraging student learning. System-wide professional development continues to focus on the use of data to inform instruction and school improvement planning. School based administrators are required to use the systemic data protocol to drive their school improvement plans and help teachers deliver high quality instruction.

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(4)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.	Ratings from teacher evaluation systems further highlight the strengths and weaknesses of those systems and provide valuable information on the distribution of effective teachers across districts.

Directions:

1. Complete the table below by listing each of the rating or performance levels in the LEA's performance evaluation systems, and the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.

Performance Rating or Level	Number of Teachers	Percentage of Teachers
Satisfactory	4,624	99.50 %
Unsatisfactory	23	.50%
	Total: 4,647	

2. Provide the link to this information on the school system's designated website below:

<http://www.hcpss.org/employees/>

3. If the LEA does not currently publicly report this data, please list the major action steps that you will take to make this information publicly available by 6/30/11. Update the Action Steps Table (below) as appropriate to reflect progress to date.

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Completion Date
Proposed plan vetted through School Support Team (Division of Instruction Directors), Division Of Support Services Management Team and Chiefs	Chief Academic Officer, Chief of Staff, and Superintendent	August 2010
Implementation of Data Collection Involving School Based Administrators and the Office of Human Resources	Chief Academic Officer and Chief of Staff	August-September 2010
Data collection process continues with ongoing assessment driving refinement	Chief Academic Officer and Chief of Staff	October 2010-May 2011
Refined process institutionalized	Chief Academic Officer, Chief of Staff, and Superintendent	June 2011

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(5)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.	To the extent information on the distribution of teacher performance ratings is readily accessible by school, State officials, parents and other key stakeholders can identify and address inequities in the distribution of effective teachers on an ongoing basis.

Directions:

1. Is the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level publicly reported for each school in the LEA? Mark "Yes" or "No".
 - a. ____ Yes, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.
 - b. Please provide the link to this information on the LSS's designated website below:
 - c. ___X___ No, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are not publicly reported for each school in the LEA
2. If the LEA does not currently publicly report these data, please list the major action steps

that you will take to publicly report this information by 6/30/11. Update the Action Steps Table (below) as appropriate to reflect progress to date.

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Completion Date
Develop plan with Division of Instruction School Support Team and Division Of Support Services Management Team	Chief Academic Officer, Chief of Staff, and Superintendent	November 2010
Engage relevant stakeholders in data collection process that includes focus groups as well as benchmark analysis of teacher evaluation.	Chief Academic Officer and Chief of Staff	December 2010-May 2011
Refine process based on data	Chief Academic Officer, Chief of Staff, and Superintendent	June 2011

Citation	Description	Rationale
Descriptor (a)(2)	Describe, for each LEA in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.	Principal evaluation systems should reflect a comprehensive review of the established criteria and are an important information source for assessing the distribution of effective principals.

Directions:

Include the following information on the local school system's designated website reporting the evaluation systems of principals. The description of the principal evaluation system must explain how evaluation results are used in decisions regarding each of the following: principal professional development, compensation, promotion, retention and removal. If this information has already been included and updated on your school system's website, please indicate so below and provide the link.

1. Provide the link to this information on the school system's designated website below:

<http://www.hcpss.org/employees/>

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(6)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.	Evaluation systems that include student achievement outcomes yield reliable assessments of teacher performance. Knowing if an evaluation system includes these outcomes informs the value of teacher performance ratings.

Directions:

1. Do the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion? (Mark "Yes" or "No")
 - a. Yes, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.
 - b. If Yes, please respond (check one):

 Student achievement outcomes are included as an evaluation criterion.

 Student growth is included as an evaluation criterion.
 - c. No, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals do not include student achievement outcomes or student growth as an evaluation criterion.

HCPSS has expanded principal evaluations to include performance-based indicators. Compensation of principals is negotiated through Howard County Administrators Association. Promotional opportunities are based on vacancies and success in job-related performance.

Principals receive systemic professional development through monthly Leadership I (Division of Instruction Principals and Central Office-based leaders) meetings and yearly Summer Institute for School Improvement. Many principals serve on systemic long range planning committees, advisories, internal work groups and interview panels. Additionally, an executive leadership fellows program is under exploration for the 2010-2011 school year.

Principal retention is supported through the professional development opportunities delineated above as well as strategic placement provided through school administration. Principals who are not meeting success in an identified standard work with their administrative director to set performance-based indicators. Progress is reviewed both mid-year and the end of the year. Principals that receive an unsatisfactory on their overall evaluation are placed on an action plan. Intensive supports and resources are provided. Administrative directors monitor principal action

plans throughout the year. The shared goal is to have the principal perform at the satisfactory level. However, when a principal on an action plan is unsuccessful, he/she may be reassigned to a non-leadership position or terminated.

The Board of Education expects that all employees conduct themselves in accordance with applicable laws and standards of behavior that reflect and support the educational and human relationship philosophies of the HCPSS. Principals who violate this expectation may be subject to termination.

Citation	Description	Rationale
Indicator (a)(7)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.	Ratings from principal evaluation systems further highlight the strengths and weaknesses of those systems and provide valuable information on the distribution of effective principals across districts.

Directions:

1. Complete the table below by listing each of the rating or performance levels in the LEA's performance evaluation systems, and the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating or level.

Performance Rating or Level	Number of Principals	Percentage of Principals
Satisfactory	36	97.3%
Unsatisfactory	1	2.70 %
	Total: 37	

2. Please provide the link to this information on the school system's designated website below:

<http://www.hcpss.org/employees/>

3. If the LEA does not currently publicly report this data, please list the major action steps that you will take to make this information publicly available by 6/30/11. Update the Action Steps Table (below) as appropriate to reflect progress to date.

Action Steps	Person(s) Responsible	Completion Date
Review principal evaluations to determine the impact of performance-based objectives. Use data to inform and revise goal setting process for SY 2010-2011	Chief Academic Officer	June 2010
Develop a communication plan to keep stakeholders informed.	Chief Academic Officer and Chief of Staff	August 2010
Pilot the recommendations of the internal work group.	Chief Academic Officer	September 2010
Assess the progress of the pilot and communication plan	Superintendent and Chiefs	January 2011
Revise and refine process based on assessment	Chief Academic Officer	February-May 2011
Institutionalize the process	Chief Academic Officer	June 2011