

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:

Information that met the needs for the 2009 report can be found at:

<http://marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/programs/arra/sfsf2>

Currently this information is not posted on the ACPS Website but will be posted in accordance with timelines in the following sections.

Professional Development:

From the information gathered from their evaluations, teachers provide evidence of their own professional growth. Teachers shall document their participation in professional development activities, as well as their participation in activities that support school-based and system-wide initiatives. An assessment of the teacher's professional growth based upon his or her participation in the documented activities shall be compiled in the Professional Development Office. In addition, teacher evaluation may result in the

development of a professional development plan that is based on needs identified in the observation/evaluation process. Professional development identified as a result of the observation/evaluation process may include mentoring. Teachers are encouraged to explore Professional Development activities that are relevant to their needs and area of teaching and to choose those activities that will have a positive impact by increasing the achievement of all students.

Promotion:

As mentioned in the response to the compensation section, successful evaluations are a prerequisite for leadership roles within the school or county. Some leadership roles within a school may result in additional compensation. Two required factors leading to consideration for administrative positions is successful participation in leadership roles at the school level and satisfactory evaluations.

Retention and Removal:

Teacher evaluation results are used in both the retention and removal processes. All teachers not on probation are evaluated at least once every two (2) years by personnel certified by the State Department of Education and designated by the Superintendent. These teachers may be evaluated on a more frequent basis at the determination of the supervisor and principal or at the request of the teacher. Probationary teachers are formally evaluated at least once every semester. Each evaluation includes a conference with the school administrator and the supervisor responsible for the teacher’s area of certification.

The results of teacher evaluations are also used to retain teachers. Upon successful evaluations over a two-year period, teachers are moved to a no-probationary status and will move along the corresponding Step and Class in the negotiated agreement.

The evaluation results are also used to identify and provide intermediate steps e.g., additional coursework, training and mentoring for teachers who are struggling or need additional professional development. This performance evaluation data serves as the basis for decisions to recommend a teacher’s placement on a Second-Class Certificate or a 3rd year of probationary status. The evaluation results are also used as a basis for the termination process.

Note: ACPS has a new Superintendent of Schools and all systems and processes of evaluation for teachers referenced herein are under review and subject to change. In addition, Allegany County Public Schools intends to implement evaluation systems that are in accordance with guidelines resulting from MSDE’s initiatives involving teacher and principal evaluation development.

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.

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:

- 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	435	99.8%
Unsatisfactory	1	.2%
	Total: 436	

- Provide the link to this information on the school system's designated website below:
- 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
Migration of data (student/employee) from a AS400 to ASPEN Data Package	IT Dept./Nil Grove, Director	6/30/2010
Identify website location and develop a data landing page.	Information Officer	6/30/2011
Verify 2009-2010 System Evaluation Summary Data for accuracy.	HR Dept.	7/30/2010

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
Migration of data (student/employee) from a AS400 to ASPEN Data Package	IT Dept./Nil Grove, Director	6/30/2010
Amend existing school landing pages to include an evaluation summary by school.	Information Officer	6/30/2011
Verify 2009-2010 School Evaluation Summary Data for accuracy.	School Principal/HR	8/15/2010

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:

Information that met the needs for the 2009 report can be found at:
<http://marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/programs/arra/sfsf2>

Currently this information is not posted on the ACPS Website but will be posted in accordance with timelines in the following sections.

Evaluation System:

The principals' evaluation system for ACPS is based on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards (ISSLC). The current system is evidence based and focuses on the principal identifying strengths and needs in each area.

Professional Development:

From the information gathered from principals' evaluations, principals provide evidence of their own professional growth and identify areas in which they want to realize personal/professional growth. Principals shall document their participation in professional development activities, as well as their leadership in activities that support school-based and system-wide initiatives. In addition, principal evaluation may result in the development of a professional development plan that is based on needs identified in the observation/evaluation process. Professional development identified as a result of the observation/evaluation process may include mentoring. Principals are encouraged to explore Professional Development activities that are relevant to their needs and area of teaching and to choose those activities that will have a positive impact by increasing the achievement of all students.

Compensation:

Successful evaluations may afford a principal consideration for a promotion to a larger school which, according to contract, provides for increased compensation. The contract illustrating the principals' compensation package can be found at :

<http://www.acps.allconet.org/assets/uploads/file/Unit%20II%20new%20contract.pdf>

Promotion:

As mentioned in the response to the compensation section, successful evaluations may lead to placement in a school where compensation is greater as determined by the contract and at the discretion of the Superintendent.

Retention and Removal:

Retention and removal of a principal is at the discretion of the superintendent and is based on on-going observation and evaluation conducted by the superintendent or his designee.

Poor evaluation results are used to identify and provide intermediate steps e.g., additional coursework, training and mentoring for principals who are struggling or need additional professional development. This performance evaluation data serves as the basis for decisions to recommend retention or removal from the Office of Principal. The evaluation results may also be used as a basis for the termination process.

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.

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	22	100%
	Total: 22	

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

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
Migration of data (student/employee) from a AS400 to ASPEN Data Package	IT Dept./Nil Grove, Director	6/30/2010
Identify website location and develop a data landing page.	Information Officer	6/30/2011
Verify 2009-2010 System Evaluation Summary Data for accuracy.	Superintendent/Designee, HR	7/30/2010