

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:

The St. Mary's County Public Schools (SMCPS) teacher evaluation system is based on Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (1996, revised 2007). SMCPS has adapted these standards to align with local and state expectations. SMCPS has adapted its Teacher Performance Assessment System (TPAS) to reflect the four domains articulated in the proposed Maryland Teacher Evaluation Framework. The four domains of performance evaluated through this system are: (1) Planning and Preparation; (2) the Learning Environment; (3) Instruction; (4) Professional Responsibilities. Subsumed under these domains are domain components, each which receive an evaluative rating (ineffective, developing, effective, or highly effective). The synthesis of these ratings make up an overall rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory in each of the domains, in accordance with Maryland regulations. The assessment system includes two different processes: a formative process, a reflective system for the teacher, and a summative process which involves administrators in making judgments regarding teaching performances. All non-tenured teachers are engaged in the summative process each year. Once teachers receive continuing contracts, however, they participate annually in either the formative process or the summative process. Tenured teachers engage in the summative cycle of evaluation at least twice in their certification period,

as required by Maryland regulations. Through our online data collection system, SMCPS teacher performance assessment system (TPAS) provides the school district with detailed information about the level of proficiency at which each observed teacher is performing relative to the domain components identified in the evaluation system. Principals and central office administrators use this data to frame professional development around the identified areas of disparity in teacher performance. While in its first year of implementation, this online database of teacher observations is already yielding rich data about the performance of teachers. Administrators can also use this data to provide support targeted toward improvement of teachers who are performing less than proficient. The system provides a consistent set of expectations through which decisions can be made about teacher effectiveness. The TPAS process articulates very specific timelines and standards for administrators to use when making decisions about tenure, retention, or dismissal.

This can be accessed at <http://divisions.smcps.org/pd/evaluation-systems>

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:

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	1161	99.4
Unsatisfactory	7	.6
	Total: 1168	

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

SMCPS does not currently post this information.

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
Brief Board of Education on new regulations.	Director of HR	March 2011
Present the data to Board of Education of the number of overall satisfactory and unsatisfactory final evaluation ratings	Director of HR	October 2011
Post report on SMCPS website	Director of HR	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. 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
Brief Board of Education on new regulations.	Director of HR	March 2011
Present the data to Board of Education of the number of overall satisfactory and unsatisfactory final evaluation ratings	Director of HR	October 2011
Post report on SMCPS website	Director of HR	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:

The Leadership Performance Assessment System (LPAS) used by St. Mary's County Public Schools is based on the work and research of Doug Reeves and his publication, *Assessing Educational Leaders* (2004). It utilizes the structure and domains of leadership framed by Dr. Reeves. We compared those domains to the Maryland framework and adapted the language of the

assessment tool to meet both the Maryland expectations and the needs of our county. The focus of our assessment model is to validate an individual's performance using standards that are based on clearly stated expectations. Our model supports continued professional development and best practices. The model is built on ten domains of leadership. Each domain has components, 41 in all, that further define the domains. The ratings of leaders range from exemplary to proficient, progressing, and not meeting standards. This framework provides a continuum of learning and success.

The final evaluation is built on the information from the assessment tool. The synthesis of these ratings makes up an overall rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory, in accordance with Maryland regulations.

<http://divisions.smcps.org/pd/evaluation-systems>

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.

In Domain 1, Student Achievement, and require that principals provide data tables from our data warehouse as a part of their evaluation artifacts, we take this information into consideration in the evaluation process.

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	26	100%
Unsatisfactory	0	0%
	Total: 26	

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

SMCPS does not currently post this information.

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
Brief Board of Education on new regulations.	Director of HR	March 2011
Present the data to Board of Education of the number of overall satisfactory and unsatisfactory final evaluation ratings	Director of HR	October 2011
Post report on SMCPS website	Director of HR	June 2011