

To: Board of Education
Fr: Scott D. Kuffel
Da: April 9, 2015
Re: Teacher Evaluation Summative Results

Included with these notes is a summary with the frequencies of Distinguished and Proficient summative teacher evaluation ratings for 2013-14 and 2014-15. (It should be noted that we did have 1 Needs Improvement Rating in 2013-14, as well.)

We wanted you to see these results because legislation to create a new School Report Card will soon find these percentages appearing on the School Report Card for each building.

In my opinion, these results demonstrate adherence and partnership between building administrators and the teachers evaluated, as it relates to use of the new Danielson Frameworks. No one has a formal percentage that should describe a "great school". I know of colleagues in other districts where buildings have summative evaluation ratings of Distinguished far greater than ours, and other buildings who have far fewer Distinguished ratings than we do.

What we believe is important, is that we have shown consistency in the results and the ability for teachers and evaluators to use the new frameworks to describe effective teaching practices. As we move forward towards 2016-17, when we will first be required to use student growth as criteria for summative ratings (25-30% of a final rating), we should be pleased with the consistency to date, and continue to hone our vocabulary and skills in utilizing the Danielson Frameworks within our Evaluation Plan.

2014-15

Building	Proficient	Distinguished	TOTAL	% Proficient	% Distinguished
GHS	15	9	24	62.5%	37.5%
GMS	14	4	18	77.8%	22.2%
MIL	9	2	11	81.8%	18.2%
NS	7	3	10	70.0%	30.0%
SW	8	2	10	80.0%	20.0%
	53	20	73	72.6%	27.4%

2013-14

Building	Proficient	Distinguished	TOTAL	% Proficient	% Distinguished
GHS	27	19	46	58.7%	41.3%
GMS	18	7	25	72.0%	28.0%
MIL	19	1	20	95.0%	5.0%
NS	12	5	17	70.6%	29.4%
SW *	16	6	22	72.7%	27.3%
	92	38	130	70.8%	29.2%

* SW had 1 Needs Improvement