SAINT LOUIS
PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EVALUATION

"Enhancing teacher practice to educate our future"

PLANNING AND PREPARATION

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Student Growth

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

INSTRUCTION

ST. LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BOARD OF EDUCATION

Superintendent of Schools
Kelvin R. Adams, Ph.D.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Self-Assessment

Teacher _____   Tenured ☐   Probationary ☐

Grade/Subject _____

Self Evaluation Completion _____   _____   _____   _____

DIRECTIONS: This self-assessment instrument should be used by the teacher after professional development in the use of this tool has occurred. The instrument is based on five standards: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, Professional Responsibility, and Student Growth. Within those standards, there are 23 carefully selected criteria along with 47 descriptors for effective school performance. These criteria are based on current research-based best practices and provide a structure for professional growth efforts and the ongoing work of schools and professional development of staff. This assessment provides a detailed set of observable characteristics that staff can use to gather ongoing information that contributes to effective school performance. This tool will serve as a guide to professional growth and development as they translate into a set of performance expectations for highly effective schools to transform practice. This tool supports the Show-Me Standards, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Model, student performance and assessment. There are four performance ratings: unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished. As you self-assess your performance as a classroom teacher, note that this is a living document. This guide should serve as a means to examine growth and development over time. While this document is to be completed independently, educators will glean the value of collaborative conversations as they relate to the School Improvement Plan and the building of a reflective learning community.

PHILOSOPHY: A performance-based teacher evaluation system is critical to improving teaching, thus improving student knowledge and performance. It supplies information and feedback regarding effective practice, offers a pathway for individual professional growth, allows a mechanism to nurture professional growth toward common goals and supports a learning community in which people are encouraged to improve and share insights in the profession.

STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR PERFORMANCE-BASED EVALUATION: Following is the text of the statute that requires Missouri school districts to implement a performance-based teacher evaluation program. Adopted by the Missouri Legislature in 1983, the law also requires the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to "provide suggested procedures for such an evaluation." The first document providing suggested procedures and evaluation was made available to school districts in 1984. This document serves to revise the original document to better fulfill the intent of the existing statute.

Section 168.128. Teacher records, how maintained-evaluations, how performed and maintained.-The board of education of each school district shall maintain records showing periods of service, dates of appointment, and other necessary information for the enforcement of section 168.120 to 168.130. In addition, the board of education of each school district shall cause a comprehensive performance-based evaluation for each teacher employed by the district. Such evaluation shall be ongoing and of sufficient specificity and frequency to provide for demonstrated standards of competency and academic ability. All evaluations shall be maintained in the teacher's personnel file at the office of the board of education. A copy of each evaluation shall be provided to the teacher and appropriate administrator. The State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education shall provide suggested procedures for such an evaluation.
(L. 1969 p.275§168.114, A.L. 1983 H.B. 38 & 783)

Adapted in 2005 from Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice, Components of Professional Practice and Framework Observation Program, Educational Testing Service (ETS), 2001 in collaboration with Saint Louis Public Schools (SLPS) for the sole use of SLPS. This document may not be reproduced or used without the expressed consent of SLPS and ETS.

1

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

GUIDING PRINCIPLES: The following principles guide the developmental growth of teachers in a collaborative process of reflection:

➢ The Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation Model includes processes that address professional development and teacher evaluation. Professional development supports the teacher in improving performance on an ongoing basis while the teacher evaluation serves organizational decision-making.

➢ Proficient or distinguished is the performance standard expected of all teachers. Those who are working below the proficient level of performance on any criterion/descriptor as determined by his/her administrator/supervisor should give immediate attention to improving performance to the proficient level.

➢ Adequate time and opportunity will be provided for teachers to grow professionally through mentoring, peer coaching, working on professional teams, and other self-directed activities.

➢ Evaluation criteria/descriptors address both students and teachers. These criteria/descriptors have been established to reflect the professional standards, current research, student performance, and assessment. The central focus in developing an evaluation system is to promote student success.

➢ The process of teacher evaluation and professional growth allows for reflection, collaboration, and professional contributions to the learning community.

➢ A strong mentoring program, with proper funding and training, will provide the necessary support and feedback for first- and second-year teachers and teachers new to the school community.

➢ Evaluators will be trained in the skills of analyzing effective teaching, providing reflective conferencing, managing documentation, and facilitating teacher professional development.

➢ The system will provide for a connection among the evaluation criteria/descriptors, student performance, professional development, school building goals, and the district's strategic plan.

➢ Sufficient orientation will be provided to train teachers in the district's evaluation and professional growth process. Building-level meetings will be held to train teachers properly in the evaluation model.

➢ All teachers will develop and maintain a document file related to the identified evaluation criteria/descriptors.

➢ All staff will complete a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) based on administrator observations and teacher self-assessment.

➢ All teachers will have a Personal Professional Development Plan (PPDP). The Professional Development Plan will vary based on the proficiency of the teacher as determined by the administrator/supervisor.

➢ As teachers develop their PPDPs, close attention should be paid to the requirements for PCI, PCII, and CPC state certification. See the following website for DESE requirements: http://dese.mo.gov/divteachqual/teachcert/PD_CHART.html

➢ The St. Louis Public Schools Professional Development Office and building-level professional development will serve as a resource to provide teachers with professional opportunities related to their individual PPDP.

GLOSSARY

Action Research	A process in which the teacher plans, takes action, collects data, and makes a decision based on the collected data regarding professional practice.
Administrator/Supervisor	The person authorized to implement the evaluation process (administrator, department chair, facilitator, coordinator, etc.).
Artifact Data	Documents or tangible items of information related to performance. Artifacts are typically supplied by the teacher but may be collected from other sources and are kept in the document file.
CLEAR Curriculum	**C**ontent-Specifications **L**eading to **E**xpected **A**chievement **R**esults: an instructional planning tool for teachers that clarifies what is to be taught and assessed. It enables teachers to focus their planning time and professional conversations on how best to teach the concepts, knowledge and skills so that all students master the objectives for their grade level or course.
CSIP	Comprehensive School Improvement Plan.
Criteria	The items used to evaluate the teacher's performance. The criteria describe the behavior of the students and teacher or the skill of the teacher related to effective performance.
Descriptors	Descriptors are phrases that aid in defining and outlining the expected behavior for a particular criterion.
Document file	A teacher's collection of data illustrating performance, development, and involvement in professional activities that reflect criteria/descriptors, building goals, and the district strategic plan.
Drop-In Observations	An unscheduled, informal visit to the classroom by the administrator/supervisor. Data collection is not necessary but may occur as the administrator/supervisor deems appropriate.
Lesson Reflection Sheet	Form which will be completed by the teacher following each formal observation. It may be discussed with the administrator/supervisor at the post-observation conference and used to document criteria/descriptors.
Mentor	The experienced teacher who is assigned to guide and support a first- or second-year teacher in the district.
Observation/Conversation	The Teacher Evaluation Report indicates which performance criteria/descriptors require the data be gathered through observation or conversation. Conversation may be between the administrator/supervisor and the teacher, students, parents, staff, community, etc.
Peer Coach	A teacher who collaborates with another teacher for mutual support and instructional improvement.
Performance Improvement Plan	A collaborative plan written between observer and teacher that guides the specific needs of that teacher as evidenced by the observations. A plan to formalize and document professional growth for the purpose of attaining proficient and distinguished levels of performance. PIPs will be categorized as enrichment, progressing, or noted for development. If the teacher is not performing at a proficient level or above on all criteria/descriptors, the PIP will indicate they are progressing toward proficiency or are noted for development.
Personal Professional Development Plan	A plan required by law that is tied to the district and school improvement plan.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Planned Data	Data regarding a teacher related to a specific criterion/descriptor and collected by the administrator/supervisor.
Post-observation Conference	A conference between the administrator/supervisor and the teacher about data collected during an observation and other data submitted by the teacher. Written feedback will be completed by the administrator/supervisor in the feedback/document section of the Teacher Evaluation Report to share at the conference.
Pre-observation Conference	The interactive meeting between administrator/supervisor and teacher during which the lesson is previewed, and the purpose, time, length, and location of the observation are confirmed. A Pre-observation Form will be completed by the teacher prior to the conference.
Professional Development	Process designed to help teachers improve on an ongoing basis.
Scheduled Observation	A planned observation of performance that includes pre-observation discussion, the observation and documentation, and post-observation discussion used to collect data for the teacher evaluation.
Scoring Guide	Descriptions of performance levels which define levels of proficiency.
Secondary Core Curriculum	The four-core area curriculum for grades 9-12 that includes a year-at-a-glance overview of class structure and pacing; scope and sequence that detail which state and Terra Nova standards are addressed and two-page daily lesson plans that include essential questions, suggested warm-up activities, instructional objectives, ideas about assessment, and homework assignments.
Summative Evaluation	The section of the Teacher Evaluation Report used to summarize the administrator's /supervisor's rating of performance for each criterion/descriptor at the end of the teacher evaluation cycle. Performance ratings include unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished.
Supplemental Feedback Form	A form used when documenting only one or two criteria/descriptors.
Teacher	Any classroom personnel who provide instruction.
Teacher Evaluation	The process of collecting data and making professional judgments about the performance and development of teachers and for the purpose of personnel decision-making.
Teacher Evaluation Report	Report used to collect and organize on-going planned and unplanned data, artifacts, reflections, and feedback for the purpose of developing and evaluating teachers. The report has two major sections: Summative Evaluation and Feedback/Documentation.
Unscheduled Observation	An unannounced observation of twenty minutes or more, used to collect data for the teacher evaluation.
Unplanned Data	Unsolicited data regarding a teacher related to a specific criterion/descriptor and collected by the administrator/supervisor.
Written Documents	Any concrete examples of items which are related to performance criteria/descriptors. The Teacher Evaluation Report indicates the criteria/descriptors for which the teacher must provide written documents.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation
Evaluation Timeline

	Probationary						Tenured (Rotation)		
Year	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3
Formal Evaluation	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		*	*	YES
Scheduled Observation	1	1	1	1	1				1
Unscheduled Observation	2	2	2	2	2				1
Drop-In Observation	ADMINISTRATOR DISCRETION						ADMINISTRATOR DISCRETION		
PPDP Development	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
Document File	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES
Administrator and Teacher Meet	Administrator meets to discuss management of document file, PIP and PPDP as it relates to performance, school improvement, and strategic plan early in the school year.						Administrator meets to discuss management of document file, PIP and PPDP as it relates to performance, school improvement, and strategic plan early in the school year.		
Administrator Observes Classroom	Administrator observes classroom instruction with pre- and post-observation conferencing as appropriate.						Administrator observes classroom instruction with pre- and post-observation conferencing as appropriate.		
Data Collection	Teacher and administrator collect data throughout the year. Data for evaluation purposes must be available by dates established by administrator.						Teacher implements PIP and PPDP early in the school year; data for evaluation purposes must be available by dates established by administrator.		
Summative Evaluation Report	Administrator holds conference to review data collected and completes summative evaluation by March 1.						Administrator holds conference to review PIP and PPDP or, if on summative evaluation, all data will be collected and completed. Summative evaluation by May 1.		

Notes:

➤ Formal observations may be increased at the request of the teacher or as determined by the administrator.

➤ Teachers new to a building must be evaluated by the administrator.

➤ The Summative Evaluation summarizes the administrator's /supervisor's rating of the performance for each criterion/descriptor.

➤ Teachers have the opportunity to provide a written response to the Summative Evaluation. However, in cases in which disagreement arises, the decision of the administrator/supervisor is final. Written comments can be provided by either party and included with the report. Comments by either party must be shared within five working days of the conference and appended to the original copy of the Teacher Evaluation Report. The teacher, administrator/supervisor, and HR will retain a copy of the report.

*Administrator/supervisor reserves the right for observations as needed.

➤ A drop-in observation is an unscheduled, informal visit to the classroom by the administrator/supervisor. Data collection is not necessary but may occur as the administrator/supervisor deems appropriate.

➤ System Review: The superintendent should initiate a periodic review of the evaluation system to promote the maintenance of an effective, fair, and efficient system that is comprehensive and performance-based. The Performance-based Teacher Evaluation Committee will conduct an initial review after the first year of implementation.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

TEACHER EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH DESCRIPTORS

STANDARD 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION	STANDARD 2: CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT	STANDARD 3: INSTRUCTION	STANDARD 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY	STANDARD 5: STUDENT GROWTH
1A: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy ➢ **Knowledge of Content**	**2A: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport** ➢ **Teacher Interaction with Students; Student to Student**	**3A: Communicating Clearly and Accurately** ➢ **Oral and Written Language** ➢ **Directions and Procedures**	**4A: Reflecting on Teaching** ➢ **Use in Future Teaching**	**5A: Demonstrating Growth on Statewide Student Assessments** ➢ **Statewide Measures of Student Growth (MAP and EOC Assessments)**
1B: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students ➢ **Knowledge of Students' Characteristics, Skills, and Knowledge** ➢ **Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning**	**2B: Establishing a Culture for Learning** ➢ **Expectations for Learning and Achievement**	**3B: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques** ➢ **Quality of Questions**	**4B: Communicating with Family** ➢ **Information about Individual Student** ➢ **Information about the Instructional Program and Engagement with the Instructional Program**	**5B: Demonstrating Growth on Locally Selected Student Assessments** ➢ **Curriculum-based Measures of Student Learning** ➢ **Formative Assessment of Student Growth** ➢ **Interim Assessment of Student Growth** ➢ **Performance Assessment measures of Student Growth** ➢ **Portfolio Measures of Student Growth** ➢ **Summative Assessment of Student Growth**
1C: Selecting Instructional Goals/Objectives ➢ **Suitability for Diverse Students**	**2C: Managing Classroom Procedures** ➢ **Management of Instructional Groups** ➢ **Management of Transitions** ➢ **Performance of Non-Instructional Duties**	**3C: Engaging Students in Learning** ➢ **Presentation of Content** ➢ **Activities and Assignments** ➢ **Grouping of Students** ➢ **Structure and Pacing**	**4C: Contributing to the School and District** ➢ **Relationships with Colleagues** ➢ **Attendance**	
1D: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources ➢ **Teaching Resources** ➢ **Use of Technology**	**2D: Managing Student Behavior** ➢ **Expectations** ➢ **Response to Student Misbehavior**	**3D: Providing Feedback to Students** ➢ **Timeliness and Quality of Feedback**	**4D: Growing and Developing Professionally** ➢ **Enhancement of Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Skill and Content-Related Pedagogy**	

1E: Designing Coherent Instruction	2E: Organizing Physical Space	3E: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	4E: Showing Professionalism	
➢ Learning Activities ➢ Instructional Groups	➢ Safety and Accessibility to Learning and Use of Physical Resources	➢ Persistence	➢ Decision Making ➢ Adherence to Policies ➢ Discretion and Confidentiality ➢ Advocacy ➢ Timeliness and Appropriateness ➢ Resolving Issues	
1F: Assessing Student Learning ➢ Use for Planning ➢ Student Progress in Learning and Assignment Completion ➢ Criteria and Standards				

Pre-observation Form

The Pre-observation Form is to be completed by the teacher and given to the administrator/supervisor at/or before a pre-observation conference. This form is used by the administrator/supervisor to gain insight into the teacher's reflective understanding regarding lesson planning and may be used to document criteria/descriptors.

Teacher _____   School _____

Grade/Subject _____   Date _____

1. What do you expect the students to be able to know or do at the end of this lesson? What connections will you make to students' other learning?	2. Briefly describe the lesson and the repertoire of strategies to be used with students and to personalize learning.
3. How does this relate to the district's curriculum guide? What prerequisite knowledge has been assumed or provided?	4. How will students be assessed? How will assessment criteria and exemplars be communicated to students?

5. What, in particular, do you want observed? Are there any special circumstances of which to be aware?

NOTES:

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Standard 1: Planning and Preparation				
		Levels of Performance		
Criterion 1A:	**Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy**			
		Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
#1	**Knowledge of Content**	Teacher makes content errors or does not correct content errors students make.	Teacher displays basic content knowledge but cannot articulate connections with other parts of the discipline or with other disciplines.	Teacher displays solid curriculum content knowledge and makes connections between the content and other parts of the discipline and other disciplines.	Teacher displays extensive content knowledge, with evidence of continuing pursuit of such knowledge.
Criterion 1B:	**Demonstrating Knowledge of Students**			
#2	**Knowledge of Students' Characteristics, Skills, and Knowledge**	Teacher displays little knowledge of students' cultural and developmental characteristics, skills, and knowledge.	Teacher recognizes the value of understanding students' cultural and developmental characteristics, skills, and knowledge for the class as a whole.	Teacher displays knowledge of all students' cultural and developmental characteristics, skills, and knowledge of groups of students, and recognizes the value of this knowledge.	Teacher displays knowledge of all students' cultural and developmental characteristics, skills, and knowledge of each student and plans for those differences.
#3	**Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning**	Teacher is unfamiliar with the different approaches to learning that students exhibit, such as learning styles, modalities, and different "intelligences."	Teacher displays general understanding of the different approaches to learning that student's exhibit, such as learning styles, modalities, and different "intelligences."	Teacher displays solid understanding of the different approaches to learning that different student's exhibit, such as learning styles, modalities, and different "intelligences."	Teacher uses, where appropriate, knowledge of students' varied approaches to learning in instructional planning such as learning styles, modalities, and different "intelligences."
Criterion 1C:	**Selecting Instructional Goals/Objectives**			
#4	**Suitability for Diverse Students**	Goals/objectives are not suitable for the class.	Most of the goals/objectives are suitable for most students in the class.	All the goals/objectives are suitable for most students in the class.	Goals/objectives take into account the varying learning needs of individual students or groups.
Criterion 1D:	**Demonstrating Knowledge and Use of Resources**			
#5	**Teaching Resources**	Teacher is unaware of district curriculum, CLEAR and SECONDARY CORE CURRICULUM, as well as resources and materials available through the school or district. Resources do not support the instructional goals or engage students in meaningful learning.	Teacher displays limited awareness of district curriculum, CLEAR and SECONDARY CORE CURRICULUM and resources and materials available through the school or district. Resources do not support the instructional goals or engage students in meaningful learning.	Teacher is aware of district curriculum, CLEAR and SECONDARY CORE CURRICULUM and school and district resources. Teacher actively seeks other materials to enhance instruction, for example, from various cultural, community, or professional organizations and engages students in meaningful learning.	Teacher is fully aware of district curriculum, CLEAR and SECONDARY CORE CURRICULUM and school and district resources. Teacher actively seeks other materials to enhance instruction; for example, from various cultural, community, or professional organizations and provides opportunities to empower students to access resources.
#6	**Use of Technology**	Teacher displays limited awareness of technology resources available through the school or district.	Teacher displays limited use of technology resources available through the school or district.	Teacher is fully aware of technology resources available through the school or district and uses technology to support instruction.	In addition to being aware of school and district technology resources, teacher actively seeks additional technology to enhance learning.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Criterion 1E:	Designing Coherent Instruction			
		Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
#7	**Learning Activities**	Learning activities are not culturally relevant and suitable to students, curriculum, or instructional goals. They do not follow an organized progression and do not reflect recent professional research.	Only some of the learning activities are culturally relevant and suitable to students, curriculum, or instructional goals. Progression of activities in the unit is uneven, and only some activities reflect recent professional research.	Most of the learning activities are culturally relevant and suitable to students, curriculum, and instructional goals. Progression of activities in the unit is fairly even, and most activities reflect recent professional research.	Learning activities are highly relevant to students, curriculum, culture, and instructional goals. They progress coherently, producing a unified whole and reflecting recent professional research.
#8	**Instructional Groups**	Instructional groups do not support the instructional goals and offer no variety or flexibility in determining membership.	Instructional groups are inconsistent in suitability to the instructional goals and offer minimal variety or flexibility in determining membership.	Instructional groups vary in membership as appropriate to the different instructional goals and are determined based on student need.	Instructional groups vary in membership as appropriate to the different instructional goals and are determined based on student needs. Students help determine the appropriateness of their placement.
Criterion 1F:	Assessing Student Learning			
#9	**Use for Planning**	Teacher minimally uses assessment data to plan for the students in the class. (Teacher-made, diverse classroom assessments, surveys, inventories, textbook, *i-Know*, criterion, norm-reference, MAP…)	Teacher uses assessment data to plan for the class as a whole. (Teacher-made, diverse classroom assessments, surveys, inventories, textbook, *i-Know*, criterion, norm-reference, MAP…)	Teacher uses assessment data to plan for individuals and groups of students. (Teacher-made, diverse classroom assessments, surveys, inventories, textbook, *i-Know*, criterion, norm-reference, MAP…)	Teacher uses assessment data and students are aware of how they are meeting the established standards and participate in planning the next steps. (Teacher-made, diverse classroom assessments, surveys, inventories, textbook, *i-Know*, criterion, norm-reference, MAP…)
#10	**Student Progress in Learning and Assignment Completion**	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student learning and completion of assignments is lacking.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student learning and completion of assignments is partially effective.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student learning and completion of assignments is fully effective.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student learning and completion of assignments is fully effective. Students participate in the maintenance of records.
#11	**Criteria and Standards**	The proposed approach contains no clear connection to curriculum criteria/descriptors or standards.	Assessment criteria/descriptors and standards have been developed, but they are either not connected to the curriculum, not clear, or have not been clearly communicated to students.	Assessment criteria/descriptors and standards are connected to the curriculum, are clear and rigorous, include the use of exemplars, and have been clearly communicated to students.	Assessment criteria/descriptors and standards are connected to the curriculum, are clear and rigorous, include the use of exemplars, and have been clearly communicated to students. There is evidence that students contributed to the development of the criteria/descriptors and standards.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Standard 2: Classroom Environment				
	Level of Performance			
	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Criterion 2A: **Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport**				
#12 **Teacher Interaction with Students; Student to Student**	Teacher interaction with at least some students is negative, demeaning, sarcastic, inappropriate or indifferent. Students may exhibit disrespect for teacher. Student interactions are characterized by conflict, sarcasm or put-downs.	Teacher-student interactions are generally appropriate but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, or disregard for students. Students exhibit only minimal respect for teacher and teacher exhibits minimal relationships with students. Students do not demonstrate negative behavior toward one another.	Teacher-student interactions are friendly and demonstrate general warmth, caring and respect through eye contact, voice inflection, body language and gestures. Such interactions are appropriate to developmental and cultural norms. Student interactions are generally polite and respectful.	Teacher demonstrates genuine caring and respect for individual students through eye contact, voice inflection, body language and gestures. Students exhibit a high level of respect for teacher. Students demonstrate genuine caring for one another as individuals and as students.
Criterion 2B: **Establishing a Culture for Learning**				
#13 **Expectations for Learning and Achievement**	Teacher conveys a negative attitude toward the content, suggesting that the content is not important or is mandated by others. Instructional goals and activities convey only modest expectations for student achievement.	Teacher communicates importance of content but with little conviction. Instructional goals and activities convey inconsistent expectations for student achievement.	Teacher conveys genuine enthusiasm for content. Instructional goals and activities convey high expectations for student achievement.	Both student and teacher demonstrate that they value the content and maintain high expectations for the learning of all students.
Criterion 2C: **Managing Classroom Procedures**				
#14 **Management of Instructional Groups**	Instructional groups are off task and not productively engaged in learning.	Tasks for group work are partially organized, resulting in some off-task behavior.	Tasks for group work are organized, and groups are managed so most students are engaged at all times.	Groups working independently are productively engaged at all times, with all students assuming responsibility for productivity.
#15 **Management of Transitions**	Much time is lost during transitions.	Transitions are sporadically efficient, resulting in some loss of instructional time.	Transitions occur smoothly, with little loss of instructional time.	Transitions are seamless, with students assuming some responsibility for efficient operation.
#16 **Performance of Non-instructional Duties**	Considerable instructional time is lost in performing non-instructional duties.	Systems for performing non-instructional duties are fairly efficient, resulting in little loss of instructional time.	Efficient systems for performing non-instructional duties are in place, resulting in minimal loss of instructional time.	Systems for performing non-instructional duties are well established, with students assuming appropriate responsibility for efficient operation.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Descriptor		Level of Performance			
		Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Criterion 2D:	**Managing Student Behavior**				
#17	**Expectations**	No standards of conduct appear to have been established, or students are confused as to what the standards are.	Standards of conduct appear to have been established for most situations, and most students seem to understand them.	Standards of conduct are clear to all students.	Standards of conduct are clear to all students and appear to have been developed with student participation.
#18	**Response to Student Misbehavior**	Teacher does not respond to misbehavior, or the response is inconsistent, overly repressive, or does not respect the student's dignity.	Teacher attempts to respond to student misbehavior but with uneven results, or no serious disruptive behavior occurs.	Teacher response to misbehavior is appropriate and successful and respects the student's dignity, or student behavior is generally appropriate.	Teacher response to misbehavior is highly effective and sensitive to students' individual needs, or student behavior is entirely appropriate.
Criterion 2E:	**Organizing Physical Space**				
#19	**Safety and Accessibility to Learning and Use of Physical Resources**	Teacher makes poor use of the physical environment, resulting in unsafe or inaccessible conditions for some students or a serious mismatch between the furniture arrangement and the lesson activities.	Teacher's classroom is safe, and essential learning is accessible to all students, but the furniture arrangement only partially supports the learning activities.	Teacher's classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; teacher uses physical resources well and ensures that the arrangement of furniture supports the learning activities.	Teacher's classroom is safe, and students contribute to ensuring that the physical environment supports the learning of all students.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Standard 3:	Instruction				
		Level of Performance			
		Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Criterion 3A:	**Communicating Clearly and Accurately**				
#20	**Oral and Written Language**	Teacher's spoken language is inaudible, or written language is illegible. Spoken or written language may contain many grammar and syntax errors. Vocabulary may be inappropriate, vague, or used incorrectly, leaving students confused.	Teacher's spoken language is audible, and written language is legible. Both are used correctly. Vocabulary is correct but limited or is not appropriate to students' ages or backgrounds.	Teacher's spoken and written language is clear and correct. Vocabulary is appropriate to students' age and interests.	Teacher's spoken and written language is correct and expressive, with well-chosen vocabulary that enriches the lesson.
#21	**Directions and Procedures**	Teacher's directions and procedures are confusing to students.	Teacher's directions and procedures are clarified after initial student confusion or are excessively detailed.	Teacher's directions and procedures are clear to students and contain an appropriate level of detail.	Teacher's directions and procedures are clear to students and anticipate possible student misunderstanding.
Criterion 3B:	**Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques**				
#22	**Quality of Questions**	Teacher frames questions or poses problems that do not encourage students to explore content, and are not challenging.	Teacher frames questions and/or poses problems that encourage students to explore content, but may not be challenging.	Teacher frames thought-provoking questions and/or creates problem-solving situations that challenge students to explore content.	Teacher frames thought-provoking questions and/or creates problem-solving situations that challenge students to explore content, reflect on their understanding, consider new possibilities, and pose questions.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Descriptor		Level of Performance			
		Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Criterion 3C:	**Engaging Students in Learning**				
#23	**Presentation of Content**	Presentation of content and instructional strategies are inappropriate, unclear, or use poor examples and analogies.	Presentation of content and instructional strategies are inconsistent in quality.	Presentation of content and instructional strategies link well with students' knowledge and experience.	Presentation of content and instructional strategies link well with students' knowledge and experience. Students contribute to presentation of content.
#24	**Activities and Assignments**	Instructional strategies, activities, and assignments are inappropriate for students in terms of their age or backgrounds.	Some instructional strategies, activities, and assignments are appropriate to students and engage them mentally, but others do not.	Most instructional strategies, activities, and assignments are rigorous and appropriate to students. Almost all students are cognitively engaged in them.	Students are cognitively engaged in the activities and assignments in their exploration of content. Students initiate or adapt activities and projects to enhance understanding.
#25	**Grouping of Students**	Instructional groups are inappropriate to the students or to the instructional goals.	Instructional groups are only partially appropriate to the students or only moderately successful in advancing the instructional goals of a lesson.	Instructional groups are productive and fully appropriate to the students or to the instructional goals of a lesson.	Instructional groups are productive and fully appropriate to the instructional goals of a lesson. Students take the initiative to influence instructional groups to advance their understanding.
#26	**Structure and Pacing**	The lesson has no clearly defined structure, or the pacing of the lesson is too slow or rushed, or both. Time allocations are unrealistic.	The lesson has a recognizable structure, although it is not uniformly maintained throughout the lesson. Pacing of the lesson is inconsistent. Most time allocations are reasonable.	The lesson has a clearly defined structure around which the activities are organized. Pacing of the lesson is consistent. Time allocations are reasonable.	The lesson's structure is highly coherent, allowing for reflection and closure as appropriate. Pacing of the lesson is appropriate for all students. Time allocations are reasonable and allow for different pathways according to student needs.
Criterion 3D:	**Providing Feedback to Students**				
#27	**Timeliness and Quality of Feedback**	Feedback is not provided in a timely manner and/or is of poor quality.	Feedback is inconsistent and limited in quality.	Feedback is consistently provided in a timely manner and is of high quality.	Feedback of high quality is consistently provided in a timely manner. Evidence reflects that students make prompt use of the feedback in their learning.
Criterion 3E:	**Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness**				
#28	**Persistence**	When a student has difficulty learning, the teacher either gives up or blames the student, parents, or the environment for the student's lack of success.	Teacher accepts responsibility for students who have difficulty learning but has only a limited repertoire of instructional strategies to use to personalize learning.	Teacher persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning, possessing a moderate repertoire of strategies to personalize learning.	Teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who have difficulty learning, using an extensive repertoire of strategies and soliciting additional resources from the school in order to personalize learning.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Standard 4:	Professional Responsibility			

		Level of Performance		
	Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Criterion 4A:	**Reflecting on Teaching**			
#29 **Use in Future Teaching**	Teacher does not accurately assess the success of the lesson and attainment of goals and has no suggestions for improvement for future lessons.	Teacher has a generally accurate impression of a lesson's effectiveness and the attainment of goals and can make general suggestions about improvement for future lessons.	Teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and attainment of goals, can cite general references, and can make specific suggestions for improvement for future lessons.	Teacher makes thoughtful and accurate assessment of the lesson's effectiveness and attainment of goals, citing many specific examples and offering specific alternative actions complete with probable successes.
Criterion 4B:	**Communicating with Families**			
#30 **Information about Individual Students**	Teacher provides minimal information to parents and does not respond or responds insensitively to parent concerns about students.	Teacher adheres to the school's required procedures for communicating to parents. Responses to parent concerns are minimal.	Teacher communicates with parents about students' progress on a regular basis and is available as needed to respond to parent concerns.	Teacher provides information to parents frequently on both positive and negative aspects of student progress. Response to parent concerns is handled with great sensitivity.
#31 **Information about the Instructional Program and Engagement with the Instructional Program**	Teacher provides little information about the instructional program to families and makes inappropriate attempts to engage families.	Teacher participates in the school's required activities for parent communication but offers little additional information and makes modest and inconsistently successful attempts to engage families.	Teacher provides frequent information to parents about the instructional program and makes frequent and successful engagements of families.	Teacher provides frequent, extensive and varied information to parents about the instructional program and has frequent and successful engagement of families with students contributing to idea development.
Criterion 4C:	**Contributing to the School and District**			
#32 **Relationships with Colleagues**	Teacher's relationships with colleagues are negative or self-serving.	Teacher maintains cordial relationships with colleagues to fulfill the duties that the school or district requires.	Support and cooperation characterize relationships with colleagues.	Support and cooperation characterize relationships with colleagues. Teacher takes initiative in assuming leadership among the faculty.
#33 **Attendance**	Teacher is frequently absent and/or reports to work late or leaves early.	Teacher's attendance is inconsistent and/or arrives late/leaves early occasionally.	Teacher consistently arrives on time and is ready to begin work at the designated start time. Schedules time off well in advance.	Teacher is rarely absent or late unless the situation is of an emergency nature.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Descriptor		Level of Performance			
		Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished
Criterion 4D:		**Growing and Developing Professionally**			
#34	**Enhancement of Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Skill and Content-Related Pedagogy**	Teacher engages in no professional development to enhance content knowledge or pedagogical skill. Teacher displays little understanding of pedagogical issues involved in student learning of the content.	Teacher participates in professional development to a limited extent. Teacher displays basic pedagogical knowledge but does not anticipate student misconceptions.	Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill and uses information in the classroom. Pedagogical practices reflect current research on best pedagogical practice within the discipline but without anticipating student misconceptions.	Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development and makes a systematic attempt to apply knowledge and may conduct research in the classroom. Teacher displays continuing search for best practice and anticipates student misconceptions.
Criterion 4E:		**Showing Professionalism**			
#35	**Decision Making**	Teacher makes decisions based on self-serving interests.	Teacher's decisions are based on limited though genuinely professional considerations.	Teacher maintains an open mind and participates in decision making based on high professional standards.	Teacher takes a leadership role in decision making and helps ensure that such decisions are based on the highest professional standards.
#36	**Adherence to Policies**	Teacher is uncooperative or noncompliant about district/school policies and procedures and program regulations.	Teacher sometimes adheres to district/school policies and procedures and sometimes supports and enforces program regulations.	Teacher consistently adheres to district/school policies and procedures and consistently supports and enforces program regulations.	Teacher consistently adheres to district/school policies and procedures and consistently supports and enforces program regulations while assisting others in their understanding and compliance.
#37	**Discretion and Confidentiality**	Teacher does not use discretion and demonstrates little understanding of confidentiality when discussing work-related issues.	Teacher sometimes uses discretion and sometimes demonstrates an understanding of confidentiality when discussing work-related issues.	Teacher consistently uses discretion and demonstrates an understanding of confidentiality when discussing work-related issues.	Teacher always uses discretion and demonstrates an understanding of confidentiality when discussing work-related issues and assists others in their understanding and appropriateness.
#38	**Advocacy**	Teacher does not initiate and utilize the available resources to ensure that students have a fair opportunity to succeed.	Teacher does not always initiate, utilize, or follow through with available resources to ensure that students have a fair opportunity to succeed.	Teacher works within the context of a particular team, department, or support personnel to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to succeed, regardless of race, culture, gender, religious beliefs, looks, ability/disability or class.	Teacher makes concerted efforts to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to succeed, regardless of race, culture, gender, religious beliefs, looks, ability/disability or class.
#39	**Timeliness and Appropriateness**	Teacher does not assume and complete duties and responsibilities in a timely, willing, and appropriate manner.	Teacher assumes and completes some duties and responsibilities in a timely, willing, and appropriate manner.	Teacher consistently assumes and completes all duties and responsibilities in a timely, willing, and appropriate manner.	Teacher always assumes and completes all duties and responsibilities in a timely, willing, and appropriate manner.
#40	**Resolving Issues**	Teacher does not select and use appropriate channels for resolving issues and problems.	Teacher selects and uses some appropriate channels for resolving issues and problems.	Teacher consistently selects and uses appropriate channels for resolving issues and problems.	Teacher always selects and uses appropriate channels for resolving issues and problems and appropriately reports issues to others who would benefit from the information.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Standard 5: Student Growth

Criterion 5A:		Demonstrating Growth on Statewide Student Assessments				
Descriptor (Enter Date Noted)		Level of Performance				**Documentation (Circle)**
		Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	
#41	**Statewide Measures of Student Growth (MAP and EOC Assessments)**	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on statewide assessments show little improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on statewide assessments show some improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on statewide assessments show improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on statewide assessments show great improvement.	Observation/ Conversation Written Documents
Criterion 5B:		**Demonstrating Growth on Locally Selected Student Assessments**				
#42	**Curriculum-based Measures of Student Growth**	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on curriculum-based assessments show little improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on curriculum-based assessments show some improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on curriculum-based assessments show improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on curriculum-based assessments show great improvement.	Observation/ Conversation Written Documents
#43	**Formative Assessment of Student Growth**	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on formative assessments show little improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on formative assessments show some improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on formative assessments show improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on formative assessments show great improvement.	Observation/ Conversation Written Documents
#44	**Interim Assessment of Student Growth**	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on interim assessments show little improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on interim assessments show some improvement..	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on interim assessments show improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on interim assessments show great improvement.	Observation/ Conversation Written Documents
#45	**Performance Assessment Measures of Student Growth**	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on performance assessments show little or no improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on performance assessments show some improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on performance assessments show improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on performance assessments show great improvement.	Observation/ Conversation Written Documents

Criterion 5B:		Demonstrating Growth on Locally Selected Student Assessments (Cont.)				
Descriptor **(Enter Date Noted)**		Level of Performance				**Documentation (Circle)**
		Unsatisfactory	Basic	Proficient	Distinguished	
#46	**Portfolio Measures of Student Growth**	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on portfolio assessments show little improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on portfolio assessments show some improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on portfolio assessments show improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on portfolio assessments show great improvement.	Observation/ Conversation Written Documents
#47	**Summative Assessment of Student Growth**	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on summative assessments show little improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on summative assessments show some improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on summative assessments show improvement.	Measures of growth in student learning (academic achievement across two points in time) on summative assessments show great improvement.	Observation/ Conversation Written Documents

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation
Lesson Reflection Sheet

The Lesson Reflection Sheet will be completed by the teacher following each formal observation and taken to the post-observation conference. This form may be used by the administrator/supervisor to discuss and document standards/criteria/descriptors.

Teacher _____   **School** _____

Grade/Subject _____   **Date** _____

Teacher Signature _____   **Administrator Signature** _____

1. Did the lesson establish a climate that encouraged the students to be productively engaged in the work? How do I know?	2. Did the goal/objective of the lesson allow for students to engage in activities and learning situations that were consistent with the district's curriculum?
3. How did I ensure that all students participated in the activities/discussion?	4. What feedback did I receive from students indicating they achieved understanding and that the goals/objectives were met for this lesson?
5. Did I adjust my goals or my strategies as I taught the lesson? What would I do differently next time? Why?	6. If I could share one thing from this lesson with a colleague, what would it be?

NOTES:

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Supplemental Feedback Form

(Short Form)

☐Scheduled Observation ☐Unscheduled Observation ☐Artifact Data ☐Unplanned Data ☐Drop-In Observation

Teacher _____ School _____

Grade/Subject _____ Date _____

Administrator/Supervisor _____

Criterion/Descriptor: _____

_____

Data: _____

_____

Criterion/Descriptor: _____

_____

Data: _____

Teacher's Comments: _____

Administrator's/Supervisor's Comments: _____

_____ _____ _____ _____
Teacher's Signature   Date   Administrator's/Supervisor's Signature   Date

Signatures indicate that the above has been reviewed and discussed. Copies must be submitted to teacher and administrator/supervisor.

Performance Improvement Plan

Teacher _____   Tenured ☐   Probationary ☐

School _____   Grade/Subject_____

Administrator/Supervisor _____   Date _____

Type of Plan: ☐ Enrichment   ☐ Progressing Toward Proficiency   ☐ Noted for Development

Objectives (Applicable descriptors and expected level of performance):

Area of Development	Strategy/Activity	Expected Outcome to Inform/Change Teaching Practice	Resources Needed	Beginning Date	Ending Date

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation
Performance Improvement Plan

Note the teacher and administrator/supervisor responsibilities and/or strategies for achieving objectives:

Teacher will: _____

_____

_____

Administrator will: _____

_____

_____

Tangible evidence of progress toward outcome(s): _____

_____

Teacher's Comments:	Administrator's/Supervisor's Comments:

_____
Teacher's Signature   Date   Administrator's/Supervisor's Signature   Date

Plan developed: _____   Completed: _____   Revised: _____   Continued: _____   Reviewed: _____

_____
Teacher's Signature   Date   Administrator's/Supervisor's Signature   Date

Signatures indicate that the above has been reviewed and discussed. Copies must be submitted to teacher and administrator/supervisor.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

TEACHER EVALUATION REPORT

Teacher _____   School/Location: _____

SSN: _____ Years of Service: _____   Date: _____

Grade Level/Content Area: _____

Administrator/Supervisor: _____

Dates of Observations: _____   _____   _____   _____

TEACHER STANDARDS	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
1A: Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy	☐	☐	☐	☐
1B: Demonstrating knowledge of students	☐	☐	☐	☐
1C: Selecting instructional goals and objectives	☐	☐	☐	☐
1D: Demonstrating knowledge of resources	☐	☐	☐	☐
1E: Designing coherent instruction	☐	☐	☐	☐
1F: Assessing student learning	☐	☐	☐	☐
2A: Creating an environment of respect and rapport	☐	☐	☐	☐
2B: Establishing a culture for learning	☐	☐	☐	☐
2C: Managing classroom procedures	☐	☐	☐	☐
2D: Managing student behavior	☐	☐	☐	☐
2E: Organizing physical space	☐	☐	☐	☐
3A: Communicating clearly and accurately	☐	☐	☐	☐
3B: Using questioning and discussion techniques	☐	☐	☐	☐
3C: Engaging students in learning	☐	☐	☐	☐
3D: Providing feedback to students	☐	☐	☐	☐
3E: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness	☐	☐	☐	☐
4A: Reflecting on teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐
4B: Communicating with family	☐	☐	☐	☐
4C: Contributing to the school and district	☐	☐	☐	☐
4D: Growing and developing professionally	☐	☐	☐	☐
4E: Showing professionalism	☐	☐	☐	☐
5A: Demonstrating growth on statewide student assessments	☐	☐	☐	☐
5B: Demonstrating growth on locally selected student assessments	☐	☐	☐	☐
Overall Rating	☐	☐	☐	☐

UNSATISFACTORY: The teacher does not yet appear to understand the concepts underlying the component.
BASIC: The teacher appears to understand the concepts underlying the component and attempts to implement its elements.
PROFICIENT: The teacher clearly understands the concepts underlying the component and implements it well.
DISTINGUISHED: The teacher at this level is a master teacher and makes contributions to the field, both in and outside their class. Their classrooms operate at a qualitatively different level, consisting of a community of learners, with students highly motivated and engaged, as well as assuming a major responsibility for their own learning.

St. Louis Public Schools Teacher Evaluation

Performance Improvement Plan (collaboratively developed between the teacher and administrator/supervisor):
A PIP with the following descriptors has been the impetus for growth and development:

Area of Development	Achieved	Revised	Continued	Did Not Achieve
	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐

Optional comments by evaluator and/or teacher.   Should additional comments become necessary, please attach to this form provided the evaluator and teacher have initialed all additional pages.

This evaluation has been discussed with me: (☐) yes   (☐) no

The teacher may submit a written response within ten (10) days to be sent to Human Resources for inclusion in the teacher's personnel file with a copy to the evaluator.

_____   _____   _____   _____
DATE   EVALUATOR   DATE   EMPLOYEE

_____
ADMINISTRATOR AT LOCATION

Distribution: Personnel File
                          Principal
                          Employee

COMMENTS: