

EES

2018-19

Educator Effectiveness System



MANUAL FOR EVALUATORS AND PARTICIPANTS



Table of Contents

<u>KEY PRIORITIES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS SYSTEM</u>	1
DESIGN VALUES	1
THE EDUCATOR EFFECTIVENESS SYSTEM IS ABOUT GROWTH	1
<u>EES MEASURES</u>	3
STUDENT GROWTH & LEARNING	3
TEACHER PRACTICE	3
<u>FINAL EFFECTIVENESS RATING</u>	4
HIGHLY EFFECTIVE	4
EFFECTIVE	4
MARGINAL	4
UNSATISFACTORY	4
<u>TEACHER CLASSIFICATION</u>	4
CLASSROOM TEACHERS	5
NON-CLASSROOM TEACHERS	5
TEACHERS WITH MULTIPLE ROLES	5
<u>DIFFERENTIATING EES TO MEET TEACHERS' NEEDS</u>	5
NON-TENURED TEACHERS AND TEACHERS RATED AS LESS THAN EFFECTIVE	5
TENURED TEACHERS WHO RECEIVED A RATING OF EFFECTIVE OR BETTER IN THE PRIOR YEAR'S EVALUATION	6
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS (PDP)	6
<u>ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATIONS FOR SY2018-2019</u>	7
<u>ORIENTATION TRAINING FOR ALL TEACHERS</u>	8
<u>TEACHERS NEW TO EES- OVERVIEW TRAINING</u>	8
<u>EVALUATION CONFERENCES</u>	9
BEGINNING CONFERENCE	9
MID-YEAR CONFERENCE (OPTIONAL)	9
ENDING CONFERENCE	9
<u>IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINES</u>	10
SINGLE TRACK SCHOOLS IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINES	10
<u>SUPPORTING TEACHERS WITH DOCUMENTED DEFICIENCIES</u>	13
<u>TEACHER PRACTICE MEASURES</u>	15
CORE PROFESSIONALISM	15
PROCESS, REQUIREMENTS* & BEST PRACTICES FOR: CORE PROFESSIONALISM (CP)	17
RATING CALCULATION FOR CORE PROFESSIONALISM	18

OBSERVATIONS	19
PROCESS, REQUIREMENTS* & BEST PRACTICES FOR: FORMAL OBSERVATIONS	21
RATING CALCULATION FOR OBSERVATIONS	23
WORKING PORTFOLIO (WP)	23
PROCESS, REQUIREMENTS* & BEST PRACTICES FOR: WORKING PORTFOLIOS (WP)	25
RATING CALCULATION FOR WORKING PORTFOLIO	26
STUDENT GROWTH AND LEARNING MEASURES	27
STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVE (SLO) AND	27
SCHOOL OR SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT OBJECTIVE(SSIO)	27
THE FOUR COMPONENTS FOR SLOS AND SSIOS	29
PROCESS, REQUIREMENTS*& BEST PRACTICES FOR: SLO	30
PROCESS, REQUIREMENTS* & BEST PRACTICES FOR: SSIO	33
RATING CALCULATION FOR SLOS AND SSIOS	36
FINAL EFFECTIVENESS RATING	38
EXCEPTIONS TO THE TEACHER PRACTICE WEIGHTS	39
IMPACT OF FINAL RATING ON EMPLOYMENT ACTION(S)	39
APPENDIX A: KEY TERMS	40
APPENDIX B: SUPPORTING RESOURCES	42
APPENDIX C: ROSTER VERIFICATION (RV) CALENDARS	44
2018-2019 TRIPOD STUDENT PERCEPTION SURVEY RV & IMPLEMENTATION CALENDAR	44
2018-2019 HGM RV CALENDAR	44
APPENDIX D: MULTI-TRACK SCHOOLS IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINES	45
YELLOW TRACK SCHOOLS IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE	45
RED TRACK SCHOOLS IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE	48
GREEN TRACK SCHOOLS IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE	51
BLUE TRACK SCHOOLS IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINES	54

EES Resources Online

The Hawaii State Department of Education (HIDOE) has a public webpage, <http://bit.ly/HIDOEees>, where teachers, evaluators and the public can access information about the EES. More detailed information, resources and relevant documents and forms can be found on the HIDOE Intranet. The Intranet is only accessible by employees via their authenticated username (EmployeeID@hido.org) and password. To access many of the links to these resources that are embedded in the [EES Manual](#), employees will need to log in. First-time users of the Intranet can set their password via our Self-Service Password Manager; instructions available here: <http://bit.ly/DOEpwguide>. Employees who need further assistance with their login should contact the IT Help Desk at 564-6000, or via HATS at 8-1-808-692-7250.

Key Priorities for Implementing the Educator Effectiveness System

The Educator Effectiveness System (EES) is a comprehensive process to evaluate teachers' performance in the Hawaii State Department of Education (Department) to determine how to best target supports for teacher growth and improvement. The Department developed and refined the EES over the course of a one-year planning period and two-year pilot. The system has been further refined based on data and input collected from stakeholders during statewide implementation starting in School Year (SY) 2013-2014 and periodic refinement through SY2017-2018. Driven by the Department's beliefs about the value and importance of continuous improvement, the EES provides teachers with constructive feedback and structures of support throughout the school year.

Design Values

Nothing matters more than effective teachers

Research has shown that highly effective teachers have a greater impact on student achievement than any other factor. The EES aims to improve student and system outcomes by providing all teachers with the support they need to succeed. When teachers excel, students will thrive.

Teachers deserve to be treated like professionals

Professionals require evaluation systems that provide fair, transparent, equitable, and comprehensive feedback about their performance. The EES uses multiple measures to give teachers the best information available and guard against misguided judgments. In order to support and retain effective teachers, the Department needs to recognize excellence. The EES introduces a performance rating system that enhances effective instructional practices.

The Educator Effectiveness System is about growth

To reach its goals, the Department must invest in its teachers. The EES provides tools and data to help teachers become more effective. The EES supports teacher development by:

Clarifying Expectations

To be effective, teachers and administrators must have a clear understanding of what constitutes successful teaching/system improvement. The multiple EES measures and performance rubrics will identify areas of strength and improvement for our teachers.

Providing Feedback

The EES provides sources of regular feedback to teachers. Feedback is essential to learning and improvement. Under the EES, teachers receive feedback and opportunities for collegial discussion about their data multiple times throughout the school year.

Driving Professional Development

The EES data will help evaluators determine what support teachers need, the best way to allocate resources, and what instructional approaches/structures work best. Providing specific feedback to teachers allows them to set goals and seek professional development aligned with their needs.

Valuing Collaboration

Collaboration among teachers is critical. It builds common expectations of student and system outcomes and allows teachers to share best practices. The EES helps facilitate collaboration within schools and between schools by providing a common language and data set to use when talking about teacher practice, student achievement, school improvement, and system change. The Department encourages leveraging existing cooperative structures like data teams, professional learning communities, departments, instructional leadership teams, and grade level teams to help teachers interpret EES.

EES Measures


The EES measures are rooted in the Hawaii Teacher Performance Standards and comply with Hawaii State Board of Education (Board) Policy 203.4. Board policy requires the evaluation system to have two major components each of which counts towards at least 40 percent of the overall rating. The EES consists of Student Growth and Learning measures for half of a teacher's annual effectiveness rating, with Teacher Practice accounting for the other half. EES components used to comprise each measure differ based on each teacher's job classification since different data links to different teaching assignments.

Student Growth & Learning



- Student Learning Objective (SLO) or School System Improvement Objective (SSIO)

Teacher Practice



- Core Professionalism (CP) (including reflection on Tripod Student Survey & Hawaii Growth Model (HGM) - Median Growth Percentile (MGP) results)
- Observation(s) or Working Portfolio (WP)

Teachers cannot opt out of EES. It is a requirement of all teachers, based on the Bargaining Unit 5 (BU5) contract. All BU5 teachers shall be evaluated, irrespective of future plans the teacher may have (separation, retirement, leave, etc).

Final Effectiveness Rating

The combination of measures will result in an annual final effectiveness rating of Highly Effective, Effective, Marginal, or Unsatisfactory.

Highly Effective

Demonstrates excellence in teacher practice and student/system outcomes that exceed expectations.

Effective

Demonstrates effective teacher practice and student/system outcomes that meet expectations.

Marginal

Needs improvement to demonstrate effective teacher practice and/or expected student/system outcomes.

Unsatisfactory

Does not show evidence of effective teacher practice or expected student/system outcomes.

The final effectiveness rating represents the combined performance on multiple measures. Individual component ratings do not equate to the final effectiveness rating. Individual component ratings may use different terminology (e.g., Distinguished, Proficient, Basic, etc.) because they are indicators of specific levels of performance on unique rubrics.

The Professional Development Educate, Empower, Excel (PDE³) system, the Department's online platform, will be used to document all evaluation dates, component ratings, and generate a final effectiveness rating.

Teacher Classification

The EES applies to all BU5 employees within the Department. BU5 employees fall into two broad categories: 1) Classroom Teachers (CT) and 2) Non-Classroom Teachers (NCT). PDE³ will apply data to teachers depending upon the specified classification of either CT or NCT. If teachers switch roles mid-year, a conference should be initiated by the evaluator to discuss the implications on the teacher's evaluation. The Summary of Conference (SOC) form may be used to document this meeting.

Classroom Teachers

CTs are BU5 employees who plan, deliver, and assess instruction for students.

Non-Classroom Teachers

NCTs are BU5 employees who do not plan, deliver, or assess instruction for students as their primary responsibility. NCTs are professionals who may support students, educators, parents, and other members of the educational community either at a school, complex area, or state office. Examples of NCT roles include curriculum coordinator, academic coach, registrar, resource teacher, librarian, counselor, student services coordinator, student activities coordinator, technology coordinator, and department head or grade level chair.

Teachers with Multiple Roles

Some teachers may serve in multiple school roles. Teachers who have both classroom and non-classroom responsibilities need to mutually determine, with their evaluator, which teacher classification best applies to their position. Teachers who primarily plan, deliver, and assess instruction for students should generally be classified as CTs. If the teacher and evaluator cannot agree on the teacher's classification, the evaluator's determination is the one that will take precedence.

Differentiating EES to Meet Teachers' Needs

The EES applies differentiated evaluation tracks. A teacher's tenure status and prior year's rating will determine the differentiated support and evaluation track. The differentiated process reflects the belief that teachers at different performance levels deserve and require different types of feedback, support, and opportunities to grow as professionals.

Non-tenured teachers and teachers rated as Less than Effective

All teachers that begin SY 2018-2019 as a non-tenured teacher, shall be on the Enhanced Track for SY 2018-2019. Any teacher rated Less than Effective in the prior year's evaluation shall also participate in an Enhanced Evaluation.

Tenured teachers who received a rating of Effective or better in the prior year's evaluation

Tenured teachers rated Effective or better in SY 2017-2018 shall be on the Streamlined Track for SY 2018-2019. During the year in which tenured teachers participate in a Streamlined Evaluation, their prior year's final rating shall be carried over. If a tenured teacher does not have a final EES rating from the previous year, the teacher shall be on the Standard Track for SY 2018-2019.

Professional Development Plans (PDP)

All teachers will develop and maintain a professional development plan that identifies areas for targeted growth and learning of teachers and students. The PDP may be used as a piece of evidence for CP for those on Standard & Enhanced tracks. There are two types of professional development plans: 1) Individual Professional Development Plan and 2) Principal Directed Professional Development Plan.

Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP):

A teacher's IPDP can take shape in many different formats, but should include concrete goal(s) for targeted growth and learning of teachers and students. Teachers will discuss the contents of their plan with their evaluator by the end of the first quarter. Teachers may include their IPDP as evidence within Core Professionalism (CP) for those that are on the Standard or Enhanced tracks. Reflection on the plan itself and the learning opportunities within the plan are considered a matter of professional responsibility. A [sample IPDP template](#) can be found on the HIDOE Intranet.

Principal Directed Professional Development Plan (PDPDP):

A PDPDP will apply to teachers who received a Less than Effective rating for the previous school year. The principal/evaluator will lead the development of this plan and must be constructed within 30 instructional days from the start of the school year. The plan should include specific interventions and teacher expectations, as well as a timeline for improvements to occur.

Additionally, teachers who have demonstrated documented deficiencies can be placed on a PDPDP at any time during the school year by their principal/evaluator (see the Supporting Teachers with Documented Deficiencies section of this manual for more information).

Annual Comprehensive Evaluations for SY2018-2019

The Department has committed to improving the EES as referenced in the [Superintendent's Memo](#). The improvements to EES are reflected in the chart below.

School Year 2018-2019		Comprehensive Evaluations		
		Enhanced	Standard	Streamlined
		Any teacher who received an Overall Marginal or Unsatisfactory EES rating in the prior school year. Any Non-Tenured teacher, regardless of their overall rating in the prior school year.	Tenured teachers with no EES rating from the prior school year.	Tenured teachers who received an overall Effective or Highly Effective EES rating in the prior school year.
Teacher Practice	Core Professionalism**	Domain 4 evidence & reflection on student survey and MGP results	Domain 4 evidence & reflection on student survey and MGP results	Reflection on student survey and MGP results (not rated)
	Observation OR Working Portfolio	Two or more formal observations, or a WP for NCT	One or more formal observations, or a WP for NCT	Not required or rated*
Student Growth	SLO OR SSIO	One SLO or SSIO	One SLO or SSIO	Not required or rated*
Final Rating		New rating received	New rating received	Rating carried over from prior year
*At evaluator's discretion, teachers will continue to set learning objectives, engage in data team processes, participate in walkthroughs and implement best practices as part of school improvement processes. Such efforts during a Streamlined Evaluation shall not be rated and documentation is not required.				
**All teachers will develop & maintain a professional development plan that identifies areas of targeted growth & learning of teachers and students. The PDP may be used as evidence for CP.				
<u>Non-tenured teachers who are eligible for tenure in the second semester will stay on the assigned Enhanced track for the duration of the school year.</u>				

Orientation Training for all Teachers

All teachers must participate in an annual EES Orientation to review the evaluation tool.

Topic	Provider	Purpose and Outcomes	Due Date*
EES Orientation Video	School level, complex area, or state office staff, as applicable	Provide an orientation to the performance evaluation system Inform teachers about the tools, process, performance criteria, guidance material, method of calculating the annual evaluation rating, and timelines	Must be conducted prior to the first day of instruction with students *Relative to teachers hired after the school year starts, training should be conducted as soon as possible, and prior to the teacher’s engagement in applicable evaluation components

Teachers New To EES- Overview Training

In addition to the annual EES Orientation training, teachers new to the EES must participate in the following basic training requirements. Attendance for all required training sessions should be recorded in PDE³. Training and support should not be limited to the overviews; it should be ongoing and targeted to support individual needs.

Topic	Provider	Purpose and Outcomes	Due Dates*
Teacher Practice Overview: Introduction to the Framework for Teaching Overview of Observations/ Working Portfolio, Core Professionalism (including Professional Development Plans, Tripod Student Survey and Hawaii Growth Model reflections)	Participant of the Trainer-of-Trainers for “Introduction to the Framework for Teaching” OR certified in the observation protocol	Provide teachers with a basic understanding of the components within the Teacher Practice & Student Growth & Learning measures	See Implementation Timeline *Relative to teachers hired after the school year starts, training should be conducted as soon as possible, and prior to the teacher’s engagement in applicable evaluation components
Student Growth and Learning Overview: Quality Instruction via SLO for beginning teachers	School level, complex area, or state office staff, as applicable		

Evaluation Conferences

Every teacher is unique, therefore support and development should not look exactly the same for everyone. It is imperative that teachers and administrators have opportunities for honest, data-driven conversations focused on promoting continuous improvement. Instead of meeting about each evaluation component separately, it is recommended that teachers and evaluators work together to schedule combined conferences for as many components as possible. While observation cycles typically require their own conferencing schedule, most of the other components in the EES can be discussed during a Beginning Conference, Mid-Year Conference (optional), and Ending Conference as described here.

Beginning Conference

This is a collaborative discussion about the teacher's past performance and plan for the year ahead. It is recommended that the topics of conversation include a teacher's professional development plan, Core Professionalism, Observation schedule, Working Portfolio (WP), and SLO/SSIO plan, as applicable.

Mid-Year Conference (optional)

If necessary or desired, a meeting can be arranged to discuss progress on all aspects of the teacher's performance. Topics could also include the impact of new students on a SLO, progress on a WP, or a needed adjustment to a teacher's professional development plan. Additionally, concerns could be discussed if the teacher has documented deficiencies and an intervention is necessary.

Ending Conference

Teacher and evaluator review the summative feedback and the documentation that should support all ratings (component and overall) for Teacher Practice and Student Growth and Learning at the Ending Conference. Progress made with the teacher's professional development plan should be discussed along with the teacher's final effectiveness rating for the school year. Best practice would be to upload this documentation into PDE³.

Implementation Timelines

(Timelines for Multi-Track Schools is located in Appendix D. 12 month teachers should follow the Green Multi-track calendar as appropriate and in agreement with their evaluator.)

Teachers and evaluators should collaborate to complete EES requirements given the constraints applicable to their school and situation. The deadlines shown here are administrative deadlines. Evaluators may require evidence submission prior to dates listed to allow for feedback and revisions.

If a teacher and evaluator want to alter these timelines for a specific situation, it requires mutual agreement between the Employer and Association. Coordination and documentation of approval should be done through the EES Complex Area Lead and the Hawaii State Teachers Association (HSTA) UniServ Director. If there is no agreement, the timeline in this manual shall be followed.

Single Track Schools Implementation Timelines

Evaluator or Implementation Deadline	Component	Implementation Notes
August		
8/6 (or prior to the first day of instruction)	Training	SY2018-2019 EES Orientation Video training for all teachers. Teachers informed of online EES manual on the DOE public website (hawaiipublicschools.org)
8/27	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Data snapshot of Infinite Campus rosters for Grades 3-12.
8/28-8/31	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	School set up for Tripod Roster Verification

September		
8/24 (or prior to starting EES evaluation)	Training	EES Overview trainings for teachers new to the EES* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators may start scheduling beginning conferences for components (Observation, CP, WP, IPDP as applicable) <i>*Relative to teachers hired after the school year starts, training should be conducted as soon as possible.</i>
9/4-9/6	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Teachers in grades 3-12 verify roster for Tripod Student Survey administration
9/7-9/10	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Principals review & approve Tripod Student Survey rosters
9/7	1 st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve 1 st Sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9/10-12/7: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan Secondary teachers who only teach quarter-long classes must collaborate with their evaluators to determine the following deadlines: approval, mid-term, data collection, and end-of-term rating
9/18	PDPDP	Evaluator-led PDPDP developed for teachers who received a final effectiveness rating of less than Effective in the prior school year
October		
10/5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WP (for NCTs as applicable) CP IPDP Year Long SLO/SSIO 	Beginning Conferences completed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators & NCTs collaborate & agree upon 5 components for WP Evaluators share CP expectations Teachers share IPDP with evaluators Evaluators approve year-long SLO/SSIO in PDE ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10/15-4/26: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan
November		
11/2	1 st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve mid-term 1st sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³
11/20 – 12/5	Tripod Student Survey	Tripod Student Survey window <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers in Gr.3-12 that roster verified will administer the survey

December		
12/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Sem. SLO/SSIO Observations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers end data collection/implementation of 1st sem. SLO/SSIO 1st Sem. observations completed
12/10-1/8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Sem. SLO/SSIO 	Evaluators conduct 1 st sem. SLO/SSIO ending conferences
January		
1/8 or second day after return from Winter Break	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Sem. SLO/SSIO Observations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators finalize 1st sem. SLO/SSIO end-of-term rating in PDE³ Evaluators finalize 1st Sem. observations ratings in PDE³
1/18	Year Long SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve mid-term year-long SLO/SSIO in PDE ³
1/25	EES Track Movement	Deadline for moving a teacher from Streamlined to Standard evaluation track for SY 2018-2019
February		
2/8	2 nd Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve 2 nd sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2/12-4/26: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan
2/14	Tripod Student Survey	Results for Tripod Student Survey distributed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers review & reflect upon the results
March		
3/8	2 nd Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve mid-term 2 nd sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³
April		
4/26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2nd Sem. Obs WP CP IPDP/PDPDP 2nd Sem. or Year long SLO/SSIO Tripod Student Survey & HGM Reflections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2nd Sem. observations completed Teachers stop data collection/implementation for WP, CP, IPDP/PDPDP, year long or 2nd sem. SLO/SSIO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers should prepare for the final evaluation conference as applicable

May		
4/29-5/17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations/WP • SLO/SSIO • CP • IPDP/PDPDP • Tripod Student Survey & HGM Reflections (as applicable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluators complete all ending conferences within this time frame; especially for teachers rated less than Effective. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluators finalize and lock all relevant components in PDE³, including the Summary Tab where evaluator & teacher should e-sign and date to acknowledge the final effectiveness rating for SY 2018-2019. ○ For teachers that receive a less than Effective final rating, the principal must review and discuss the final effectiveness rating no later than 5/17.

Supporting Teachers with Documented Deficiencies

Triggers for initiating an intervention support due to documented performance deficiencies (contingent on the teacher’s current evaluation track) include, but are not limited to observations, SLO/SSIO implementation, Core Professionalism, Tripod Student Survey results, student outcomes, parent concerns, or walk-by data. Information and data from the previous year may be used by the evaluator to trigger additional supports or to place a teacher on a Standard evaluation track.

Evaluators should document concerns as they arise, contact their EES Complex Area Lead for guidance, and schedule a meeting with the teacher to discuss next steps and expectations.

Evaluators may provide targeted support. Administrative interventions may occur based on the magnitude of a single performance deficiency or multiple performance deficiencies on the teacher’s part. The administrator’s professional judgment determines how he or she proceeds.

Concerns Arise

Evaluator documents concerns based on walk-bys, EES data, parent concerns, etc. and schedules a meeting with the teacher



Evaluator meets with the teacher and documents the meeting using the EES SOC form and applies professional judgement to determine using one or more of the following courses of action:

Continue to check on progress while outlining next steps, necessary supports, timeline, and expectations

And/or

Initiate a PDPDP

And/or

Move the teacher onto a Standard evaluation cycle


One way to trigger more support is for the evaluator to initiate the development of a PDPDP. This plan should outline supports and goals for improving a teacher's practice. The placement of a teacher on a PDPDP may be documented on the [EES SOC form](#).

Moving a teacher from Streamlined to Standard

If a teacher who is participating in a Streamlined Evaluation demonstrates documented performance deficiencies, the evaluator should address the issue and document the concern(s) in an [EES Summary of Conference](#). Evaluators have the option to put the teacher on a Standard Evaluation (see Implementation Timeline).

If the EES Track Movement date has passed, the evaluator should continue to document concerns and provide support for the remainder of the school year. At the end of the year, the evaluator should determine if the teacher has made improvements or if the teacher will need to be placed on the Standard evaluation track at the start of the next school year for more targeted and formal support. This track change should be addressed at the ending of the year conference.

Teacher Practice Measures



Teacher practice is based on two measures, Core Professionalism and Observation/Working Portfolio. Teachers have access to Charlotte Danielson’s book, [Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching](#). The element-level rubrics found in the 2007 edition and the component-level rubrics found in the [2013 edition of The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument](#) were consolidated into the Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching as a guide for evidence collection and evaluation within the EES.

Core Professionalism

Core Professionalism (CP) encompasses the range of responsibilities and activities a teacher handles that are critical to students and schools. Throughout the school year, teachers engage in professional activities that positively contribute to the school culture.

Indicators for Core Professionalism

Domain 4 Evidence

The criteria and expectations for CP are articulated in the Domain 4 Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching Rubric (see pg. 24). The Domain Level Rubric provides a more holistic picture of a teacher’s professional responsibilities. [Additional CP resources](#) can be found on the HODOE Intranet.

Reflection on Tripod Student Survey results

The Tripod Student Survey collects student perspectives about teaching and learning pertaining to a specific classroom. Teachers that administered a class survey will receive a teacher report on their class' collective results. Schools will also receive a school level report based on the collective results from all students surveyed in the school. Teachers will reflect upon their individual, school, complex or state level Tripod Student Survey results as applicable to their position. Teachers should consult and collaborate with their evaluator on the acceptable documentation method of reflection. More information about the Tripod Student Survey is available in the [additional CP resources](#) on the HIDOE Intranet.

Reflection on Hawaii Growth Model (HGM) results

The HGM is a normative model that ranks each student's state assessment score against other students with similar test score history (academic peer group) in ELA and Math. Each student will receive a Student Growth Percentile (SGP). The SGP resulting from this analysis helps to determine how much a student has progressed within a given year compared to other students within their academic peer group. Teachers teaching in Gr. 4-8, ELA/Math have a Median Growth Percentile (MGP) derived from their students' SGP. Each school also receives a MGP according to the school's performance in ELA/Math.

Teachers will reflect on individual or school-wide HGM results as applicable to their position and should consult and collaborate with their evaluator on the acceptable documentation method of reflection.

More information about the Hawaii Growth Model is available in the [additional HGM resources](#) on the HIDOE Intranet.

Reflection on Professional Development Plans

Teachers will reflect on progress of their professional development plans and should consult and collaborate with their evaluator on the acceptable documentation method of reflection. A sample of an [IPDP template](#) can be found on the HIDOE Intranet.

Process, Requirements* & Best Practices for: Core Professionalism (CP)

*notates required actions

Beginning Conference	The purpose of the beginning conference is for the evaluator to review the CP expectations with the teacher, prior to the end of the first quarter, through a mutually agreed upon meeting (individually or with a group of teachers).	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	Understand and clarify evaluator's expectations*	Review the expectations w/teachers.* Discuss what qualifies & quantifies for acceptable evidence, where the evidence should be turned in, and due dates for submission. Must document date into PDE ³ for Standard & Enhanced track teachers*
Evidence Collection	The purpose of the evidence collection is for the teacher and evaluator to capture the holistic picture of a teacher's professional responsibilities, activities & contributions to the school culture. Evaluators can also submit evidence to a teacher's CP evidence.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	Collect evidence that aligns to the expectations & rubric throughout the school year. Teachers should also reflect upon the Tripod & Growth scores as a part of their evidence. Submit the evidence via designated way evaluator identified (PDE ³ , Google, hard copies, etc.)*	Submit evidence as applicable. Inform teacher if evidence is to be submitted for evaluation purposes.* If the teacher does not participate in CP (or any other component of the EES in a timely manner or at all), the evaluator should address this through the SOC process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The principal should issue a directive requiring the teacher to follow through by a specific deadline; and identify the possible consequence(s) if the teacher does not follow through. • If the teacher does not comply within that time, the evaluator will rate the teacher as Unsatisfactory for the affected EES component and may also use this as evidence in CP.
Ending Conference	The purpose of the ending conference is for the teacher & evaluator to review the evidence and assign a rating.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	Input any comments into PDE ³ as applicable.	Review evidence & assign rating in PDE ³ for Standard & Enhanced track teachers*

Rating Calculation for Core Professionalism

CP is viewed and rated holistically using the Domain 4 Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching rubric (see rubric below). Indicators are not rated individually and then averaged, but rather it is the evaluator’s judgment of the preponderance of evidence. A single indicator may be important enough to influence the final CP rating. Evaluators may also contribute to the pool of evidence (e.g., following school policies and procedures, participation in professional development, etc.) and must notify teachers when it is going to be used for evaluation purposes. Evaluators are responsible for clearly communicating submission of CP evidence, deadlines, and clarifying expectations to their teachers for those on the Standard or Enhanced track.

CP ratings may be quantified by using the following Domain 4 Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching rubric:

0 (Unsatisfactory)	2 (Basic)	3 (Proficient)	4 (Distinguished)
<p>Teacher demonstrates low ethical standards and little sense of professionalism for improving his/her own teaching and collaboration with colleagues. Record-keeping systems are chaotic and ineffective, with information lost or missing. Communication with families/communities is unclear, infrequent, and culturally insensitive. Teacher avoids participating in both school and department projects unless specifically required to do so, and makes a minimal commitment to professional development. Reflection on practice is infrequent or inaccurate, resulting in few ideas for improvement</p>	<p>Teacher demonstrates modest ethical standards and a moderate sense of professionalism for improving his/her own teaching, and modest collaboration with colleagues. Record-keeping systems are minimal and partially effective. Communication with families/communities is sometimes unclear, sporadic, and of mixed cultural sensitivity. Teacher participates to a minimal extent in both school and department projects, and makes a commitment to professional development. Reflection on practice is sporadic and occasionally accurate, resulting in inconsistent ideas for improvement</p>	<p>Teacher demonstrates high ethical standards and a sense of professionalism focused on improving his/her own teaching, and collaboration with colleagues. Record-keeping systems are efficient and effective. Communication with families/communities is clear, frequent, and culturally sensitive. Teacher participates in both school and department projects, and engages in professional development activities. Reflection on practice is frequent and accurate, resulting in valuable ideas for improvement</p>	<p>Teacher demonstrates highest ethical standards and a deep sense of professionalism, focused on improving his/her own teaching and supporting the ongoing learning of colleagues. Record-keeping systems are efficient and effective, with evidence of student contribution. Communication with families/communities is clear, frequent, and culturally sensitive, with meaningful student participation. Teacher assumes leadership roles in both school and department projects, and engages in a wide range of professional development activities. Reflection on practice is insightful, resulting in valuable ideas for improvement that are shared across professional learning communities and contribute to improving the practice of colleagues</p>

Observations


Observations and collaborative conferencing are critical to understanding and developing teacher practice. The observation cycle consists of three key steps, which should be completed by the same observer. Best practice is for the cycle to be completed within two weeks. The lengths of conferences and observations will vary depending on the context. Observations are based on Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching. The Department decided to focus on five observable components for classroom observations based on their alignment with our statewide priorities. [The Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching Rubrics](#) will be used to guide evidence collection and evaluations of these focus components.

Observers must be Educational Officers (EOs) who are certified by the Department to conduct observations. Evaluators have the authority to determine the number of classroom observations beyond the minimal observation requirement based on their professional judgment. If a teacher requests additional observations, it is up to the evaluator to approve or deny these additional requests. A different EO may conduct any additional evaluations, as long as s/he conducts the whole observation cycle.

While a minimum of one observation is required for Standard Evaluations and two for Enhanced Evaluations, educators are encouraged to engage in more observations to provide feedback, improve practice, and determine an accurate picture of what is truly happening in the classroom. Video-taping for evaluation purposes shall not be allowed but teachers may consent to recording for mentoring, coaching and professional development purposes only.

Indicators for Classroom Teacher Observations

There are 11 observable components within Domain 2 (Classroom Environment) and Domain 3 (Instruction) of the Framework for Teaching. HIDOE focuses on the following five observable components for classroom observations:



Non-Classroom Teacher (NCT) Formal Observations

With administrator approval, NCTs can participate in formal observation cycles instead of the Working Portfolio (WP). The NCT and evaluator should work collaboratively when identifying the five most appropriate components for observations from the [Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching Rubrics for NCTs](#) that pertain to Instructional Specialists, School Counselors, Library/Media, Classroom Teacher, etc. The five selected components must come from the observable Domains of the Framework; Domain 2 and Domain 3 and must include components from both Domains. If an NCT is on an Enhanced Evaluation track, two formal observations are required.

Formal Observations for Special Education (SpEd) Teachers in Fully Self-Contained (FSC) Settings

With administrator approval, SpEd FSC teachers can choose the most applicable components from Domain 2 AND 3 for their formal observation(s). The SpEd teacher and the evaluator should work collaboratively when identifying the five most appropriate components for observations from the [Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching Rubrics](#). The five selected components must come from the observable Domains of the Framework; Domain 2 and Domain 3 and must include components from both Domains. If a teacher is on an Enhanced Evaluation track, two formal observations are required.

Process, Requirements* & Best Practices for: Formal Observations

*notates required actions

Setting up an Observation Cycle	The goal is to work together to establish mutually agreed upon conference dates and times, format & documentation expectations. The pre-conference questions or their alternate are optional, unless the evaluator requires this as a matter of practice at the school or office.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	Address the pre-observation conference questions or submit relevant lesson materials to provide context for the upcoming lesson, as applicable to the expectations set by the evaluator.*	<p>May select the most appropriate date and time, if the teacher and evaluator cannot agree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must provide a minimum of a 24-hour notice to the teacher prior to conducting the pre-conference.* (If scheduling conflicts occur, evaluators should document attempts & continue with the observation process).
Pre-Observation Conference	The purpose of the pre-observation conference is for the teacher to share lesson objectives and activities along with helpful information that provides context for the observation. In classrooms where the five components are sometimes challenging to address, the teacher and evaluator should identify the types of evidence that would be appropriate for the levels of performance within that classroom. The pre-observation conference may occur through email, WebEx, PDE ³ or other electronic formats; in situations where the teacher and evaluator do not agree on the format, the pre-observation conference will default to face-to-face.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	<p>Share lesson objectives and activities, along with helpful information that will assist the observer*, such as student characteristics and specific classroom situations.</p> <p>Ask the evaluator to collect specific feedback and clarify questions about the observation at this time.</p>	<p>Review the pre-conference materials submitted by the teacher.</p> <p>Ask questions rooted in the rubric, discuss what will be used as evidence of learning, and clarify any questions posed by the teacher.</p> <p>Document the scheduled date & time into PDE³*</p>

Process, Requirements* & Best Practices for: Formal Obs, Continued

*notates required actions

Classroom Observation	The purpose of the observation is to collect evidence to provide clear, timely, and useful feedback that supports teachers' professional learning. The observation should last as long as it takes to observe the discussed lesson.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	<p>Carry out the lesson discussed.*</p> <p>Collect additional artifacts relative to the lesson observed, such as student work samples, to bring to the post-observation conference.</p>	<p>Must provide teacher with 24-hour notice prior to conducting the formal observation.* (If conflicts arise, evaluators should document attempts and continue with the observation process.)</p> <p>Collect objective evidence, noting both student and teacher actions.*</p> <p>Speak with students during the lesson to gather additional evidence about their learning or typical classroom practice.</p>
Post Observation Conference	After the observation, the teacher and evaluator should match evidence with components and analyze how the evidence aligns with the rubric. The purpose of the post-observation conference is to engage teachers and evaluators in professional conversations that promote quality teaching and learning. Post-observation conferences should be scheduled for face-to-face interactions. Evaluators must provide a copy of the evidence/observation notes to the teacher prior to the post-observation conference.* Observation concludes with the teacher's reflection (as applicable to the evaluator's expectations) and the evaluator finalizing the documentation within PDE ³ . The observation reflection questions or their alternate are optional, unless the evaluator requires this as a matter of practice at the school or office.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	<p>Participate in collaborative analysis about how the evidence corresponds to component rubrics.</p> <p>Submit additional artifacts to the evaluator as evidence.</p> <p>Address the post-observation conference questions as applicable to the expectations of the evaluator.</p> <p>Document any concerns or additional information.</p>	<p>Facilitate an evidence-based discussion rooted in aligning evidence to the Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching.</p> <p>Discuss areas of strength and weakness and performance level demonstrated for each component.</p> <p>Review, if any, reflections that the teacher submits & add in any additional comments as applicable.</p> <p>Document date & component ratings in PDE³*</p>

Rating Calculation for Observations

During a post-observation conference for each observation cycle, the evaluator assigns a final performance level rating by using the [Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching Rubrics](#). An Unsatisfactory rating in the observation component as a whole, shall require an additional observation. This additional observation need not be done by a different evaluator, but it is permissible. After all observation cycles are completed, the individual component ratings (five from each observation) will be averaged and quantified using the performance level scoring scale. The final observation rating will be a number from zero to four that is produced by averaging the scores from all of the component level ratings (0=Unsatisfactory, 2=Basic, 3=Proficient, 4=Distinguished). [Additional Observation resources](#) can be found on the HIDOE Intranet.


Working Portfolio (WP)

Non-Classroom Teachers (NCTs), in collaboration with their evaluator, will have the option to complete a WP in place of a formal observation. WPs provide a method of documenting a teacher's practice by collecting and presenting quality evidence of meeting performance standards articulated by the Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching or the Hawaii Teacher Standards Board's (HTSB) Performance Standards for School Librarians and School Counselors. The collection of evidence is the responsibility of the NCT. The evaluator may participate in collecting evidence. The evidence may be compiled in physical or electronic formats as determined through collaboration between the teacher and the evaluator. If there is no agreement, the evaluator will determine the format. The evaluator and NCT may choose to supplement the WP with observation data of the NCT.

Indicators for Working Portfolios

NCTs should work with their evaluators to select either the [Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching](#) or the [HTSB-approved Professional Standards for School Librarians and School Counselors](#). When using the Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching, the NCT and evaluator may compile a combination of components from Domains 1, 2, or 3 from different rubrics if necessary to best reflect the NCT's primary job responsibilities. It is not appropriate to combine some components from the Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching and some standards from the HTSB because the two frameworks employ different organizational structures. If the NCT and the evaluator cannot agree, the evaluator will select the most appropriate rubric and components.

Chart for Selecting Working Portfolio Components



Process, Requirements* & Best Practices for: Working Portfolios (WP)

*notates required actions

Beginning Conference Complete by the end of the first quarter (if NCT assumes position after first quarter, conduct Beginning Conference as soon as possible)	The purpose of the Beginning Conference is for the evaluator & teacher to engage in a collaborative conversation to select and approve the Framework, five components & corresponding rubrics. Discussions should also lead to setting clear expectations for what types and sources of evidence will be considered high quality and in alignment with the rubrics. Completing the WP Beginning Conference questions is optional unless the evaluator requires this as a practice at the school or office.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	In preparation for the Beginning Conference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Download the appropriate WP rubrics from the HIDOE intranet site. Complete the WP Beginning Conference questions and identify the proposed framework, components, and sources of evidence as applicable to the expectations set by the evaluator.* 	In preparation for the Beginning Conference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm NCT roles/responsibilities and review any materials submitted by the NCT. Document approved framework and 5 components for evidence collection in PDE ³ . Discuss expectations for acceptable types & sources of evidence. Document date of Beginning Conference in PDE ³ .*
Evidence Collection	The purpose of the Evidence Collection is to gather and document quality evidence connected to the components that demonstrate the typical practice of the NCT over the course of the year	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	Implement strategies to gather multiple types of evidence for each component. Use the NCT WP Evidence Submission form to document hard copy evidence.	If needed, collect supplemental evidence and share with the teacher. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inform teacher if evidence will be submitted for evaluation purposes.*

Process, Requirements* & Best Practices for: WP, Continued

*notates required actions

Mid-Year Conference (Optional)	The purpose of the optional Mid-Year Conference is to review the progress made, verify if revisions are necessary, and repeat Beginning Conference process for any revisions to the components or types of evidence collected.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	Conference with evaluator as needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share evidence/justification for revisions. 	Review progress and provide feedback. Document conference, ensure changes are reflected and approved in PDE ³ .*
Ending Conference	The purpose of the Ending Conference is to discuss the submitted evidence for the WP and discuss areas of strength, identified areas for growth, and next steps. The Ending Conference may be used to document reflections of the WP process within the Ending Conference Summary in PDE ³ . The WP reflection questions or their alternate are optional, unless the evaluator requires this as a matter of practice at the school or office.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	Organize and submit evidence for evaluator's review prior to the Ending Conference.* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If physical evidence is used, attach the WP Teacher Evidence Submission forms; if PDE³ is used, submit descriptions online. Explain evidence alignment to rubric. <p>Reflect upon the ratings as applicable to the expectations of the evaluator.</p> <p>Document any concerns or additional information.</p>	Facilitate an evidence-based discussion rooted in aligning evidence to the WP Rubric. Discuss areas of strength and weakness and performance level demonstrated for each of the 5 components. Review, if any, reflections that the teacher submits & add in any additional comments as applicable. Document date & component ratings in PDE ³ *

Rating Calculation for Working Portfolio

During the Ending Conference, the evaluator assigns a performance level rating using agreed upon rubrics for each of the applicable components chosen for the WP. The individual component ratings are then quantified using the performance level scoring scale. The final WP rating is a number from zero to four that is produced by averaging the scores from all five component ratings. The final observation rating will be a number from zero to four that is produced by averaging the scores from all of the component level ratings (0=Unsatisfactory, 2=Basic, 3=Proficient, 4=Distinguished). [Additional WP resources](#) can be found on the HIDOE Intranet.

Student Growth and Learning Measures

Student Learning Objective (SLO) and School or System Improvement Objective (SSIO)



SLOs are carefully planned long-range goals that are based on standards and developed by teachers. Specific and measurable targets are set from initial student readiness evidence. SLOs reflect the most important desired learning outcomes specific to the course or subject and grade for the semester, quarter (for applicable secondary teachers), or year. CTs are required to develop one complete SLO for approval and implementation during the year of their Standard or Enhanced Evaluation.

The SSIO is similar to a SLO and serves as an option for NCTs only, depending on the nature of their assignment. A NCT who works directly with students on acquiring new or improved learning should complete a SLO. A NCT who works toward school or system improvement(s) should complete a SSIO. The evaluator and teacher should collaborate to determine which is appropriate, a SLO or SSIO as it relates to the complex, school, and/or classroom needs. If an agreement cannot be reached, the evaluator will select the most appropriate focus.

The SLO/SSIO process should be integrated into existing efforts to analyze data, set goals, and implement formative instructional cycles. (e.g., if a group of teachers in the same department, course, or grade level can agree on a common SLO, or if the school develops a school-wide SLO, data team meetings can become a useful forum for analyzing progress towards the SLO and sharing teaching strategies that are successful in reaching interim targets.)

Special Considerations

Alternative Learning Settings

Teachers working with students in an alternative learning setting, either on or off campus, may consider both the SLO and SSIO as options. The teacher and evaluator should work together to determine which is more appropriate but the evaluator will select the focus if an agreement cannot be reached.

Mid-year Assignment Changes

If a teacher changes roles mid-year, the teacher and evaluator can work together on a new SLO/SSIO within appropriate approval deadlines.

Preschool Teachers

Teachers of preschool students should use SLOs instead of SSIOs.

Teachers in Self-Contained Classrooms

Teachers working with students with severe cognitive disabilities in a fully self-contained setting may have a small class with drastically different needs. Teachers and evaluators have the following additional options depending on the context of the class:

- Create different SLOs for each student; SLOs may integrate Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals and objectives
- Create a common learning goal such as: Students will apply knowledge and skills of verbal and nonverbal language to communicate effectively in various situations, one-to-one, in groups, and for a variety of purposes; the Expected Target(s) will vary for each student

The Four Components for SLOs and SSIOs

Learning Goal

SLO	A description of what a student should know and be able to do at the end of the instructional term based on the appropriate instructional standards and curriculum
SSIO	A description of what the teacher will achieve or contribute to school-wide systems and performance by the end of the instructional term based on appropriate professional standards

Assessment(s)

SLO	Standards-based, high quality measure(s) using clear criteria or rubrics to evaluate student achievement
SSIO	High quality measure(s) using clear criteria or rubrics to evaluate the degree to which the Expected Target(s) was achieved

Expected Target(s)

SLO	A target based on the student’s readiness level describing anticipated outcomes for each individual student
SSIO	A target that includes the starting point and anticipated end results using the Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-bound (SMART) goal format

Instructional Strategies

SLO	A description of appropriate and evidence-based strategies that will be used to address all students’ needs and are specific to the learning goal
SSIO	A description of the appropriate strategies that will lead to the Expected Target(s)

SLO/SSIO Requirement

Schools may use existing documents that support teaching and learning for the SLOs and SSIOs if the documentation addresses all four components of the SLO/SSIO. [The SLO template/SLO template with directions](#) or [SSIO template/SSIO template with directions](#) are optional. It is acceptable for schools to create their own version of the SLO template as long as it applies to the context of their system and the four components of the SLO/SSIO. Teachers and evaluators must agree on the format, rating rubric, and supporting documentation prior to the Beginning-of-Term Conference. If an agreement cannot be reached, the evaluator will determine the format and where the SLO/SSIO will be documented. Only approved SLOs/SSIOs shall be implemented, measured, and used in the evaluation. The following information highlights both processes.

Process, Requirements* & Best Practices for: SLO

*notates required actions

Prior to the Beginning of Term Conference	The purpose of the Beginning of Term Conference is to plan for an effective SLO implementation. The interval of instruction should be identified and the teacher should begin to plan out the four components of the SLO. Evaluators and teachers should discuss meaningful ways to document and align the SLO to current schoolwide and classroom practices.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	Determine the priority content focus area based on student needs as evidenced by baseline data. Submit SLO and supporting document(s) to evaluator for review and feedback by evaluator's deadline.*	Clarify the SLO process and expectations with the teacher and set the beginning conference date.
Beginning of Term Conference (Approval Process)	The purpose of the beginning conference is for the evaluator to review the SLO (and any supporting document(s) with the teacher using the SLO Criteria Sheet (on pg. 32) for the designated interval through a mutually agreed upon meeting.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	Share the SLO (and any supporting document(s) with the evaluator* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain the rationale why it was selected and how it addresses student needs. <p>Explain the outcome and how it is aligned to the assessment(s), expected target(s) and instructional strategies.</p> <p>Identify which rating rubric aligns to the outcome.</p>	Review the SLO to determine approval for implementation and provide feedback to the teacher if the SLO doesn't meet the expectations outlined in the criteria sheet (pg.32).* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the rigor of the SLO, the data that was used to determine student needs, the aligned assessments/rubrics and the strategies that will be used to get to the outcome. • Identify which rating rubric aligns to the outcome. <p>Document conference date and approval into PDE³.*</p>

Process, Requirements* & Best Practices for: SLO, Continued

*notates required actions

Throughout the Term (Implementation, Progress Monitoring, Mid-term Conference)	The purpose of this phase is for the teacher to implement the SLO and for the evaluator to monitor and support as necessary. A Mid-Term Conference may be scheduled if the teacher or evaluator determines a need. The SLO Mid-Term Reflection Sheet is optional unless the evaluator requires this as a matter of practice at the school or office.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	Implement the appropriate assessments & strategies of the approved SLO, monitor progress and determine if adjustments are needed.* Address the SLO Mid-Term Reflection Sheet as applicable to the expectations set by the evaluator. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formative assessment data, such as conversations & student work can provide insight into progress being made. If adjustments to SLO Assessment(s) and/or Expected Target(s) are needed, request a mid-term conference with evaluator. Factors include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ New/exited students ➤ Extenuating circumstances that impact administration of assessments ➤ Misalignment of assessment data and Expected Target(s). 	Monitor and provide support for the teacher as needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If requested, schedule a mid-term conference and discuss ways to adjust; document the date and approval in PDE³.*
Prior to End of Term Conference (Compilation of Outcome)	The purpose of this phase is to prepare for the End of Term Conference. Teachers should gather SLO implementation data and start organizing and analyzing it for their End of Term Conference.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	Collect, compile, analyze & submit assessment data and Expected Target(s) information (as applicable to evaluator's expectations.)* Prepare to discuss the SLO result(s).	Schedule End of Term Conference and review the SLO results from the teacher.
End of Term Conference	The purpose of the ending conference is for the teacher & evaluator to review the SLO evidence and assign a rating. The SLO Results and Reflection Tool or their alternate are optional, unless the evaluator requires this as a matter of practice at the school or office.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	Share the results of the SLO using the assessments/rubrics outlined in the approved SLO, SLO Criteria Sheet and Rating Rubric.* Reflect on outcomes and practice by addressing the SLO Results and Reflection Tool as applicable to the expectations set by the evaluator.	Facilitate the discussion about the data, supporting documents, and end results based on the SLO and Rating Rubric. Document the End of Term conference date & assign rating in PDE ³ .*

Student Learning Objective (SLO) Criteria Sheet

Use the criteria to determine the quality and completeness of the SLO. The SLO has met the development requirements if all boxes are checked.
Only an approved SLO can be implemented.

<p style="text-align: center;">Learning Goal</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>What will students know and be able to do, based on the appropriate standards, at the end of the instructional interval?</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment(s)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>What evidence will be used to measure attainment of the Learning Goal?</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The Learning Goal is aligned to standards/benchmarks and thoroughly describes what students will know, understand, and be able to do by the end of the instructional interval <input type="checkbox"/> The Learning Goal reflects a complexity level of Depth of Knowledge (DoK) 3 or higher for grades 3 to 12, or DoK 2 or higher for grades pre-K to 2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment(s) align to the Learning Goal <input type="checkbox"/> Scoring guides or rubrics provide clear criteria for differentiating student performance levels <input type="checkbox"/> There is a clear explanation of how the assessment results will be finalized and/or combined
<p style="text-align: center;">Expected Target(s)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>What are the expected outcomes by the end of the instructional interval?</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Instructional Strategies</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>What strategies will be used to reach my goal?</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> There are multiple sources of initial evidence used to determine where students currently are in relationship to the Learning Goal <input type="checkbox"/> The Expected Target(s) are specific, measurable, rigorous, and attainable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The instructional strategies are appropriate, evidence-based, and specifically address the Learning Goal <input type="checkbox"/> Instructional strategies address all learners

Process, Requirements* & Best Practices for SSIO

*notates required actions

Prior to the Beginning of Term Conference	The purpose of this phase is to plan for an effective SSIO implementation. The interval should be identified and the teacher should begin to plan out the four components of the SSIO. Evaluators and teachers should discuss meaningful ways to document and align the SSIO to current schoolwide practices.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	<p>Determine the priority area for the school, complex, or office.</p> <p>Collect data or provide rationale on the importance of the Goal.</p> <p>Align data to Goal and determine Expected Targets and Strategies based on students' or organization's need as applicable.</p> <p>Submit SSIO and gather supporting documents for Beginning of Term Conference.*</p>	<p>Clarify the SSIO process and expectations with the teacher and set the beginning conference date.</p>
Beginning of Term Conference (Approval Process)	The purpose of the beginning conference is for the evaluator to review the SSIO with the teacher using the SSIO Criteria Sheet (on pg. 35) for the designated term or school year through a mutually agreed upon meeting.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	<p>Share the SSIO, and any supporting documentation(s) with the evaluator and explain the rationale for the Expected Target(s).*</p> <p>Identify which rating rubric aligns to the outcome.</p>	<p>Review the SSIO to determine approval for implementation and provide feedback to the teacher if the SSIO doesn't meet the expectations outlined in the criteria sheet (pg.35).*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the rigor of the SSIO, the data that was used to determine needs, the aligned evidence/criteria and the strategies that will be used to get to the outcome. • Identify which rating rubric aligns to the outcome. <p>Document conference date and approval into PDE³.*</p>

Process, Requirements* & Best Practices for SSIO, Continued

*notates required actions

Throughout the Term (Implementation and Progress Monitoring)	The purpose of this phase is for the teacher to implement the SSIO and for the evaluator to monitor and support as necessary. A Mid-term conference may be scheduled if the teacher or evaluator determines a need. The SSIO Mid-term Reflection Sheet is optional unless the evaluator requires this as a matter of practice at the school or office.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	<p>Implement the appropriate strategies of the approved SSIO, monitor progress, and determine if adjustments are needed.*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formative assessment data, such as conversations & evidence can provide insight into progress being made. <p>If adjustments to SSIO are warranted, request a mid-term conference with the evaluator. Address the SSIO Mid-Term Reflection Sheet as applicable to the expectations set by the evaluator.</p> <p>Factors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ New job role/priority focus ➤ Extenuating circumstances that impact administration of evidence ➤ Misalignment of data and Expected Target(s). 	<p>Monitor and provide support for the teacher as needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If requested, schedule a mid-term conference and discuss ways to adjust; document the date and approval in PDE³.*
Prior to End of Term Conference (Compilation of Outcome)	The purpose of this phase is to prepare for the End of Term Conference. Teachers should gather SSIO implementation data and start organizing and analyzing it for their End of Term Conference.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	<p>Collect, compile, analyze & submit assessment data and Expected Target(s) information (as applicable to evaluator's expectations.)*</p> <p>Prepare to discuss the SSIO result(s).</p>	<p>Schedule End of Term Conference and review the SSIO results from the teacher.</p>
End of Term Conference	The purpose of the ending conference is for the teacher & evaluator to review the SSIO evidence and assign a rating. The SSIO Results and Reflection Tool or their alternate are optional, unless the evaluator requires this as a matter of practice at the school or office.	
	Teacher	Evaluator
	<p>Share the results of the SSIO using the evidence outlined in the approved SSIO, SSIO Criteria Sheet and Rating Rubric.*</p> <p>Reflect on outcomes and practice by addressing the SSIO Results and Reflection Tool as applicable to the expectations set by the evaluator.</p>	<p>Facilitate the discussion about the data, supporting documents, and end results based on the SSIO and Rating Rubric.</p> <p>Document the End of Term conference date & assign rating in PDE³.*</p>

School or System Improvement Objective (SSIO) Criteria Sheet

Use the criteria to determine the quality and completeness of the SSIO. The SSIO has met the development requirements if all boxes are checked.
Only an approved SSIO can be implemented.

<p align="center">Goal</p> <p align="center"><i>What will be accomplished at the end of the interval based on identified needs?</i></p>	<p align="center">Evidence and Success Criteria</p> <p align="center"><i>What evidence will be used to measure attainment of the goal?</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The statement thoroughly describes what will be accomplished by the end of the interval <input type="checkbox"/> When applicable, standards listed are clearly aligned to the goal and the full text of each specific standard is provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Explicit measures for data collection are used to monitor progress and adjust implementation strategies <input type="checkbox"/> Scoring guides or rubrics provide clear criteria for measuring all areas of the goal
<p align="center">Expected Target</p> <p align="center"><i>What are the expected outcome by the end of the interval?</i></p>	<p align="center">Implementation Strategies</p> <p align="center"><i>What strategies will I use to reach my goal?</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A starting point is established by relevant data source(s). If there is no baseline data, information is provided to explain a starting point <input type="checkbox"/> The target is specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Strategies are appropriate, evidence based, and specific ally address the goal

Rating Calculation for SLOs and SSIOs

During the End of Term Conference, the evaluator assigns a final rating for the SLO/SSIO based on the outcomes. An incomplete SLO/SSIO will result in a zero rating. Some possible reasons for an incomplete SLO/SSIO may include failure to revise the SLO/SSIO to meet acceptable indicators of quality, administer assessment(s), implement the SLO/SSIO, or collect appropriate documentation.

Teachers who have an incomplete SLO/SSIO due to an approved leave or a change in position during the school year which impedes their ability to complete all aspects of a SLO/SSIO will not receive a SLO/SSIO rating nor an overall final effectiveness rating.

SLO/SSIO ratings are quantified through the use of the following rubrics

SLO Rating Rubrics

Rating Rubric for teachers using individual student targets			
4 (Highly Effective)	3 (Effective)	2 (Developing)	1 (Ineffective)
90-100% of students met or exceeded Expected Target	75-89% of students met or exceeded Expected Target	60-74% of students met or exceeded Expected Target	Fewer than 60% of students met or exceeded Expected Target

Rating Rubric for teachers using a percentage goal for the class			
4 (Highly Effective)	3 (Effective)	2 (Developing)	1 (Ineffective)
Exceeded the Expected Target	Met the Expected Target	Partially met the Expected Target	No progress

Rating for teachers using IEP or for individual student targets of a class size less than five			
4 (Highly Effective)	3 (Effective)	2 (Developing)	1 (Ineffective)
All students met the Expected Target and some exceeded the target based on individual growth outcomes	All students met the Expected Target based on individual growth outcomes	One or more students met or exceeded the Expected Target based on individual growth outcomes	No students met the Expected Target based on individual growth outcomes

SSIO *Rating Rubrics*

4 (Highly Effective)	3 (Effective)	2 (Developing)	1 (Ineffective)
Met 90-100% of Expected Target	Met 75-89% of Expected Target	Met 60-74% of Expected Target	Met less than 60% of Expected Target

The following Rating Rubric should be used for evaluating results assessed by a NCT developed rubric as opposed to a percentage based target			
4 (Highly Effective)	3 (Effective)	2 (Developing)	1 (Ineffective)
Exceeded the target set in the rubric	Met the target set in the rubric	Did not meet the target as set in the rubric	Did not meet the target as set in the rubric due to inadequate implementation


Final Effectiveness Rating

A teacher’s final effectiveness rating is based on combined ratings from the measures of Student Growth and Learning as well as Teacher Practice.

The Student Growth and Learning rating as well as the Teacher Practice rating are determined by calculating a weighted average, based on weightings for each EES measure. A teacher will receive an overall score from Teacher Practice and an overall score from Student Growth & Learning. Those scores will be applied to the matrix below to determine the Final Effectiveness Rating.

Student Growth & Learning

Teacher Practice



Student Growth and Learning

Unsatisfactory 0-1	Marginal 2	Effective 3	Highly Effective 4	
Marginal	Effective	Effective	Highly Effective	Highly Effective 4
Marginal	Effective	Effective	Effective	Effective 3
Marginal	Marginal	Effective	Effective	Marginal 2
Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Marginal	Marginal	Unsatisfactory 0-1

Teacher Practice

Exceptions to the Teacher Practice weights

An exception to the weighted measures shall occur if a teacher earns an Unsatisfactory rating in either the Observation or CP components of teacher practice. If the overall observation rating is Unsatisfactory, the teacher practice rating shall be Unsatisfactory. If a teacher earns an Unsatisfactory CP rating, the overall teacher practice rating shall be Unsatisfactory. A final rating may be rendered in situations where only the SLO/SSIO and CP components exist and are justified by proper documentation.

Within PDE³, teachers will be able to see annual rating data, as well as historical data about their performance. No teacher shall be rated Less than Effective without proper documentation.

Impact of Final Rating on Employment Action(s)

Note: there may be employment circumstances that may not be addressed below.			
TEACHER STATUS	FINAL SY 2017- 2018 RATING	FINAL SY 2018- 2019 RATING	EMPLOYMENT ACTION(S) ****
Tenured	Effective/ Highly Effective	Effective/ Highly Effective	Continuation of employment
Tenured	Marginal	Effective/ Highly Effective	Continuation of employment
Tenured	Effective/ Highly Effective	Marginal	Continuation of employment
Tenured	Marginal	Marginal	2018-2019 Rating deemed Unsatisfactory
Tenured	Effective/ Highly Effective or Marginal	Unsatisfactory	Termination of Employment
Non-Tenured *	Effective/ Highly Effective	Effective/ Highly Effective	Continuation of employment**
Non-Tenured *	Effective	Marginal	Continuation of employment & extension of probation. **
Non-Tenured *	Marginal	Marginal	Non-renewal of employment***
Non-Tenured *	Effective/ Highly Effective or Marginal	Unsatisfactory	Non-renewal of employment****

Tenured teachers with a final rating of Marginal may file for an Expedited Appeal Process.

* In order to be probation complete a teacher must complete required semesters of probation and have effective or better ratings in the last two years of probation. The transition from non-tenured to tenured may change EES track for the subsequent school year.

** Refer to Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article VIII. P

*** Refer to Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article VI. JJ

**** Refer to Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article XX.7

Appendix A: Key Terms

Educator Effectiveness System (EES)

The evaluation system for BU5 members employed as teachers within the Department.

Median Growth Percentile (MGP)

An aggregate measure calculated by finding the median score for a group of SGP scores.

Professional Development Educate, Empower, Excel (PDE³) (<https://pde3.k12.hi.us>)

PDE³ is a platform for transparent documentation between teachers and evaluators for the EES, as well as a platform to search and record professional development opportunities. Employees need to log in with a secured username and password.

Roster Verification (RV) (<https://rostersonline.k12.hi.us>)

A process to record and validate instructional relationships between students and teachers. The online tool captures data from the Infinite Campus (IC) to help schools build rosters for teachers to verify. While the same online tool is used for Tripod Student Survey and HGM, the two RV administrations are unique due to the type of information used by each metric. RV administrations involve:

- school teams and administrators preparing the system,
- classroom teachers verifying student roster data, and
- school administrators approving the data at two points in a school year.

All CTs in grades 3-12 who are responsible for delivering instruction and assigning or collaborating in the assignment of grades or monitoring student progress will verify rosters during the designated Tripod Student Survey RV window. Only teachers who are responsible for both providing and assessing direct instruction for math, ELA, Hawaiian Language Arts, and ELL, in grades 4-8 will verify rosters for SGP attribution purposes.

Schoolwide ELA MGP

The median of all SGPs achieved in ELA across a school.

Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA)

The SBA is an assessment system developed by a state-led consortium (including Hawaii) to accurately measure student progress toward college and career readiness. SBA replaced the Hawaii State Assessment in the 2014-2015 school year.

Strive HI Performance System

Hawaii's school accountability and improvement system that was approved by the U.S. Department of Education in May 2013.

Student Growth Percentile (SGP)

A rank from 1 to 99 relative to students with similar achievement histories.

Teacher ELA MGP

The median, or middle value, summarizing the growth performance of students linked to an individual teacher instructing grades 4-8 ELA classes.

Teacher Math MGP

The median, or middle value, summarizing the growth performance of students linked to an individual teacher instructing grades 4-8 math classes.

Teacher Median Growth Percentile (MGP)

The MGP summarizing the complete set of student growth scores, both ELA and math, linked to an individual teacher.

Tripod Student Survey

Surveys administered to students and treated as formal assessments capturing students' perceptions of their classroom experiences. Teachers are provided with feedback about how to improve their teaching practice.

Appendix B: Supporting Resources

[Adjustments to the EES for SY 2018-2019 Memo](#)

SY 2018-2019 Memo from the Superintendent summarizing the changes to EES for the current school year.

[Complex Area Support Team](#)

Each complex area will have at least one lead educator who will serve as the EES contact.

[Educator Effectiveness System Summary of Conference \(EES SOC\)](#)

The form to document conversation between the evaluator and teacher regarding EES issues. The document memorializes the events, conversations, and possible next steps to situations.

EES Help Desk

The EES Help Desk will provide callers with knowledge, awareness, and understanding of the EES components. In addition, the Help Desk documents caller feedback to improve overall EES training and implementation planning.

- Phone Number: 808-586-4072
- Hours of Operation: 7:30 A.M. - 3:30 P.M.
- Days: Monday-Friday, except state holidays and the winter break period

Expedited Appeals Process (EAP): [EAP Form](#) and [EAP Form Instructions](#)

A process for tenured teachers rated Marginal and is to be used instead of Step 1 and 2 of the grievance procedure.

[HIDOE Intranet](#)

The Intranet is an internal website for HIDOE staff. It includes a site devoted to the EES that connects users to the manual, orientation training video, component overviews, reference documents, FAQs, and other supporting materials.

Implementing the Framework for Teaching in Enhancing Professional Practice: An ASCD Action Tool

Charlotte Danielson and six members of the Danielson Group collaborated to create this book. It contains specific examples for each component and element of the Framework for Teaching, for proficient and distinguished levels of performance.

Talk About Teaching! Leading Professional Conversations

A book written by Charlotte Danielson to help school leaders understand the value of reflective, informal, professional conversations in promoting a positive environment of inquiry, support, and teacher development. Organized around the “big ideas” of successful teaching and ongoing teacher learning, it explores the unique interaction of power structures in schools.

Improvements to the EES letter

A letter from Superintendent Matayoshi dated April 22, 2017 to the Hawaii State Teachers Association regarding improvements to the EES.

Appendix C: Tripod Roster Verification (RV) Calendar

2018-2019 Tripod Student Perception Survey RV & Implementation Calendar

School Year 2018-2019 Tripod Student Perception Survey Implementation Calendar Online & Paper Administration									
Track	OITS Data Snapshot	SBT School Set Up	Teachers RV	Administrators Review & Approve	State Data Quality Check	State Send Data to Vendor	Schools Survey Window	Last Day to Ship Surveys	OHR/TNL/SVS Report/Scores
Yellow	7/30/2018	7/31-8/3/2018	8/6-8/2018	8/9-10/2018	9/11-17/2018	9/18/2018	10/16-30/2018	N/A (Online Only)	2/14/2019
Blue	7/30/2018	7/31-8/3/2018	8/6-8/2018	8/9-10/2018	9/11-17/2018	9/18/2018	10/16-30/2019	N/A (Online Only)	2/14/2019
Single and Charter Schools	8/27/2018	8/28-31/2018	9/4-6/2018	9/7-10/2018	9/11-17/2018	9/18/2018	11/20-12/5/2018	12/6/2018	2/14/2019
Red	8/27/2018	8/28-31/2018	9/4-6/2018	9/7-10/2018	9/11-17/2018	9/18/2018	11/20-12/5/2018	12/6/2018	2/14/2019
Green	8/27/2018	8/28-31/2018	9/4-6/2018	9/7-10/2018	9/11-17/2018	9/18/2018	11/20-12/5/2018	12/6/2018	2/14/2019

Appendix D: Multi-Track Schools Implementation Timelines

YELLOW Track Schools Implementation Timeline

Evaluator or Implementation Deadline	Component	Implementation Notes
July		
7/9 (or prior to the first day of instruction)	Training	SY2018-2019 EES Orientation training for all teachers. Teachers informed of online EES manual on the DOE public website (hawaiipublicschools.org)
7/27 (or prior to starting EES evaluation)	Training	EES Overview trainings for teachers new to the EES* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators may start scheduling beginning conferences for components (Observation, CP, WP, IPDP as applicable) <i>*Relative to teachers hired after the school year starts, training should be conducted as soon as possible.</i>
7/30	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Data snapshot of Infinite Campus rosters for Grades 3-12.
7/31-8/3	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	School set up for Tripod Roster Verification
August		
8/6-8/8	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Teachers in grades 3-12 verify roster for Tripod Student Survey administration
8/9-8/10	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Principals review & approve Tripod Student Survey rosters
8/10	1st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve 1 st Sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8/13-11/21: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan Secondary teachers who only teach quarter-long classes must collaborate with their evaluators to determine the following deadlines: approval, mid-term, data collection, and end-of-term rating

8/20	PDPDP	Evaluator-led PDPDP developed for teachers who received a final effectiveness rating of less than Effective in the prior school year
September		
9/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WP (for NCTs as applicable) CP IPDP Year Long SLO/SSIO 	<p>Beginning Conferences completed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators & NCTs collaborate & agree upon 5 components for WP Evaluators share CP expectations Teachers share IPDP with evaluators <p>Evaluators approve year-long SLO/SSIO in PDE³</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10/1-5/3: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan
October		
10/19	1st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve mid-term 1st sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³
10/16 – 10/30	Tripod Student Survey	Tripod Student Survey window Teachers in Gr.3-12 that roster verified will administer the survey
November		
11/21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Sem. SLO/SSIO Observations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers end data collection/implementation of 1st sem. SLO/SSIO 1st Sem. observations completed
11/26-1/8	1st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators conduct 1 st sem. SLO/SSIO ending conferences
January		
1/8 or second day after return from Winter Break	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Sem. SLO/SSIO Observations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators finalize 1st sem. SLO/SSIO end-of-term rating in PDE³ Evaluators finalize 1st Sem. observations ratings in PDE³
1/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year Long SLO/SSIO EES Track Movement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators approve mid-term year-long SLO/SSIO in PDE³ Deadline for moving a teacher from Streamlined to Standard evaluation track
February		
2/8	2 nd Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve 2 nd sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2/12-5/3: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan
2/14	Tripod Student Survey	Results for Tripod Student Survey distributed Teachers review & reflect upon the results

April		
4/5	2nd Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve mid-term 2 nd sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³
May		
5/3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd Sem. Obs • WP • CP • IPDP/PDPDP • 2nd Sem. or Year long SLO/SSIO • Tripod Student Survey & HGM Reflections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd sem. observations completed • Teachers stop data collection/implementation for WP, CP, IPDP/PDPDP, year long or 2nd sem. SLO/SSIO • Teachers should prepare for the final evaluation conference as applicable
5/6-5/17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations/WP • SLO/SSIO • CP • IPDP/PDPDP • Tripod Student Survey & HGM Reflections (as applicable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluators complete all ending conferences within this time frame; especially for teacher rated less than Effective. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluators finalize and lock all relevant components in PDE³, including the Summary Tab where evaluator & teacher should e-sign and date to acknowledge the final effectiveness rating for SY 2018-2019. ○ For teachers that receive a less than Effective final rating, the principal must review and discuss the final effectiveness rating no later than 5/17.

RED Track Schools Implementation Timeline

Evaluator or Implementation Deadline	Component	Implementation Notes
July		
7/9 (or prior to the first day of instruction)	Training	SY2018-2019 EES Orientation training for all teachers. Teachers informed of online EES manual on the DOE public website (hawaiipublicschools.org)
August		
8/16 (or prior to starting EES evaluation)	Training	EES Overview trainings for teachers new to the EES* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators may start scheduling beginning conferences for components (Observation, CP, WP, IPDP as applicable) <i>*Relative to teachers hired after the school year starts, training should be conducted as soon as possible.</i>
8/27	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Data snapshot of Infinite Campus rosters for Grades 3-12.
8/28-8/31	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	School set up for Tripod Roster Verification
8/31	1st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve 1 st Sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9/4-12/7: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan Secondary teachers who only teach quarter-long classes must collaborate with their evaluators to determine the following deadlines: approval, mid-term, data collection, and end-of-term rating
September		
9/4-9/6	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Teachers in grades 3-12 verify roster for Tripod Student Survey administration
9/7-9/10	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Principals review & approve Tripod Student Survey rosters
9/10	PDPDP	Evaluator-led PDPDP developed for teachers who received a final effectiveness rating of less than Effective in the prior school year

9/21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WP (for NCTs as applicable) CP IPDP Year Long SLO/SSIO 	<p>Beginning Conferences completed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators & NCTs collaborate & agree upon 5 components for WP Evaluators share CP expectations Teachers share IPDP with evaluators <p>Evaluators approve year-long SLO/SSIO in PDE³</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9/24-5/31: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan
October		
10/18	1st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve mid-term 1st sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³
November		
11/20 – 12/5	Tripod Student Survey	Tripod Student Survey window Teachers in Gr.3-12 that roster verified will administer the survey
December		
12/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Sem. SLO/SSIO Observations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers end data collection/implementation of 1st sem. SLO/SSIO 1st Sem. observations completed
12/10-1/8	1st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators conduct 1 st sem. SLO/SSIO ending conferences
January		
1/8 or second day after return from Winter Break	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Sem. SLO/SSIO Observations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators finalize 1st sem. SLO/SSIO end-of-term rating in PDE³ Evaluators finalize 1st Sem. observations ratings in PDE³
1/11	Year Long SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve mid-term year-long SLO/SSIO in PDE ³
1/25	EES Track Movement	Deadline for moving a teacher from Streamlined to Standard evaluation track
February		
2/14	Tripod Student Survey	Results for Tripod Student Survey distributed Teachers review & reflect upon the results
March		
3/1	2 nd Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve 2 nd sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3/4-5/31: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan
April		
4/5	2nd Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve mid-term 2 nd sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³

May		
5/31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd Sem. Obs • WP • CP • IPDP/PDPDP • 2nd Sem. or Year long SLO/SSIO • Tripod Student Survey & HGM Reflections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd sem. observations completed • Teachers stop data collection/implementation for WP, CP, IPDP/PDPDP, year long or 2nd sem. SLO/SSIO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teachers should prepare for the final evaluation conference as applicable
June		
6/3-6/21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations/WP • SLO/SSIO • CP • IPDP/PDPDP • Tripod Student Survey & HGM Reflections (as applicable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluators complete all ending conferences within this time frame; especially for teacher rated less than Effective. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluators finalize and lock all relevant components in PDE³, including the Summary Tab where evaluator & teacher should e-sign and date to acknowledge the final effectiveness rating for SY 2018-2019 ○ For teachers that receive a less than Effective final rating, the principal must review and discuss the final effectiveness rating no later than 6/21.

GREEN Track Schools Implementation Timeline

Evaluator or Implementation Deadline	Component	Implementation Notes
July		
7/30 (or prior to the first day of instruction)	Training	SY2018-2019 EES Orientation training for all teachers. Teachers informed of online EES manual on the DOE public website (hawaiipublicschools.org)
August		
8/16 (or prior to starting EES evaluation)	Training	EES Overview trainings for teachers new to the EES* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators may start scheduling beginning conferences for components (Observation, CP, WP, IPDP as applicable) <i>*Relative to teachers hired after the school year starts, training should be conducted as soon as possible.</i>
8/27	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Data snapshot of Infinite Campus rosters for Grades 3-12.
8/28-8/31	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	School set up for Tripod Roster Verification
8/31	1st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve 1 st Sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9/4-12/7: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan Secondary teachers who only teach quarter-long classes must collaborate with their evaluators to determine the following deadlines: approval, mid-term, data collection, and end-of-term rating
September		
9/4-9/6	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Teachers in grades 3-12 verify roster for Tripod Student Survey administration
9/7-9/10	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Principals review & approve Tripod Student Survey rosters
9/7	PDPDP	Evaluator-led PDPDP developed for teachers who received a final effectiveness rating of less than Effective in the prior school year

9/28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WP (for NCTs as applicable) CP IPDP Year Long SLO/SSIO 	<p>Beginning Conferences completed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators & NCTs collaborate & agree upon 5 components for WP Evaluators share CP expectations Teachers share IPDP with evaluators <p>Evaluators approve year-long SLO/SSIO in PDE³</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10/19-5/31: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan
November		
11/2	1st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve mid-term 1st sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³
11/20-12/5	Tripod Student Survey	Tripod Student Survey window Teachers in Gr.3-12 that roster verified will administer the survey
December		
12/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Sem. SLO/SSIO Observations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers end data collection/implementation of 1st sem. SLO/SSIO 1st Sem. observations completed
12/10-1/29	1st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators conduct 1 st sem. SLO/SSIO ending conferences
January		
1/29 or second day after return from Winter Break	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Sem. SLO/SSIO Observations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators finalize 1st sem. SLO/SSIO end-of-term rating in PDE³ Evaluators finalize 1st Sem. observations ratings in PDE³
February		
2/8	Year Long SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve mid-term year-long SLO/SSIO in PDE ³
2/14	Tripod Student Survey	Results for Tripod Student Survey distributed Teachers review & reflect upon the results
2/15	EES Track Movement	Deadline for moving a teacher from Streamlined to Standard evaluation track
March		
3/1	2 nd Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve 2 nd sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3/4-5/31: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan
April		
4/2	2nd Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve mid-term 2 nd sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³

May		
5/31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd Sem. Obs • WP • CP • IPDP/PDPDP • 2nd Sem. or Year long SLO/SSIO • Tripod Student Survey & HGM Reflections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd sem. observations completed • Teachers stop data collection/implementation for WP, CP, IPDP/PDPDP, year long or 2nd sem. SLO/SSIO <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teachers should prepare for the final evaluation conference as applicable
June		
6/3-6/21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations/WP • SLO/SSIO • CP • IPDP/PDPDP • Tripod Student Survey & HGM Reflections (as applicable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluators complete all ending conferences within this time frame; especially for teacher rated less than Effective. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluators finalize and lock all relevant components in PDE³, including the Summary Tab where evaluator & teacher should e-sign and date to acknowledge the final effectiveness rating for SY 2018-2019. ○ For teachers that receive a less than Effective final rating, the principal must review and discuss the final effectiveness rating no later than 6/21.

BLUE Track Schools Implementation Timelines

Evaluator or Implementation Deadline	Component	Implementation Notes
July		
7/9 (or prior to the first day of instruction)	Training	SY2018-2019 EES Orientation training for all teachers. Teachers informed of online EES manual on the DOE public website (hawaiipublicschools.org)
7/27 (or prior to starting EES evaluation)	Training	EES Overview trainings for teachers new to the EES* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators may start scheduling beginning conferences for components (Observation, CP, WP, IPDP as applicable) <i>*Relative to teachers hired after the school year starts, training should be conducted as soon as possible.</i>
7/30	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Data snapshot of Infinite Campus rosters for Grades 3-12.
7/31-8/3	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	School set up for Tripod Roster Verification
August		
8/6-8/8	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Teachers in grades 3-12 verify roster for Tripod Student Survey administration
8/9-8/10	Tripod Student Survey Roster Verification (RV)	Principals review & approve Tripod Student Survey rosters
8/10	1st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve 1 st Sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8/13-12/7: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan Secondary teachers who only teach quarter-long classes must collaborate with their evaluators to determine the following deadlines: approval, mid-term, data collection, and end-of-term rating
8/16	PDPDP	Evaluator-led PDPDP developed for teachers who received a final effectiveness rating of less than Effective in the prior school year

September		
9/28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WP (for NCTs as applicable) CP IPDP Year Long SLO/SSIO 	<p>Beginning Conferences completed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators & NCTs collaborate & agree upon 5 components for WP Evaluators share CP expectations Teachers share IPDP with evaluators <p>Evaluators approve year-long SLO/SSIO in PDE³</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10/1-5/3: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan
October		
10/16-10/30	Tripod Student Survey	Tripod Student Survey window Teachers in Gr.3-12 that roster verified will administer the on-line survey
10/19	1st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve mid-term 1st sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³
December		
12/7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Sem. SLO/SSIO Observations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers end data collection/implementation of 1st sem. SLO/SSIO 1st Sem. observations completed
12/10-1/8	1st Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators conduct 1 st sem. SLO/SSIO ending conferences
January		
1/8 or second day after return from Winter Break	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1st Sem. SLO/SSIO Observations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators finalize 1st sem. SLO/SSIO end-of-term rating in PDE³ Evaluators finalize 1st Sem. observations ratings in PDE³
1/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Year Long SLO/SSIO EES Track Movement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators approve mid-term year-long SLO/SSIO in PDE³ Deadline for moving a teacher from Streamlined to Standard evaluation track
February		
2/8	2 nd Sem. SLO/SSIO	Evaluators approve 2 nd sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2/12-5/3: Teachers implement SLO/SSIO plan
2/14	Tripod Student Survey	Results for Tripod Student Survey distributed Teachers review & reflect upon the results

April		
4/5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd Sem. SLO/SSIO 	Evaluators approve mid-term 2 nd sem. SLO/SSIO in PDE ³
May		
5/3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd Sem. Obs • WP • CP • IPDP/PDPDP • 2nd Sem. or Year long SLO/SSIO • Tripod Student Survey & HGM Reflections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd sem. observations completed • Teachers stop data collection/implementation for WP, CP, IPDP/PDPDP, year long or 2nd sem. SLO/SSIO • Teachers should prepare for the final evaluation conference as applicable
5/6-6/21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observations/WP • SLO/SSIO • CP • IPDP/PDPDP • Tripod Student Survey & HGM Reflections (as applicable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluators complete all ending conferences within this time frame; especially for teacher rated less than Effective. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evaluators finalize and lock all relevant components in PDE³, including the Summary Tab where evaluator & teacher should e-sign and date to acknowledge the final effectiveness rating for SY 2018-2019. ○ For teachers that receive a less than Effective final rating, the principal must review and discuss the final effectiveness rating no later than 6/21.