

P-10: Administrative Procedures

Personnel Evaluations and Surveys



REFERENCES

- [Board Policy P-10](#)
- [Utah Code Ann. §53G-11-517, Restriction on transfer of employee with unsatisfactory performance](#)
- [Administrator Evaluation Program Handbook](#)
- [Educator Collaborative Assessment Program Handbook](#)
- [Peer Assistance and Review Handbook](#)
- [Rater Certification Plan](#)
- [Classroom Observation and Feedback Form](#)

DEFINITIONS

Administrator: An individual who:

- A. serves in a position that requires:
 - 1. an educator license with an administrative area of concentration; or
 - 2. a letter of authorization described in Utah Code Ann. §§ 53G-4-301 or 53E-6-304; and
- B. supervises school administrators or teachers.

Career Status Educator: An educator, other than an administrator, who has worked for the district on at least half-time basis for three consecutive years and received satisfactory evaluations shall obtain career status upon the start of the educator's fourth consecutive year if no extension of provisional status is required.

Certified Rater: An educator who has been trained in evaluating educator performance and has demonstrated competency in using an educator evaluation tool to rate educator effectiveness according to established standards.

Evaluator: The individual designated to perform the evaluation of a particular district employee.

- A. For licensed educators/teachers, the evaluator will be the educator's principal, the principal's designee, or the educator's immediate supervisor.
- B. For administrators, the evaluator will be the administrator's immediate supervisor.
- C. For classified employees, the evaluator will be the employee's immediate supervisor or department administrator.

Provisional Administrator: A provisional administrator is:

- A. An administrator hired from outside the district into their first administrative assignment within the district who has not successfully completed three consecutive years; the three-year provisional period may be extended if necessary.
- B. An administrator hired from within the district into their first administrative assignment within the district who has not successfully completed two consecutive years.

Provisional Educator: An educator, other than an administrator, who has worked for the district less than three years unless a different time period is provided in the educator's applicable negotiated agreement.

Summative Evaluation: The annual evaluation that summarizes an educator's performance during a school year and that is used to make decisions related to the educator's employment.

PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

I. Educator Evaluations

The Educator Collaborative Assessment Program (ECAP) is the district's recognized system for evaluating an educator's performance. Complete details of the ECAP program are outlined in the [ECAP Handbook](#).

Each licensed educator shall be evaluated by the educator's principal, the principal's designee, or an immediate supervisor. The district ensures that all educators are evaluated by a certified rater. (For more details, see the Rater Certification Plan listed in the References section above.)

- A. Orientation and mentoring
 - 1. The principal of each school shall hold an ECAP orientation for every licensed educator within the school which will outline the purpose of the evaluations and the evaluation methods that will be used.
 - 2. The orientation will take place at least 15 days prior to beginning the formal evaluation process.
 - 3. All provisional educators will be assigned a mentor for the duration of the educator's provisional status.

- a. Where possible, the mentor shall be a career educator who performs substantially the same duties as the provisional educator and has at least three years of successful educational experience.
- B. Evaluation frequency
Career educators, including licensed employees in non-teaching positions, shall be evaluated annually.
Provisional educators will receive two evaluations annually.
- C. Summative Evaluations
 1. Educators will be rated on the Utah Effective Teaching Standards, and each rating must be supported by evidence from the observations, documentation, and/or conferences.
 2. Each summative evaluation will include a rating of one of the following four levels of performance: Highly Effective, Effective, Minimally Effective (Emerging Effective for provisional educators), and Not Effective.
 3. An educator's summative evaluation must include the following components:
 - a. observations of professional performance;
 - b. student academic growth; and
 - c. student and parent input.
 4. Based on the educator's performance during the school year, the evaluator shall prepare and deliver
 - a. A mid-year evaluation for provisional educators prior to February 15; and
 - b. An end of year evaluation for all educators prior to May 15.
- D. An educator's annual advancement on the district's approved salary schedule shall be based upon the summative evaluation rating.
 1. Legislative educator salary adjustment
 - a. The certified salary schedule includes \$4,200 as part of the legislative educator salary adjustment.
 - i. In accordance with state law, a salary adjustment may be awarded only to an educator who has received a satisfactory rating or above on the educator's most recent evaluation.
 - 1) Human Resource Services will provide a list of all educators receiving less than a satisfactory rating to the Budgeting Department.
 - 2) Local resources, and not state funds, will be used to fund the legislative educator salary adjustment portion of an educator's salary.
- E. Observations
 1. Observations are one aspect of an educator's summative evaluation.
 2. Informal classroom observations will be conducted as needed for both career and provisional educators in order to provide the educator with written feedback to support the improvement of their practice.
 - a. All educators will have a minimum of three observations with accompanying written feedback annually.
 3. In documenting the observation, either the electronic or paper Classroom Observation and Feedback Form must be used.
 4. Within five days of the observation, the educator must be provided with written feedback regarding the results of the observation and any observations that support the evaluator's rating of the educator's performance.
- F. Professional growth plan
 1. Every educator must create a professional growth plan each year.
 - a. As part of this plan, educators must conduct a self-assessment of their performance and rate themselves on each of the Utah Effective Teaching Standards.
 - b. The plan must also include the educator's professional goal(s) geared toward improving professional practice.
 - c. The plan must contain a component to measure student academic growth.
 - d. In the plan, the educator must address stakeholder input received from the previous year.
- G. Collaborative conferences
 1. Collaborative conferences between the evaluator and educator must be held three times each year.
 2. Fall conference
 - a. The educator and evaluator will work collaboratively to:
 - i. set goals and write the professional growth plan;
 - ii. review student academic growth data;
 - iii. discuss and approve measures to be used to monitor student academic growth; and
 - iv. address stakeholder input received from the previous year.
 3. Mid-year conference
 - a. The educator and evaluator will meet to:
 - i. review the professional growth plan; and
 - ii. discuss student academic growth and achievement data.

- b. For provisional teachers, during this conference the evaluator should schedule the provisional teacher's mid-year progress report.
 - 4. Spring conference
 - a. The educator and evaluator shall meet to:
 - i. review the educator's professional growth plan and any evidence supporting achievement of the listed goals;
 - ii. assess student academic growth data; and
 - iii. discuss new stakeholder input data and propose a response for the following year.
- H. Right to review and appeal
 - 1. Informal reviews:
 - a. An educator seeking an informal review of their summative evaluation must submit a written request to the evaluator within five business days of the delivery of the evaluation. The request must be based on new or additional documentation that was not previously reviewed during the evaluation process. The evaluator will meet with the educator to discuss the presented documentation and its effect on the summative evaluation. The evaluator shall provide a written decision on the informal review to the educator within ten business days following the scheduled meeting.
 - i. The evaluator may make any changes to the summative evaluation deemed appropriate.
 - b. An educator who is not satisfied with the informal appeal decision may request a second level review after the informal appeal decision has been received. The educator must submit a written request for a second level review to the supervisor of the evaluator within five business days following the date of the informal review decision. The request should identify specific concerns with the informal appeal decision, a response to the informal appeal decision, a copy of the evaluation, and any other supporting documentation. The individual acting as the second level reviewer is the next level administrator who did not issue the evaluation. The administrator conducting the review will determine what, if any, additional information is needed in order to render a decision. The administrator will provide a written decision to the educator within 15 business days after receiving the request, however, if the administrator needs additional time, the administrator will notify the employee that the deadline for a decision has been extended.
 - i. The second level reviewer may make any changes to the summative evaluation deemed appropriate.
 - 2. Formal reviews:
 - a. An educator who is not satisfied with a summative evaluation may request a formal review within 15 days after receiving the written evaluation or final decision from the informal review process. See, Utah Code Ann. §53G-11-508, Summative evaluation timelines.
 - b. A request for a formal review must be made in writing to the director of Human Resource Services (HRS) over certified personnel.
 - c. The formal review will be conducted in accordance with Utah Code Ann. §53G-11-508 and Utah Admin. Rule R277-533-8.
- I. Extension of provisional status

In accordance with Utah Code Ann. §53G-11-503, career employee status for provisional employees, HRS may extend the provisional period of an educator for up to an additional two years if a provisional educator has not been able to fulfill the requirements necessary to obtain a level II teaching license by the conclusion of the third year of employment.
- J. Informal assistance
 - 1. In the event that an educator's performance is not satisfactory, the evaluator will notify the educator in writing. The evaluator and the educator will work collaboratively to develop an informal assistance plan including these elements:
 - a. statement of the issues or concerns;
 - b. the available resources that will be provided for improvement; and
 - c. a recommended course of action that will improve the educator's performance.
 - 2. The evaluator will notify the educator in writing whether the informal assistance plan was or was not successful in improving the educator's performance to a satisfactory level.
 - 3. In the event that a career status educator's performance on an informal assistance plan is not satisfactory, the evaluator will also:
 - a. inform HRS; and
 - b. inform the career status educator of the right to be assisted by a representative from any professional association of which the educator is a member.

- K. Formal assistance
 - 1. Once a career status educator has been notified that the informal assistance plan was unsuccessful, the educator and evaluator will determine whether to pursue a Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) intervention referral, or a performance assistance plan.
 - a. If either the educator or evaluator chooses PAR intervention, the educator will be referred to the PAR program. (See, [PAR handbook](#) for an explanation of this program.)
 - b. If the educator and evaluator choose the performance assistance plan option, the educator must work with evaluator to develop a formal performance assistance plan that includes the components outlined above in Section I.J.1.a.-c.
 - c. If the formal performance assistance plan is not successful in improving the educator's performance to a satisfactory level, the evaluator shall recommend the creation of a remediation team to HRS. (See, ECAP handbook and applicable negotiated written agreement for a complete explanation of the remediation process, including the creation of the remediation team.)

II. Administrator Evaluations

The Administrator Evaluation Program (AEP) is the district's recognized system for evaluating a licensed administrator's performance. Complete details of the program's implementation are outlined in the [AEP Handbook](#).

Licensed administrators shall be evaluated by their immediate supervisor annually.

- A. Orientation and mentoring
 - 1. District administration shall hold an AEP orientation for every licensed administrator which will outline the purpose of the evaluations and the evaluation methods that will be used.
 - 2. The orientation will take place at least 15 days prior to beginning the formal evaluation process.
 - 3. All provisional administrators will be assigned a mentor for the duration of the administrator's provisional status. Where possible, the mentor shall be a career administrator who performs substantially the same duties as the provisional administrator and has at least three years of successful experience.
 - 4. The mentor will review the job description and provide support to the provisional administrator with a minimum of two contacts per year.
- B. Summative evaluations
 - 1. Each summative evaluation rating must indicate one of the following four levels of performance: Highly Effective, Effective, Minimally Effective (Emerging Effective for provisional administrators), and Not Effective.
 - 2. An administrator's summative evaluation must include the following components:
 - a. observations of professional performance;
 - b. student academic growth;
 - c. student, parent, and employee input; and
 - d. the effectiveness of evaluating employee performance.
 - 3. Evaluators must collect evidence to support their evaluation ratings, as outlined in the Utah Educational Leadership Standards, through direct observation of job performance, review of applicable documents, and interviews with stakeholders and the administrator.
 - a. The district expects the process of collecting evidence to be a collaborative process between the evaluator and the administrator.
- C. Compensation

Compensation for school and district administrators will be made in accordance with state law.
- D. Professional growth plan
 - 1. Every year the administrator must create a professional growth plan.
 - a. As part of this plan, the administrator must conduct a self-assessment based on the Utah Educational Leadership Standards.
 - b. The plan should also include the administrator's professional goal(s) geared toward improving his or her professional practice.
 - c. For school-based administrators and network directors, the plan should include a review of schoolwide student academic growth data.
 - d. The plan should also respond to any stakeholder input that has been received from the previous year.
- E. Collaborative conferences between the administrator and evaluator must be held three times each year.
 - 1. Beginning of year conference
 - a. The administrator and evaluator shall:
 - i. work collaboratively to set goals and write the professional growth plan;
 - ii. review student academic growth data;

- iii. address stakeholder input received from the previous year; and
 - iv. establish guidelines to monitor progress toward improvement.
 2. Mid-year conference
 - a. The administrator and evaluator shall:
 - i. review the professional growth plan goal(s); and
 - ii. discuss student academic growth and achievement data.
 - b. For provisional administrators, during this conference the evaluator should schedule the provisional administrator's mid-year progress report prior to February 15.
 3. End of year conference
 - a. The administrator and evaluator shall:
 - i. review the administrator's professional growth plan and any evidence supporting achievement of the listed goals;
 - ii. assess student academic growth data; and
 - iii. discuss new stakeholder input data and propose a response for the following year.
- F. Evaluation summary report
Based on the administrator's performance during the year, the evaluator shall prepare an evaluation summary report for each administrator prior a May 15.
- G. Right to review and appeal
 1. An administrator who is not satisfied with a summative evaluation may request a review within 15 days after receiving the written evaluation pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §53G-11-508, Summative evaluation timelines.
 2. An administrator who is not satisfied with their evaluation summary report may request an informal appeal and, if necessary, a formal appeal under the same process listed for teacher evaluations. See, Section I.H.
- H. Informal assistance
 1. In the event that a career administrator's performance is not satisfactory, the evaluator will notify the administrator in writing. The evaluator and the administrator will work collaboratively to develop an informal assistance plan that includes these elements:
 - a. a statement of the issues or concerns with the administrator's performance;
 - b. the available resources that will be provided for improving such performance; and
 - c. a recommended course of action that will improve the administrator's performance.
- I. Remediation
 1. In the event that a career administrator's performance on an informal assistance plan is not satisfactory, the evaluator will:
 - a. inform HRS;
 - b. inform the administrator of the right to be assisted by their professional association;
 - c. give the administrator written notification of their remediation status; and
 - d. develop a written plan identifying the deficiencies and requirements to improve the administrator's performance (see, Section 2. below).
 2. The written remediation plan will give the administrator an opportunity to correct any identified problems or concerns. The plan will be developed collaboratively with the administrator and evaluator, and will include these elements:
 - a. statement of the concerns or deficiencies as they relate to the Utah Educational Leadership Standards;
 - b. specific steps or actions for improvement with expected measurable outcomes;
 - c. resources and assistance available to the administrator including informal conferences and the services of district personnel; and
 - d. a timeline for improvement, such timeline must include a minimum of at least 30 days.
 3. At the conclusion of the time period provided for in the plan, the evaluator shall, in writing, indicate which one of the following outcomes occurred:
 - a. improvement was sufficient and the administrator is no longer on remediation status or an assistance plan;
 - b. improvement was evident, but remediation status and an assistance plan will continue for an additional specified time period; or
 - c. improvement was not sufficient and the administrator will be terminated.

III. Non-Educator Contract Employee Evaluations

- A. The evaluations for non-educator contract employees must be completed by April 30 of each year.
- B. Employees will be evaluated based on their annual performance from May 1 to April 30.

1. Employees who have not been with the district for at least one school year will still receive the annual evaluation. However, in rating the employee's performance, the evaluator shall take into account the length of service, the type of position, and typical learning curve.
- C. By May of each year, the department administrator or direct supervisor (hereafter collectively referred to as "department supervisor") must identify if there are any additional specific criteria to be used in the upcoming evaluations.
- D. By the end of October of each school year, the department administrator must discuss with employees the intent of performance evaluations, as well as communicate the criteria on which the employees will be evaluated.
- E. Evaluation
 1. Each employee's evaluation is based on how the employee performed according to any criteria established by the department administrator and the requirements in the employee's job description.
 2. The department administrator must assure that the evaluations are conducted in a fair manner.
 3. Employee self-evaluation

The department administrator will initiate the evaluation process using the district's online evaluation system. The system will send an email to the affected employees, at their individual district email address, notifying them that the evaluation process is ready to begin. The employee must then log on to the system and complete a self-evaluation using the following ratings:

 - a. Not Effective (This means that the employee is not meeting the job requirements nor the supervisor's expectations);
 - b. Minimally Effective (This means that the employee occasionally meets the job requirements and the supervisor's expectations, but is not consistent);
 - c. Effective (This means that the employee is meeting both the job requirements and the supervisor's expectation); or
 - d. Highly Effective (This means that the employee is performing above expectations).
 4. Employees may also provide comments in their self-evaluation supporting their various self-rankings.
 5. The employee should be given a reasonable deadline (i.e., a week) to submit the self-evaluation to the department administrator.
- F. Evaluator rating
 1. Once the employee has completed the self-evaluation, the employee's direct supervisor or department administrator will then evaluate the employee.
 2. The evaluator will not be able to review the employee's responses until after the employee has completed the self-evaluation section.
 3. The evaluator will rate the employee's performance as follows:
 - a. Not Effective;
 - b. Minimally Effective;
 - c. Effective; or
 - d. Highly Effective.
 4. The evaluator may write notes in the section labeled "Notes" to support a rating that has been given. Any area in which the employee has been identified as "Not Effective" must have a comment.
- G. Evaluation conference
 1. Once the evaluator has completed the evaluator portion and has reviewed the employee self-evaluation, the evaluator shall schedule a conference with the employee.
 2. The purpose of the conference is to discuss each performance rating. If the evaluator and employee disagree on any performance rating, there should be discussion that allows each individual to express the basis for their rating. The evaluator should be specific and give examples that support the given rating.
 3. During this meeting, performance goals for the next year will be discussed. The evaluator and the employee should develop performance goals jointly and the evaluator will write them into the goal section of the evaluation.
 - a. The goals should be very specific and measurable.
 4. The evaluator must sign a hard copy of the evaluation signifying that the evaluator has fairly and accurately completed the evaluation.
 5. The employee must also sign the evaluation, acknowledging that the evaluator has met with the employee and discussed the evaluation. The signature does not denote that the employee agrees fully with the evaluation, only that the employee participated in the evaluation process.
 - a. If the employee refuses to sign the evaluation, the evaluator should indicate the employee's refusal to sign on the evaluation but should still proceed to distribute the evaluation.
 6. The original signed evaluation should be given to the employee.
 7. A copy should be sent to HRS for placement in the employee's file.

8. The evaluator should also keep a copy for their records.
 9. The evaluation may be used as written documentation or supporting documentation in the steps leading to or starting the remediation process as identified in the appropriate written agreement.
- H. Right to review and appeal
1. If an employee disagrees with the evaluation, the employee may engage in the following appeal process (for assistance in this process the employee may contact their association representative, their supervisor, or HRS):
 - a. At any time, the employee may submit a written response to the evaluation and have it placed in the personnel file along with the evaluation.
 - b. Informal appeal: The employee must submit a written request to the evaluator for an informal appeal within five business days of the delivery of the final evaluation. The request must be based on new or additional documentation that was not previously reviewed during the evaluation process. The evaluator will then meet with the employee to discuss the presented documentation and its effect on the evaluation. The evaluator will provide a written decision on the informal appeal to the employee within ten business days following the scheduled meeting.
 - c. Formal appeal step 1: The employee who is not satisfied with the results of the informal appeal may engage in a formal appeal process after a response to the informal appeal decision has been received. The employee must submit a written request for a formal appeal to the evaluator's supervisor within five business days following the date of the informal appeal decision. The request should identify specific concerns with the informal appeal decision, a detailed response to the informal appeal decision, a copy of the evaluation, and any other supporting documentation. The individual reviewing the formal appeal is the next level administrator who did not issue the evaluation. The administrator reviewing the appeal will determine what, if any, additional information is needed to appropriately review the appeal. The administrator must provide a written decision to the employee within 15 business days after receiving the appeal, however, if the administrator needs additional time, the administrator will notify the employee that the deadline for a decision has been extended.
 - d. Formal appeal step 2: The employee may engage in the formal appeal step 2 process after a response to step 1 formal appeal has been received. The employee must submit a written request for a formal step 2 appeal within five business days following the date of the step 1 decision. The request must be submitted to the HRS director. The request should identify the employee's specific concerns, a detailed response to the formal step 1 appeal decision, copies of the evaluation, and previously submitted documentation. The HRS director will determine what, if any, additional information is needed to render a decision on the appeal. The HRS director will provide a written final decision to the employee within 15 business days. If the HRS director needs additional time, the HRS director will notify the employee that the deadline for a decision has been extended. This will be the district's final and binding decision, and there will be no other internal appeals related to the evaluation in question.

IV. Engagement and Exit Surveys

- A. The district will request that all district educators complete a public education engagement survey, at a minimum, every other school year in which it is not administering the school climate survey.
 1. This survey is derived from the model public education engagement survey put forth by the Utah State Board of Education ("USBE") although the district may, in its discretion, add additional questions.
- B. The district will request that an educator leaving the district complete a public education exit survey at the time of their separation from district employment.
 1. This survey is derived from the model public education engagement survey put forth by USBE.
- C. The district administers the surveys using a USBE approved online provider.
- D. The surveys allow educators to remain anonymous and survey results are shared only with appropriate district-level personnel.