



Florida State University Schools

Student Services Personnel Evaluation System

2018-2019

Dr. Stacy Chambers, Director
Megan Brink, High School Principal
Angela Wills, Elementary Principal
Suzanne Wilkinson, Middle School Principal &
FLDOE District Contact

Florida State University Schools (FSUS)
3000 School House Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32311

www.fsus.fsu.edu
850.245.3700

Table of Contents

Purpose	1
Development Process	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Responding to the Call	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Partners in Collaboration	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Fundamental Principles in the Process	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Framework For Student Services Personnel Evaluation Model (SSPEM)	4
Florida’s New Evaluation System.....	4
Comprehensive System of Learning Supports and Student Services.....	5
Comprehensive Evaluation System Model for Student Services Personnel.....	7
Professional Practice Component—SSPEM	8
Description of the Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices.....	8
Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices—SSPEM	10
Evaluating Professional Practice—Methods and Sources of Evidence	22
Evaluation Rubric—Crosswalk with Professional Practice Standards	29
Evaluation Rubric—Crosswalk with Florida Educator Accomplished Practices and Teacher Evaluation Models	35
Scoring the Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices	40
General Instructions	40
Completing the Evaluation Rubric Scoring Protocol	40
Scoring Instructions.....	41
Summative Performance Level.....	41
Student Growth Component—SSPEM	47
Student Academic performance Component.....	47
Student Academic performance: Value-Added Measure (VAM)	47
Student Academic performance: Measurable Student Outcomes	48
Summative Evaluation Form	53
Recommendations for District Use	55
The Evaluation Cycle Process.....	55
SSPEM and the District Framework.....	59
References	61
Appendix A: Resources	65
Appendix B: Research Support for Practices in the SSPEM Model	67

Purpose

The purpose of Florida’s Student Services Personnel Evaluation Model (SSPEM) is to assist districts by developing a state pre-approved performance evaluation system for student services personnel (i.e., school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, and school nurses) that:

- Aligns with current research-based best practices and professional standards
- Meets the requirements of the Student Success Act
- Reflects the functions, practices, and responsibilities that positively impact student achievement, behavior, and health.

The SSPEM is an integrated evaluation system that establishes common practice standards across the student services professions by focusing on evidence-based and research-based practices that are linked to student achievement and behavior. The model provides districts with a state-approved evaluation framework to adopt or adapt to address the district’s instructional framework and needs, or use as a guide in developing its own performance evaluation system for student services personnel. The SSPEM may also serve as a guide for other “non-classroom” instructional or teaching fields for which special evaluation procedures and criteria are necessary.

Framework For Student Services Personnel Evaluation Model (SSPEM)

Florida's New Evaluation System

Florida's evaluation system has been adopted for the purpose of increasing student academic performance by improving the quality of instructional and supportive services. The evaluation system must be designed to:

- Support effective instruction and student academic performance
- Inform the development of district and school improvement plans
- Provide appropriate instruments, procedures, and criteria for continuous quality improvement of professional skills (i.e., professional development)

The Student Success Act requires districts to incorporate student academic performance and instructional practices in performance evaluation systems for instructional personnel (section 1012.34, Florida Statutes [F.S.]). The evaluation system must include the following components:

- Student academic performance
- Instructional practices
- Professional and job responsibilities

The evaluation system (i.e., combined components) must differentiate among four levels of performance. Fifty percent of the evaluation must be based on data and indicators of student academic performance as assessed annually by statewide (Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test® 2.0 [STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS 2.0] or End of Course [EOC] exams) or district assessments. The other 50 percent of the evaluation must include instructional practices based on the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) and the district's instructional practice framework (e.g., Marzano, Danielson).

Student services personnel are classified as "instructional personnel" in Florida statutes (s. 1012.01(2)(b), F.S.) and subject to the new evaluation system requirements. However, the statute differentiates between "classroom" and "non-classroom" instructional personnel. The student services disciplines or professions – school social work, school counseling, school psychology, and school nursing – fall in the non-classroom instructional personnel category (school nurses, though not classified as instructional personnel in statute, are included in the model because they are non-classroom personnel who provide services to students and schools, and many districts classify them as instructional personnel).

Because the Student Success Act allows for special evaluation procedures and criteria for selected teaching fields, the instructional practices component of the Student Services Personnel Evaluation Model was modified to reflect the professional practices and job responsibilities of student services personnel and to align with the teacher instructional practices identified in FEAPs. The statute also allows modifications to the student academic performance component for non-classroom instructional personnel.

For student services professionals, the student performance portion of the evaluation may be based on a combination of student academic performance data (at least 30 percent) and other measurable student outcomes (e.g., graduation rates, behavioral measures, truancy rates) specific to the position or assignment (up to 20 percent).

Comprehensive System of Learning Supports and Student Services

A comprehensive system of student learning supports is fundamental to promoting student success, addressing the barriers to learning, and re-engaging disconnected students. Florida's multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) focuses on increasing academic and behavioral outcomes for all students consistent with the State Board of Education mission by:

- Enhancing the capacity of all Florida school districts to successfully implement and sustain a multi-tiered system of student supports with fidelity in every school
- Accelerating and maximizing student academic and social-emotional outcomes through the application of data-based problem solving used by effective leadership at all levels of the educational system
- Informing the development, implementation, and ongoing evaluation of an integrated, aligned, and sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for post-secondary education and/or successful employment within our global society

Student services personnel perform critical tasks in schools that support FDOE's mission to "increase the proficiency of all students within one seamless, efficient system" and contribute to positive student outcomes through a multi-tiered system of support that promotes student achievement by ameliorating barriers to learning and providing interventions and other supports matched to student need.

Student services personnel provide professional services that promote effective classroom learning and positive and safe school environments, and ensure all students receive high-quality instruction that is responsive to their diverse and developmental needs. Student services personnel coordinate and collaborate with teachers, administrators, families, and community-based professionals to provide the academic, social, behavioral, health, and mental health learning supports necessary for a positive school climate and student success. Student services personnel are integral to implementing school-wide initiatives, such as

response to intervention (RtI), positive behavior interventions and supports, social emotional learning programs, college and career planning, and bullying prevention. Some of the critical functions student services personnel perform include the following:

- Supporting effective teaching and improved student learning and facilitating collaboration among school staff, families, and the community
- Providing a variety of prevention and intervention services in schools that promote effective classroom learning and teaching
- Working together with teachers and administrators to develop a positive school climate, improving classroom management skills, providing behavioral interventions to reduce discipline infractions, improving school safety, and removing barriers to learning
- Providing educational programs and activities that support student learning and teaching, including consultation with teachers and families, assessments linked to instruction, individual and group counseling, problem-solving instruction, and remedial interventions
- Collaborating with teachers and school staff to ensure students receive high-quality instruction that is responsive to the diverse and developmental needs of all students, create a continuum of support services for all students, and provide various instructional strategies to facilitate learning in all classrooms
- Participating, as members of the school team, in professional development to ensure high-quality learning
- Fostering collaboration between general and special education, and between community and schools, and schools and parents

Research demonstrates that students who receive social-emotional support and prevention services achieve better academically in school (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Shellinger, 2011; Greenberg et al., 2003; Welsh, Parker, Widaman, & O'Neill, 2001; Zins, Bloodworth, Weissberg, & Walberg, 2004). Comprehensive student support services in schools have been found to improve school climate and produce declines in disciplinary referrals, suspension, grade retention, and special education referrals and placement among at-risk students (Bruns, Walrath, Glass-Siegel, & Weist, 2004).

Consultation yields positive results, such as remediating academic and behavior problems for children in school settings; changing teacher's and parent's behavior, knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions; and reducing referrals for special education.

Comprehensive Evaluation System Model for Student Services Personnel

Florida's comprehensive performance evaluation system for student services personnel serves multiple functions and is designed to accomplish the following:

- Establish the practices and expectations of the position or profession that are based on research and linked to student outcomes
- Develop evaluation procedures that align with professional standards and accomplished educator practices (FEAPs)
- Evaluate individual performance relative to expectations by assessing the quality and effectiveness of the services
- Provide feedback to the professional that recognizes effective performance, identifies areas for improvement, and directs professional growth activities
- Provide support to supervisees and practitioners not meeting performance expectations

A comprehensive, evidence-based evaluation system uses a Multi-Source, Multi-Method, Multi-Trait model. This model ensures no single source of data, single data type, or single trait or attribute will be used to evaluate complex patterns of human behavior. When a single element model is used, the probability of making errors in the interpretation of the data is high. In the evaluation of student services personnel, the Multi-Source refers to collecting data from multiple settings and/or individuals who are familiar with the work of the professional being evaluated. Examples of Multi-Source include the following:

- Reviewing permanent products (e.g., intervention plans)
- Interviewing stakeholders (e.g., teachers, administrators)
- Observing directly the professional at work (e.g., leadership meetings, problem-solving sessions)

The Multi-Method refers to using Review, Interview, and Observation methods to collect the data.

Finally, the Multi-Trait refers to assessing multiple areas of expertise and role function (e.g., consultation, assessment, professional behaviors, leadership). Consistent levels of performance across the sources, methods, and traits are clear indicators of the performance level. Inconsistent levels of performance across the sources, methods, and traits may indicate areas of strengths and weaknesses in skill sets (e.g., traits) and/or settings in which those skills are applied.

Professional Practice Component—SSPEM

Description of the Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices

The primary responsibility of student services personnel is to remove barriers to learning by providing a multi-tiered system of support that promotes positive academic, behavioral, and healthy outcomes for students and for teachers, school administration, and families. Providing a multi-tiered system of supports depends on a multi-dimensional process. At the core of this process are four foundational skill sets:

- Problem Solving and Data-Based Decision Making—Expectations for student achievement are expressed in the collection and analysis of student, school, and district data to identify the barriers to learning.
- Instruction/Intervention Planning, Design, and Implementation—Ability to implement a multi-tiered system of supports by identifying research-based interventions and strategies that have a high probability of increasing student learning and engagement.
- Facilitation of Collaboration Through a Resource-Oriented Team Process—Use of skills to develop linkages with other district and community programs and facilitate relevant staff development.
- Professional Practice—Knowledge of unique professional skills, responsibility, and ethical practice in assessment and program development, and proficiency, self-reflection, professional growth planning, team learning, and collegial engagement.

The Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices integrates these foundational skills within a multi-tiered system of support. The Evaluation Rubric is structured around five domains, sets of practice standards within each domain, and indicators that differentiate four levels of performance for each practice (Highly Effective, Effective, Emerging, and Ineffective). The Evaluation Rubric includes the following key components:

- **Domains**—Broad categories used to organize professional practices and structure evaluation criteria.
- **Practices**—Descriptive standards of a domain related to a specific area of professional skill.
- **Indicators**—A continuum of descriptive statements that assist in differentiating between levels of performance for each practice.

Mastery of professional skills is a career-long and continuous process achieved through professional practices that focus on the five broad domains addressed in the Florida SSPEM:

- Data-Based Decision Making and Evaluation of Practices
- Instruction/Intervention Planning and Design

- Instruction/Intervention Delivery and Facilitation
- Learning Environment
- Professional Learning, Responsibility, and Ethical Practice

The five domains include 25 practice standards with indicators that differentiate four levels of performance for each practice (Highly Effective, Effective, Emerging, and Ineffective). The indicators for each practice standard include suggested artifacts or evidence that student services personnel may use to help demonstrate their level of performance for that indicator.

The indicator descriptors provide criteria that distinguish among the performance levels on each practice standard. It is important to clearly understand the indicator statements under each practice standard in order to find the level of proficiency that best describes the student services professional's performance related to the indicator. The indicators provide for a formative as well as a summative assessment of the student services personnel's strengths and weaknesses and contribute to the development of a plan for improving performance.

The "Effective" level describes performance that has school-wide impact and clearly makes a significant contribution to the school. In addition, the effective student services professional demonstrates a willingness to learn and apply new skills.

The "Highly Effective" level describes performance that is well above the Effective and results from consistent engagement with "professional practice." The highly effective student services professional frequently serves as a role model to others. Some professionals will be rated highly effective on some indicators, but few will be rated consistently highly effective on the summative evaluation.

The "Emerging" level describes student services professionals who show an understanding of what is required for success, but require support and direction to become effective. Emerging personnel will require raising their expectations and their standards of practice made more specific. The addition of focused professional learning will assist emerging personnel toward more effective performance.

The "Ineffective" level describes student service professionals who are not demonstrating proficiency through their actions or inactions on the skill sets needed for improved student learning. Personnel at this level may require prescribed goal setting and professional development and in time may not be recommended for continued employment.

Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices— SSPEM

The SSPEM is a dynamic approach that assesses the performance of student services personnel, improves the quality of service delivery, and directs continuous improvement of professional skills. The Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices offers an equitable model that recognizes the complexity of the duties and responsibilities of student services personnel within a multi-tiered system of supports.

Evaluation Rubric for Student Services Professional Practices in a Multi-Tiered System of Support

Domain A: Data-Based Decision Making and Evaluation of Practices			
Highly Effective	Effective	Emerging	Ineffective
1. Collects and uses data to develop and implement interventions within a problem-solving framework.			
Uses and/or facilitates collecting district data relevant to informing problem identification, problem analysis, and intervention design at the systems level.	Uses available school data and collects additional student data (e.g., screening, progress monitoring, and diagnostic assessment) relevant to informing problem identification, problem analysis, and intervention design.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be effective independently.	Does not collect or use data to inform interventions within a problem-solving framework OR ineffectively demonstrates the practice/skill required.
2. Analyzes multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data to inform decision making.			
Analyzes, integrates, and interprets data from multiple sources at the school or district level, and uses the data to inform systems-level decisions.	Analyzes, integrates, and interprets data from multiple sources at the individual and group level, and uses the data to inform decisions.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be effective independently.	Does not analyze, integrate, and interpret data from multiple sources or use data to inform decisions OR ineffectively demonstrates the practice/skill required.
3. Uses data to monitor student progress (academic, social/emotional/behavioral) and health and evaluate the effectiveness of services on student achievement.			
Uses school or district data to monitor the effectiveness of MTSS supports and district intervention program outcomes.	Uses individual and group data to monitor student progress, evaluate the effectiveness of academic and behavioral instruction/intervention, and modify interventions based on student data.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be effective independently.	Does not monitor student progress or evaluate the effectiveness of academic and behavioral instruction/intervention OR ineffectively demonstrates the practice/skill required.
4. Shares student performance data in a relevant and understandable way with students, parents, and administrators.			
Trains or mentors others to provide feedback on student performance and other assessment data to stakeholders and to present data in a way that is understandable and relevant to stakeholder interest/needs.	Provides feedback on student performance and other assessment data to stakeholders (students, teachers, parents, administrators, school teams) and presents data in a way that is understandable and relevant to stakeholder interest/needs.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be effective independently.	Does not provide feedback on student performance and other assessment data; does not present data in a way that is understandable and relevant OR ineffectively demonstrates the practice/skill required.

Evaluation Rubric for Student Services Professional Practices in a Multi-Tiered System of Support

Evaluation Rubric for Student Services Professional Practices in a Multi-Tiered System of Support

Domain B: Instruction/Intervention Planning and Design			
Highly Effective	Effective	Emerging	Ineffective
1. Uses a collaborative problem-solving framework as the basis for identification and planning for academic, behavioral, and health interventions and supports.			
Provides a leadership role by training others and facilitating team members' ability to identify, problem solve, and plan academic and behavioral interventions.	Works with team and team members to identify, problem solve, and plan academic, behavioral, and health interventions.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be effective independently.	Does not work with team to identify, problem solve, and plan academic and behavioral interventions OR ineffectively demonstrates the practice/skill required.
2. Plans and designs instruction/intervention based on data and aligns efforts with the school and district improvement plans and state and federal mandates.			
Trains or mentors others in collecting and using multiple sources of data, including classroom, district, and state assessments, to design and plan instruction and interventions that are aligned with school improvement priorities and other mandates.	Uses multiple sources of data, including classroom, district, and state assessments, to design and plan instruction and interventions that are aligned with school improvement priorities and other mandates.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be effective independently.	Instruction and interventions are not aligned OR are poorly aligned with school improvement priorities and other mandates.
3. Applies evidence-based research and best practices to improve instruction/interventions.			
Applies evidenced-based best practices when developing and planning instruction and interventions across all levels of MTSS (individual, targeted group, school, systems).	Applies evidence-based and best practices when developing and planning instruction and intervention.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be effective independently.	Fails to apply OR poorly applies evidence-based and best practices when developing and planning instruction and intervention.
4. Develops intervention support plans that help the student, family, or other community agencies and systems of support to reach a desired goal.			
Collaborates to identify systems-level needs, resources, and infrastructure to access services and supports.	Develops a support plan that reflects the goals of student/client systems and supports the goal.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be effective independently.	Support plans are ineffectively developed (i.e., plans do not reflect goals or systems coordination and support to obtain stated goal).

Evaluation Rubric for Student Services Professional Practices in a Multi-Tiered System of Support

Domain B: Instruction/Intervention Planning and Design			
Highly Effective	Effective	Emerging	Ineffective
5. Engages parents and community partners in the planning and design of instruction/interventions.			
Develops systems-level strategies (e.g., validate participation, decision making, two-way communication) for engaging families and community when planning and designing instruction and interventions.	Engages families, community, and educational stakeholders when planning and designing instruction and interventions. Parent input is valued and incorporated into plans.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be effective independently.	Does not engage OR ineffectively engages families and community when planning and designing instruction/intervention.

Evaluation Rubric for Student Services Professional Practices in a Multi-Tiered System of Support

Domain C: Instruction/Intervention Delivery and Facilitation			
Highly Effective	Effective	Emerging	Ineffective
1. Collaborates with school-based and district-level teams to develop and maintain a multi-tiered continuum of services (MTSS) to support the academic, social, emotional, and behavioral success and health of all students.			
Facilitates the development of MTSS at the district level by planning and implementing interventions that address systemic issues/concerns.	Facilitates the development of MTSS at the school level by planning and implementing interventions whose intensity matches student, group, or school needs.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not contribute to the development and implementation of MTSS at the school level OR ineffectively demonstrates the practice/skill required.
2. Consults and collaborates at the individual, family, group, and systems levels to implement effective instruction and intervention services.			
Consults and collaborates at the school/systems level to plan, implement, and evaluate academic and social-emotional/behavioral services.	Consults and collaborates at the individual, family, and group levels to plan, implement, and evaluate academic, social-emotional/behavioral, and health services.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not consult/collaborate OR demonstrates practice/skill ineffectively when planning, implementing, or evaluating academic and social-emotional/behavioral services.
3. Implements evidence-based practices within a multi-tiered framework.			
Assists in identifying and implementing evidence-based practices relevant to system-wide (school or district) interventions and supports.	Incorporates evidence-based practices in the implementation of interventions for individual students and targeted groups.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not incorporate OR ineffectively demonstrates evidence-based practices when implementing interventions for individual students and targeted groups.
4. Identifies, provides, and/or refers for supports designed to help students overcome barriers that impede learning.			
Identifies the systemic barriers to learning and facilitates the development of broader support systems for students and families.	Identifies barriers to learning and connects students with resources that support positive student outcomes/goals.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not identify barriers to learning or connect students with resources that support positive outcomes/goals OR ineffectively demonstrates the practice/skill required.

Evaluation Rubric for Student Services Professional Practices in a Multi-Tiered System of Support

Domain C: Instruction/Intervention Delivery and Facilitation			
Highly Effective	Effective	Emerging	Ineffective
5. Promotes student outcomes related to career and college readiness.			
Develops/plans district-level or school-level policies/interventions/supports that address student postsecondary goal attainment.	Develops/plans interventions or programs to increase student engagement (e.g., attendance, on-task behavior, rigorous/relevant instruction, participation in school activities) and support attainment of post-secondary goals.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not develop interventions that increase student engagement or support attainment of postsecondary goals OR ineffectively demonstrates practice/skill required.
6. Provides relevant information regarding child and adolescent development, barriers to learning, and student risk factors.			
Develops/provides trainings that include best practices related to developmental issues, barriers to learning, and risk factors.	Provides students, staff, and parents with information, research, and best practices related to developmental issues, barriers to learning, and risk factors.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not inform students, staff, or parents about best practices related to developmental issues, barriers to learning, or risk factors OR demonstrates practice/skill ineffectively.

Evaluation Rubric for Student Services Professional Practices in a Multi-Tiered System of Support

Domain D: Learning Environment			
Highly Effective	Effective	Emerging	Ineffective
1. Collaborates with teachers and administrators to develop and implement school-wide positive behavior supports.			
Interacts with school, district, parents, and community partners to sustain and promote effective system-wide programs/services that result in a healthy school climate.	Interacts with school personnel to promote and implement school-wide positive behavior supports.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not interact with school personnel to promote and implement school-wide positive behavior supports OR poorly demonstrates the practice/skill required.
2. Collaborates with school personnel and students to foster student engagement (e.g., involvement, motivation, persistence, resilience, ownership).			
Examines need and feasibility for systemic intervention to support and increase student engagement district-wide.	Consults with school staff and students to identify strengths and weaknesses as part of problem solving and intervention planning to increase student engagement.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not consult with school personnel to support and/or increase student engagement OR ineffectively demonstrates the practice/skill required.
3. Promotes safe school environments.			
Interacts with learning community to enhance, support, and/or create safe and violence-free school climates through training and advancement of initiatives that relate to healthy and violence-free schools.	Interacts with school personnel to promote and implement effective programs/services that result in a healthy and violence-free school climate (i.e., readiness, school failure, attendance, dropout, bullying, child abuse, youth suicide, school violence).	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Fails to demonstrate OR ineffectively demonstrates understanding, advocacy, and implementation of services/programs that address risk and protective factors among students/staff.
4. Integrates relevant cultural issues and contexts that impact family–school partnerships.			
Creates and promotes multicultural understanding and dialogue through training and information dissemination to examine the broader context of cultural issues that impact family–school partnerships.	Identifies relevant cultural issues and contexts that impact family–school partnerships and uses this knowledge as the basis for problem solving related to prevention and intervention.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not OR ineffectively demonstrates knowledge of cultural influences on students, teachers, communication styles, techniques, and practices.

Evaluation Rubric for Student Services Professional Practices in a Multi-Tiered System of Support

Domain D: Learning Environment			
Highly Effective	Effective	Emerging	Ineffective
5. Provides a continuum of crisis intervention services.			
Engages the learning community in strengthening crisis preparedness and response by organization, training, and information dissemination.	Collaborates in crisis planning, prevention, response, and recovery and/or collaborates in implementing/ evaluating programs.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not OR ineffectively demonstrates skills related to collaboration for crisis intervention along the continuum of services.

Evaluation Rubric for Student Services Professional Practices in a Multi-Tiered System of Support

Domain E: Professional Learning, Responsibility, and Ethical Practice			
Highly Effective	Effective	Emerging	Ineffective
1. Develops a personal, professional growth plan that enhances professional knowledge, skills, and practice and addresses areas of need on the evaluation.			
Establishes continuous improvement strategy to identify and self-monitor areas for skill and professional growth based on performance outcomes.	Maintains a plan for continuous professional growth and skill development aligned with performance evaluation outcomes and personal/professional goals.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not develop a personal professional growth plan with goals related to performance evaluation outcomes OR shows ineffective effort in this practice/skill.
2. Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices (e.g., professional learning community [PLC]).			
Facilitates professional learning communities' review of practices and response to feedback from supervisor and/or coworkers.	Participates in professional learning opportunities consistent with the professional growth plan and uses feedback from supervisor and/or colleagues for skill enhancement.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not participate in professional development opportunities OR demonstrates poor acceptance and/or use of constructive feedback to enhance skills.
3. Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development activities.			
Integrates acquired knowledge and training into practice for professional community.	Integrates and applies acquired knowledge and training into professional practice.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Demonstrates little or no interest in altering practices and delivery of services to accommodate new knowledge and skills.
4. Demonstrates effective recordkeeping and communication skills.			
Supports record/data management system impact on practice and facilitates active listening among professional learning community members.	Demonstrates reliable recordkeeping skills; demonstrates coherent, professional written/oral communication; adapts communication style and content to a variety of audiences; establishes rapport and is an active listener.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not OR ineffectively maintains reliable system of recordkeeping; fails to or poorly demonstrates active listening, written, and/or verbal communication skills.

Evaluation Rubric for Student Services Professional Practices in a Multi-Tiered System of Support

Domain E: Professional Learning, Responsibility, and Ethical Practice			
Highly Effective	Effective	Emerging	Ineffective
5. Complies with national and state laws, district policies and guidelines, and ethical educational and professional standards.			
Demonstrates a clear understanding of professional practice standards and ethics. Operationalizes standards in day-to-day practice as a model for professional community members.	Adheres to professional standards, ethics and practices; maintains accurate, timely, and confidential records; and complies with relevant laws, rules, guidelines, and policies at the national, state, and local levels.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not adhere to standards of professional practice, national and state laws, and/or local policy and procedures in the professional arena.

Evaluating Professional Practice—Methods and Sources of Evidence

When evaluating professional practices it is necessary to use multiple methods of collecting evidence (e.g., Review, Interview and Observation) to document the professional's performance in each practice. This may include reviewing permanent products (e.g., intervention plans), interviewing stakeholders (e.g., teachers, administrators), and observing the professional at work (e.g., leadership meetings, problem-solving sessions).

Table 1 (p. 21) provides examples of multiple methods and sources of evidence data to evaluate the demonstration of the practice standards in each of the five domains. Districts may modify and add to these evidences to reflect the sources used locally to determine the student services professional's performance level. These sources and methods should be shared at the beginning of each evaluation cycle to allow the evaluatee the opportunity to document practices.

Table 1

Methods and Sources of Evidence

Data-Based Decision Making and Evaluation of Practices	
<p>Sources of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Artifacts <input type="checkbox"/> Observation <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder Feedback <input type="checkbox"/> Conference/Interview <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Growth Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Other: 	<p>Types of Evidence:</p> <p>Documentation of problem identification and problem analysis with graphed data and gap analysis (e.g., screening, progress monitoring, diagnostic assessment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem-Solving/Intervention Plan • Academic Intervention Record • Behavior Intervention Plan • Progress-Monitoring Plan • Section 504 Plan <p>Reports with data analysis and interpretation (e.g., psychoeducational; psychological; psychosocial; counselors, school health report)</p> <p>Data platforms/electronic documentation systems (e.g., Data Warehouse, Pinnacle, Global Scholar, Performance Matters, AIMSWEB, mCLASS, EASY CBM)</p> <p>Critical Components Checklist</p> <p>Counseling Plan and logs</p> <p>Needs Assessments</p>
Instruction/Intervention Planning and Design	
<p>Sources of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Artifacts <input type="checkbox"/> Observation <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder Feedback <input type="checkbox"/> Conference/Interview <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Growth Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Other: 	<p>Types of Evidence:</p> <p>Problem solving/intervention meeting/ plan - documentation of intervention design and development (with targets, goals, delivery methods, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical Components Checklist • Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA) • Individual Educational Plan (IEP) • Section 504 Plan • Emergency Action Plan • Individualized Health Care Plan • School Health Plan <p>Electronic documentation systems (school-entry health exam, immunization certification, health records, emergency information, electronic data panels that verify collaboration and consultation)</p>

Table 1

Methods and Sources of Evidence

	<p>Inservice trainings/presentations (handouts, agenda, PowerPoint)</p> <p>Learning community discussions/presentations (agenda)</p> <p>School/District Improvement Plans - documentation of participation</p>
--	--

Table 1

Methods and Sources of Evidence

Instruction/Intervention Delivery and Facilitation	
<p>Sources of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Artifacts <input type="checkbox"/> Observation <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder Feedback <input type="checkbox"/> Conference/Interview <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Growth Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Other: 	<p>Types of Evidence:</p> <p>Problem-Solving/Intervention Plan – documentation of intervention and monitoring of student response (e.g., RtI data, progress-monitoring data)</p> <p>Monitoring intervention implementation (dosage and fidelity)</p> <p>Electronic documentation systems (electronic data panels that track and verify services)</p> <p>Case consultation summary</p> <p>Parent conference notes/logs</p> <p>Newsletters, emails, webpage, and other communication methods</p> <p>Critical Components Checklist</p> <p>Benchmark of Quality (BoQ); Benchmarks for Advanced Tiers (BAT)</p> <p>Inservice trainings/presentations related to intervention delivery and facilitation (handouts, agenda, PowerPoint)</p> <p>Pre-post surveys</p> <p>School/District Improvement – documentation of participation</p> <p>Customer satisfaction surveys</p> <p>Family participation and engagement</p>
Learning Environment	
<p>Sources of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Artifacts <input type="checkbox"/> Observation <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder Feedback <input type="checkbox"/> Conference/Interview <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Growth Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Other: 	<p>Types of Evidence:</p> <p>Threat assessment</p> <p>Crisis intervention participation/facilitation</p> <p>School climate surveys</p> <p>Inservice trainings/presentations related to school climate, violence preventions, crisis intervention, and mental health issues</p> <p>School-based programs – development and implementation</p> <p>Health education, medication administration, first aid, bloodborne pathogens, cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automated external defibrillator (AED) trainings</p> <p>Disproportionality – risk index and ratios</p>

Table 1

Methods and Sources of Evidence

Professional Learning, Responsibility and Ethical Practice	
<p>Sources of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Artifacts <input type="checkbox"/> Observation <input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholder Feedback <input type="checkbox"/> Conference/Interview <input type="checkbox"/> Self-Assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Growth Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Other: 	<p>Types of Evidence:</p> <p>Professional Growth Plan</p> <p>Documentation of inservice, professional conferences, and workshops</p> <p>Conference/workshop follow-up activities/implementation</p> <p>Professional learning community participation/facilitation</p> <p>Membership in professional organization</p> <p>Documentation of supervision/mentoring activities</p> <p>Demonstration of time management (e.g., logs, calendars)</p>

Evaluation Rubric—Crosswalk with Professional Practice Standards

This crosswalk (Table 2) aligns the practice standards under each domain in the SSPEM Evaluation Rubric with the evidence-based professional practice standards for school counseling, school social work, school psychology, and school nursing. The crosswalk also demonstrates the similarities and consistencies among the practice standards for each of the student services professions.

Table 2

Professional Practice	School Counseling	School Social Work	School Psychology	School Nursing
Data-Based Decision Making and Evaluation of Practices				
Collects and uses data to develop and implement interventions within a problem-solving framework.	ESSC A.2.b IV-B-3a.	COE 2.03 Standard V	Domains 1 & 2 Standard II.3.9	COE 1C, 1D Standards 1, 2, & 4
Analyzes multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data to inform decision making.	ESSC D.1.g IV-A-5	COE 2.03 Standard V	Domains 1 & 9 Standard II.3.2	COE 2C Standard 2
Uses data to monitor student progress (academic, social/emotional/behavioral) and health and evaluate the effectiveness of services on student achievement.	ESSC C.2.b IV-B-3	COE 2.03 Standard V	Domain 1 & 9 Standard II.2.2	COE 1B, 1E Standards 3, 4, 6, & 10
Shares student performance data in a relevant and understandable way with students, parents, and administrators.	ESSC C.2.b IV-B-3c	COE 1.03 Standard V	Domains 1, 2, & 9 Standard II.3.8	COE 1A Standards 5A, 5B, 5C, 11, & 13
Instruction/Intervention Planning and Design				
Uses a collaborative problem-solving framework as the basis for identification and planning for academic, behavioral, and health interventions and supports.	ESSC F.4 I-B-4	COE 2.03 Standard X	Domains 2, 3, 4, & 5 Standard II.3.9	COE 1C, 2C Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6
Plans and designs instruction/intervention based on data and aligns efforts with the school and district improvement plans and state and federal mandates.	ESSC C.3.a II-B-1	COE 2.03 Standard III	Domains 1 & 5 Standard II.3.10	COE 2B, 3B Standards 4, 5, & 5B
Applies evidence-based research and best practices to improve instruction/interventions.	ESSC F.2.a IV-B-6a	COE 2.03 Standard III	Domain 9 Standard II.3.9	COE 3A, 3B Standards 9 & 10
Develops intervention support plans that help the student, family, or other community agencies and systems of support reach a desired goal.	ESSC Preamble III-B-4	COE 2.03 Standard III	Domain 7 Standard III.3.1	COE 1A Standards 5, 5A, 5B, & 5C
Engages parents and community partners in the planning and design of instruction/interventions.	ESSC B.1.a I-A-6	COE 1.03 Standard III	Domain 7 Standard II.3.10	COE 1A, 1B, 1E Standards 5, 5A, 5B, 5C, 11, & 13

Table 2

Professional Practice	School Counseling	School Social Work	School Psychology	School Nursing
Instruction/Intervention Delivery and Facilitation				
Collaborates with school-based and district-level teams to develop and maintain a multi-tiered continuum of services (MTSS) to support the academic, social, emotional, and behavioral success and health of all students.	ESSC F.4 III-B-4b	COE 2.03 Standard X	Domains 3, 4 Standard IV.1.1	COE 1C, 2C Standards 11, 12, 13, & 15
Consults and collaborates at the individual, family, group, and systems levels to implement effective instruction and intervention services.	ESSC F.4 III-C-2	COE 2.03 Standard IV	Domains 2, 3, & 4 Standard II.3.10	COE 1B, 1C Standards 11, 13, & 15
Implements evidence-based practices within a multi-tiered framework.	ESSC E.2.g I-A-5	COE 2.03 Standard IV	Domain 9	COE 3B, 3D Standards 9 & 10
Identifies, provides, and/or refers for supports designed to help students overcome barriers that impede learning.	ESSC A.5.a III-B-3i	COE 2.03 Standard XI	Domain 6 Standard III.3.1	COE 1B, 2C Standards 11 & 15
Promotes student outcomes related to career and college readiness.	ESSC A.3 III-B-2d	COE Standard IX	Domain 8	COE 1B, 1E, 3A Standards 3, 4, & 6
Provides relevant information regarding child and adolescent development, barriers to learning, and student risk factors.	ESSC C.2.b II-A-5	COE 1.01 Standard IX	Domain 8	COE 3B Standards 5B, 5C, & 8
Learning Environment				
Collaborates with teachers and administrators to develop and implement school-wide positive behavior supports.	ESSC F.4 IV-B-3	COE 2.03 Standard IV	Domain 5 Standard IV.1.1	COE 1C, 3D Standards 13, 15, & 17
Collaborates with school personnel and students to foster student engagement (e.g., involvement, motivation, persistence, resilience, ownership).	ESSC Preamble I-A-6	COE 2.03 Standard IV	Domain 5 Standard IV.1.1	COE 1B, 1C Standards 11, 13, 15, & 17
Promotes safe school environments.	ESSC Preamble I-B-5	COE 1.01 Standard IV	Domain 5, 6 Principle IV.1	COE 1D, 3D Standards 5B, 15, 16, & 17

Table 2

Professional Practice	School Counseling	School Social Work	School Psychology	School Nursing
Integrates relevant cultural issues and contexts that impact family-school partnerships.	ESSC E.2.a III-A-6	COE 1.05 Standard IX	Domain 7 Standard I.3.1 Standard II.1.2	COE 1A, 1C Standards 9, 10, 13, & 17
Provides a continuum of crisis intervention services.	ESSC Preamble III-B-3f	COE 6.03 Standard IV	Domain 6	COE 2C, 2D Standards 13, 15, & 17
Professional Learning, Responsibility, and Ethical Practice				
Develops a personal, professional growth plan that enhances professional knowledge, skills, and practice and addresses areas of need on the evaluation.	ESSC E.1.c IV-B-1e	COE 4.01, 5.02 Standard XIII	Domain 10 Standard II.1.1; II.1.2	COE 2B Standards 12 & 14
Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices (e.g., PLC).	ESSC E.1.d II-B-4h	COE 3.09 Standard XIII	Domain 10 Standard II.1.4 Standard II.4.2; IV.4.3	COE 2A Standards 8, 10, & 14
Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development activities.	ESSC F.2.a II-B-4h	COE 3.08 Standard XIII	Domain 10 Standard II.1.1; II.2.2	COE 2C, 3A Standards 7 & 8
Demonstrates effective recordkeeping and communication skills.	ESSC A.8 XVI-16.5 (Program Audit)	COE 3.04, 3.08 Standard XIII	Domain 10 Principle II.4	COE 2A, 3A Standards 10, 11, & 17
Complies with national and state laws, district policies and guidelines, and ethical educational and professional standards.	ESSC A.2.h II-C-4	COE 3.08 Standard XIII	Domain 10 Standard IV.2.2	COE 2D, 1D, 3C Standards 7, 8, & 14

SOURCES:

American Nurses Association and National School Nurses Association. (2011). *School nursing: Scope and standards of practice, 2nd Edition*. Silver Spring, MD: Author.

American School Counselor Association. (2007). School counselor competencies. In *Career/Roles*. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org/files/SCCompetencies.pdf>

American School Counselor Association. (2010). Ethical standards for school counselors. In *Legal & Ethical*. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org/files/EthicalStandards2010.pdf>

National Association of School Nurses. (2010) Code of Ethics. Retrieved from <http://www.nasn.org/RoleCareer/CodeofEthics>

National Association of School Psychology. (2010a). *Model for comprehensive and integrated school psychological services. NASP practice model overview*. [Brochure]. Bethesda, MD: Author.

National Association of School Psychology. (2010b). *Principles for professional ethics*. Bethesda, MD: Author.

National Association of Social Work. (2012a). *NASW standards for school social work services*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

National Association of Social Work. (2012b). *Code of ethics of the National Association of Social Workers*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Evaluation Rubric—Crosswalk with Florida Educator Accomplished Practices and Teacher Evaluation Models

This crosswalk (Table 3) aligns the SSPEM Evaluation Rubric with the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices and the teacher evaluation model Dr. Robert J. Marzano developed. The crosswalk demonstrates commonalities among the evaluation models.

Table 3

Professional Practices	FEAPs	Marzano
Data-Based Decision Making and Evaluation of Practices		
Collects and uses data to develop and implement interventions within a problem-solving framework.	(a) 1e, 1d, & 4a	Domain 2.3
Analyzes multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data to inform decision making.	(a) 3c & 4a	Domain 2.2
Uses data to monitor student progress (academic, social/emotional/behavioral) and health and evaluate the effectiveness of services on student achievement.	(a) 1e & 4c	Domain 2.3
Shares student performance data in a relevant and understandable way with students, parents, and administrators.	(a) 2e & 4e	Domain 2.1
Instruction/Intervention Planning and Design		
Uses a collaborative problem-solving framework as the basis for identification and planning for academic, behavioral, and health interventions and supports.	(a) 1c & 1f	Domain 2.2
Plans and designs instruction/intervention based on data and aligns efforts with the school and district improvement plans and state and federal mandates.	(a) 1a & 3h	Domain 4.3
Applies evidence-based research and best practices to improve instruction/interventions.	(b) 1b	
Develops intervention support plans that help the student, family, or other community agencies and systems of support reach a desired goal.	(b) 1c	
Engages parents and community partners in the planning and design of instruction/interventions.	(b) 1c	
Instruction/Intervention Delivery & Facilitation		
Collaborates with school-based and district-level teams to develop and maintain a multi-tiered continuum of services (MTSS) to support the academic, social, emotional, and behavioral success and health of all students.	(a) 2b	
Consults and collaborates at the individual, family, group, and systems levels to implement effective instruction and intervention services.	(b) 1c	

Table 3

Professional Practices	FEAPs	Marzano
Implements evidence-based practices within a multi-tiered framework.	(a) 2h (b) 1b	Domain 2.1
Identifies, provides, and/or refers for supports designed to help students overcome barriers that impede learning.		
Promotes student outcomes related to career and college readiness.		
Provides relevant information regarding child and adolescent development, barriers to learning, and student risk factors.		
Learning Environment		
Collaborates with teachers and administrators to develop and implement school-wide positive behavior supports.	(a) 2b (a) 2e	Domain 1
Collaborates with school personnel and students to foster student engagement (e.g., involvement, motivation, persistence, resilience, ownership).	(a) 2d (a) 2f (a) 3a	Domain 2.1
Promotes safe school environments.	(a) 2b	Domain 2
Integrates relevant cultural issues and contexts that impact family-school partnerships.	(a) 2d	Domain 2
Provides a continuum of crisis intervention services.		
Professional Learning, Responsibility, and Ethical Practice		
Develops a personal, professional growth plan that enhances professional knowledge, skills, and practice and addresses areas of need on the evaluation.	(b) 1a	Domain 3.2
Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices (e.g., PLC).	(b) 1d	Domain 3.2
Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development activities.	(b) 1e	Domain 4.2
Demonstrates effective recordkeeping and communication skills.	(a) 2a	Domain 4.1
Complies with national and state laws, district policies and guidelines, and ethical educational and professional standards.	2	Domain 4.3

Table 3

Marzano, R. (2011). *Marzano art and science of teaching: Teacher evaluation model*. York, PA: Learning Sciences International.
The Educator Accomplished Practices, [Rule 6A-5.065](#), Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.),(2011).

Scoring the Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices should be completed using evidence from multiple methods and sources. An Evaluation Rubric Scoring Protocol is provided (Form 1, p. 37). Prior to completing the Evaluation Rubric Scoring Protocol, the evaluator should be familiar with the five domains, the four levels of performance in each of the practices, and the methods and sources of evidence that will be used to determine the professional's level of performance (see Table 1, p. 21, for examples). The performance expectations, performance criteria, and the evidence/documentation should be communicated to the professional being evaluated at the beginning of the evaluation cycle (e.g., pre-evaluation planning phase).

COMPLETING THE EVALUATION RUBRIC SCORING PROTOCOL

For each practice on the Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices, the evaluator must determine the professional's performance level using the indicator statements as a guide. The evaluator will need to refer to the indicator statements on the Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices when completing the scoring protocol. It is recommended that the evaluator start with the indicator statement for Effective, as this is the performance level most likely to capture the majority of student services employees, and then move up or down the performance level/effectiveness scale as needed.

The indicator statements correspond to four levels of performance: Highly Effective, Effective, Emerging, and Ineffective. Each practice is scored 4, 3, 2, or 1—Highly Effective = 4, Effective = 3, Emerging = 2, and Ineffective = 1. Determine the indicator statement that best describes the level of performance for the professional being evaluated.

For each practice, identify the evidence used as documentation of performance under the practice statement. It is best to establish documentation evidence in the pre-evaluation phase. There is a comments section at the end of each domain. General comments about the domain may be captured here. Ratings of Emerging or Ineffective require a statement of the specific supports and activities (e.g., training, supervision, professional development) that will be implemented to move the professional to becoming Effective in that practice.

SCORING INSTRUCTIONS

- **For each practice statement:** Check the box that corresponds to the level of performance for the professional (4, 3, 2, 1). This is the practice rating score.
- **For each domain:** Sum the ratings (4, 3, 2, 1) for each of the practices; Divide by the number of practices; Multiply by 10 to obtain the total score. This is the domain score.
- **TOTAL:** Sum the scores from each of the five domains. This is the TOTAL score (25–100).

SUMMATIVE PERFORMANCE LEVEL

The professional's summative performance level (Highly Effective, Effective, Emerging, Ineffective) is based on the combined Professional Practices and Student Growth ratings.

Districts may also assign an overall performance rating to the Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices with the levels of performance used to evaluate the professional practices; however, the overall evaluation of the professional into one of the four performance levels must be professional practices (50 percent) and student growth (50 percent).

If districts choose to assign a summative rating on the Evaluation Rubric Scoring Protocol that corresponds to the four levels, there are a couple options:

1. Assign TOTAL Score ranges to each of the four levels (e.g., TOTAL scores of 80–100 = Highly Effective).
2. Set standards based on the minimum/maximum number of practices in each domain rated as Highly Effective, Effective, Emerging, and Ineffective to obtain the overall performance rating (e.g., to be rated as Highly Effective, 50 percent of the practice scores in each domain must be 4s AND no scores below 2).

Evaluation Rubric Scoring Protocol

Name:	Employee ID#:
Position:	Assignment:
Evaluator:	Date:

Scoring Key:

HE (Highly Effective) = 4 E (Effective) = 3 NI (Needs Im) = 2 U (Unsatisfactory) = 1

Domain A: Data-Based Decision Making and Evaluation of Practices	Rating Scores			
	HE	E	Em	InE
A-1. Collects and uses data to develop and implement interventions within a problem-solving framework.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
A-2. Analyzes multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data to inform decision making.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
A-3. Uses data to monitor student progress (academic and social/emotional/behavioral) and evaluate the effectiveness of services on student achievement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
A-4. Shares student performance data in a relevant and understandable way with students, parents, and administrators.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
TOTAL (Add the practice rating scores in Domain A ÷ 4, then multiply by 10 =)				
<i>Domain A Section Comments:</i>				

Domain B: Instruction/Intervention Planning and Design	Rating Scores			
	HE	E	NI	U
B-1. Uses a collaborative problem-solving framework as the basis for identification and planning for academic and behavioral interventions and supports.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
B-2. Plans and designs instruction/intervention based on data and aligns efforts with the school and district improvement plans and state and federal mandates.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
B-3. Applies evidence-based research and best practices to improve instruction/interventions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
B-4. Develops intervention support plans that help the student, family, or other community agencies and systems of support reach a desired goal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
B-5. Engages parents and community partners in the planning and design of instruction/interventions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
TOTAL (Add the practice rating scores in Domain B ÷ 5, then multiply by 10 =)				

Evaluation Rubric Scoring Protocol

<i>Domain B Section Comments:</i>

Domain C: Instruction/Intervention Delivery and Facilitation	Rating Scores			
	HE	E	NI	U
C-1. Collaborates with school-based and district-level teams to develop and maintain a multi-tiered continuum of services (MTSS) to support the academic, social, emotional, and behavioral success and health of all students.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
C-2. Consults and collaborates at the individual, family, group, and systems levels to implement effective instruction and intervention services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
C-3. Implements evidence-based practices within a multi-tiered framework.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
C-4. Identifies, provides, and/or refers for supports designed to help students overcome barriers that impede learning.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
C-5. Promotes student outcomes related to career and college readiness.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
C-6. Provides relevant information regarding child and adolescent development, barriers to learning, and student risk factors.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
TOTAL (Add the practice rating scores in Domain C ÷ 6, then multiply by 10 =				
<i>Domain C Section Comments:</i>				

Domain D: Learning Environment	Rating Scores			
	HE	E	NI	U
D-1. Collaborates with teachers and administrators to develop and implement school-wide positive behavior supports.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
D-2. Collaborates with school personnel and students to foster student engagement (e.g., involvement, motivation, persistence, resilience, ownership).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
D-3. Promotes safe school environments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
D-4. Integrates relevant cultural issues and contexts that impact family-school partnerships.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
D-5. Provides a continuum of crisis intervention services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
TOTAL (Add the practice rating scores in Domain D ÷ 5, then multiply by 10 =				

Evaluation Rubric Scoring Protocol

<i>Domain D Section Comments:</i>

Evaluation Rubric Scoring Protocol

Domain E: Professional Learning, Responsibility, and Ethical Practice	Rating Scores			
	HE	E	NI	U
E-1. Develops a personal, professional growth plan that enhances professional knowledge, skills, and practice and addresses areas of need on the evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
E-2. Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices (e.g., PLC).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
E-3. Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development activities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
E-4. Demonstrates effective recordkeeping and communication skills.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
E-5. Complies with national and state laws, district policies and guidelines, and ethical educational and professional standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Evidence:</i>				
TOTAL (Add the practice rating scores in Domain E ÷ 5, then multiply by 10 = <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/>)				
<i>Domain E Section Comments:</i>				

EVALUATION RUBRIC TOTAL SCORE:

Domain A Score	<input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/>
Domain B Score	<input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/>
Domain C Score	<input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/>
Domain D Score	<input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/>
Domain E Score	<input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/>
TOTAL	<input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/>

OVERALL RATING for the EVALUATION RUBRIC:

Highly Effective
 Effective
 Needs Improvement
 Unsatisfactory

Total Score (range)	Performance Level Rating
175–200	<i>Highly Effective</i>
125–174	<i>Effective</i>
75–124	<i>Needs Improvement</i>
< 75	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>

Student Growth Component—SSPEM

Student Academic performance Component

The Student Success Act requires that 50 percent of the personnel performance evaluation be based on student academic performance on statewide or district assessments. However, the statute allows modifications to the student academic performance component for non-classroom instructional personnel.

For instructional personnel who are not classroom teachers, the student academic performance portion of the evaluation must include growth data on statewide assessments for students assigned to the instructional personnel over the course of at least 3 years, or may include a combination of student academic performance data and other measurable student outcomes that are specific to the assigned position, provided that the student academic performance data accounts for not less than 30 percent of the evaluation. If less than 3 years of student growth data are available, the years for which data are available must be used and the percentage of the evaluation based upon student academic performance may be reduced to not less than 20 percent (section 1012.34, F.S.).

For student services professionals, the student performance portion of the evaluation may be based on a combination of student academic performance data (at least 30 percent) and other measurable student outcomes (e.g., graduation rates, behavioral measures, truancy rates) specific to the position/assignment (up to 20 percent). Student academic performance and other measurable student outcomes specific to student services professionals:

- Must account for 50 percent of the evaluation (this percentage may be modified if less than three years of data are available)
 - Up to 20 percent of the student academic performance component may be based on measurable student outcomes specific to the position/role
- Must be based on students assigned to the student services professional

Student Academic performance: Value-Added Measure (VAM)

The following are guidelines for determining the VAM portion of the student growth component based on statewide assessments and EOC exams. **All non-classroom instructional teachers will be connected to school-wide VAM.**

- Use school VAM data (same as principal) – DO NOT use district-wide data if the professional is assigned to schools. Using district-wide data is inconsistent with the statutory requirement that student academic performance be based on students assigned to the professional and with the requirement that the evaluation system differentiate between levels of performance.

- Use VAM data on students assigned to the professional (include direct and indirect services).
- For personnel assigned to multiple schools, calculate the VAM based on the percentage of time assigned to each school, or the VAM data on students assigned to the professional across school assignments.
- For personnel with district-wide or special assignments (e.g., bilingual assessment team), use district-wide data for the population served (all ELLs) but not all students.

Regardless of which method is used, the district must apply the criteria for determining the value-added component consistently across student services personnel.

The VAM score must place the professional in one of four performance levels as defined in statute (i.e., Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement/Developing, or Unsatisfactory) and then be converted to a 120-point scale* (or a 200-point scale if VAM is the only score used to calculate the student academic performance component). Classify the VAM score on a 120-point scale by assigning point values for each performance level. For example, Highly Effective = 120, Effective = 90, Needs Improvement/Developing = 60, and Unsatisfactory = 30.

The professional receives a VAM score for each school assignment. If multiple schools are served, the Total VAM score is calculated based on the cumulative value divided by the number of schools. For example, if the VAM is Highly Effective in School #1 and Effective in School #2, using the scoring rubric in the previous paragraph the Total VAM = 105 ($120 + 90 = 210 \div 2 = 105$). This score is entered on the Summative Evaluation Form (see Sample Form 3).

Student Academic performance: Measurable Student Outcomes

Districts also have the option of including measurable student outcomes in the student growth component. If a district chooses this option, the measurable student outcomes can account for up to 20 percent of the total evaluation. **The positions associated with Measureable Student Outcomes (Media Specialist, Reading Coach, Speech) are based on the students specially assigned to them, but not roster based.** The following are recommendations for districts to consider when including measurable outcomes in the student growth component of the evaluation.

- Identify the measurable outcomes related to student services (see Table 4).
 - The measurable outcomes should reflect priorities in District Improvement Plans, School Improvement Plans, or professional growth goals.
 - District and school plans should include priorities and goals that relate to the role of student services in supporting student achievement and post-school outcomes.

* These point scales incorporate the percentage of the Summative Evaluation required/allowable for that component (i.e., on a 400-point scale, 120 points = 30 percent and 80 = 20 percent). The district may modify the rubric for assigning scores to each performance level.

- Identify the metrics/tools for measuring the outcomes.
- Determine the percentage of the total evaluation that the measurable outcome(s) will account for (can count up to 20 percent).
- Select the population or group being measured. This could be the entire school or a disaggregated subgroup (e.g., intervention group, grade level, specific population of students being targeted).
- Calculate the impact of the measurable outcome using criteria based on standards or goals. Base the measurable outcome on a targeted goal (e.g., increase graduation rate by 5 percent). The district (or the evaluator and professional being evaluated) should establish criteria for the amount of growth needed to meet Effective and Highly Effective ratings.

Decide whether all personnel will be evaluated on the same measurable outcome and metric (e.g., district priority related to student services), or whether the measurable outcome will vary based on individual assignment and/or responsibilities. If the 2nd option is chosen, the outcome and metric should be discussed and mutually determined at the beginning of the evaluation cycle.

A sample for planning and documenting measurable student outcomes is provided in Form 2.

The Measurable Outcomes score must place the professional in one of four performance levels (i.e., Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement/Developing, or Unsatisfactory) and converted to an 80-point scale (if measurable outcomes account for 20 percent of the student academic performance component). Classify the Measurable Outcomes score on an 80-point scale by assigning point values for each performance level. For example, Highly Effective = 80, Effective = 60, Needs Improvement/Developing = 40, and Unsatisfactory = 20. This score is entered on the Summative Evaluation Form (see Sample Form 3 p. 48).

Table 4 (p. 44) illustrates possible student outcomes and metrics that might be used for measuring student growth in each outcome.

Table 4: Measurable Student Outcomes

Measurable Outcome	Metric for Measuring	Measurement Tool
Student achievement	Standard Score STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS Developmental Scale Score Growth Scale Value (GSV) Number/percent achieving proficiency Grades	STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) Diagnostic assessments SAT, ACT, AP Test
Reductions in behavior problems	Referral rates Number of behavior incidences Standard score	Office Discipline Referrals (ODR) Behavior rating scales
Attendance	Attendance rates	Attendance data (e.g., days present, absent, and tardy)
Reductions in suspensions	Number of suspension days	Discipline data
Student engagement	Time on task Percent work completed	Student engagement instruments http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs Structured observation
Academic efficiency	Fluency (WPM, digits correct)	Curriculum-based measurement (CBM) fluency measures
Academic skill development	Raw score Standard score	CBM progress monitoring
Social skill development	Scale scores	Social skills instruments
Retention	Retention rate	Retention data
Graduation	Graduation rate	Graduation data
Intervention-based student gains	RtI rate or progress Pre-post intervention comparison	Intervention effectiveness

Districts are NOT required to use the measurable student outcomes or metrics in Table 4.

Measurable Student Outcomes Planning Sample Form

Name:		Employee ID#:	
Position:	Yrs.:	Assignment:	
Evaluator/Title:		Date Completed:	

Measurable Student Outcome Plan	
Targeted outcome - What is the measurable outcome(s) that will be targeted?	
Relationship to district or school priorities - How does the targeted outcome relate to district or school improvement plans?	
Measurement tool and metric - What is the instrument/tool and the measurement metric?	
Targeted group - Which and how many students are targeted (data will be collected on these students for the purpose of calculating measurable student outcomes)?	
Present level - What is the current student outcome level?	
Goal - What is the student growth goal?	
Performance level - How does student growth on the measurable outcome correspond to the performance levels?	
<p><i>The following table provides a sample rubric for equating student growth to performance level. The district will need to establish the numerical value that corresponds to each of the performance levels and convert to a scale that ranges from 0-80. The numerical value of the goal should be based on the targeted outcome.</i></p>	
Summative Score (range) *	Performance Level Rating
Exceeds goal	<i>Highly Effective</i>
Meets goal	<i>Effective</i>
Improvement but short of goal	<i>Needs Improvement/Developing</i>
No progress or slippage	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>
* Sample rubric	

<i>Measurable Outcome Score</i>	/80

Student Services Professional Signature:

Date:

Evaluator's Signature:

Date:

Summative Evaluation Form

The evaluation system for instructional personnel must differentiate among four levels of performance, which are identified in statute (s. 1012.34, F.S.) as: 1) Highly Effective, 2) Effective, 3) Needs Improvement or Developing (for instructional personnel in the first three years of employment), and 4) Unsatisfactory. The SSPEM Summative Evaluation (Form 3) that follows provides a **sample** form for documenting the summative performance level of the student services personnel being evaluated. The Summative Evaluation form includes the critical components of the SSPEM and point values for each component: Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices, Value-Added Measure, and Measurable Student Outcomes related to job responsibilities.

The SSPEM Summative Evaluation integrates evaluative data from Forms 1 and 2, and the Value-Added Measure score into a rating system with a 400-point scale. The SSPEM Summative Evaluation form also provides a suggested rubric for assigning the performance level based on the 400-point scale. The point value for each component reflects the percentage of the summative evaluation required and/or permitted in statute. The score on the Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices can be directly entered into the form. The VAM score must be converted to a 120-point scale and the Measurable Outcome scores to an 80-point scale before being entered into the form (see the Student Growth Component section for scoring instructions, p. 36). Once this conversion is made, the scores for each component can be easily totaled to obtain the SSPEM Summative Evaluation score. If the district chooses not to use measurable outcomes when calculating the student growth score, the VAM score would be modified to reflect a 200-point scale.

The district should monitor the SSPEM to ensure the model effectively differentiates among levels of performance. If the summative evaluation results in too many professionals obtaining Highly Effective, Needs Improvement, or Unsatisfactory, the score criteria may need adjustment.

Form 3 is a sample—districts may adopt or modify the form provided, or submit a district-developed summative evaluation form that includes the components in the sample.

**Student Services Personnel Evaluation Model (SSPEM)
Summative Evaluation Sample Form**

Name:		Employee ID#:	
Position:	Yrs.:	Assignment:	
Evaluator/Title:		Date Completed:	

SSPEM SUMMATIVE Score:

<i>Evaluation Rubric Score</i>	/200
<i>Student Growth Score:</i>	
VAM Score School #1	
VAM Score School #2	
VAM Score School #3	
SUM	
<i>VAM Score Total (Sum/# of schools)</i>	/120
<i>Measurable Outcomes Score</i>	/80
SSPEM Summative Score:	/400

SUMMATIVE RATING for the SSPEM:

Highly Effective
 Effective
 *Needs Improvement/
Developing*
 Unsatisfactory

Summative Score (range)	Performance Level Rating
> 300	<i>Highly Effective</i>
200-299	<i>Effective</i>
100-199	<i>Needs Improvement/Developing</i>
< 100	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>

Table is for illustrative purposes, only. District may adopt different score ranges for determining the SUMMATIVE rating for the SSPEM.

<p>Implications for professional development and/or support (specify plans to address):</p>
--

Student Services Professional Signature:
Date:

Evaluator's Signature:
Date:

Recommendations for District Use

The Evaluation Cycle Process

Consistent with the National Alliance of Pupil Services Organizations (NAPSO) recommendation related to instructional support personnel, policy makers should support substantive evaluations. That is, evaluations should provide professionals with relevant, supportive, and instructive feedback.

The evaluation cycle is designed to inform those who are evaluated and those who conduct evaluations. This process supports self-reflection, feedback, and summative evaluation.

Specifically:

- Self-reflection allows the practitioner to focus on proficiencies and growth needs. (Questions to ask: What am I good at? In what area(s) can I do better?)
- The evaluator(s) offers feedback on needed improvement. It may be recurring, to guide continuous growth in proficiency, as well as summative.
- Summative evaluation provides an assessment of proficiency and determines performance levels (i.e., Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement/Developing, or Unsatisfactory).




Figure 1: SSPEM Evaluation Process

The SSPEM process illustrated in Figure 1 (p. 49) describes the following stages:

ORIENTATION

Orientation can occur at the start of a new work year, at the start of a new school year, or at the start of assignment (or new assignment) as a student services staff member. The depth and detail of orientation may vary based on prior training and whether change in the evaluation model has occurred. In any case, some form of orientation is recommended and should include the following:

- Access to the same content and expectations related to the evaluation system, including relevant information, such as:
 - The Student Success Act
 - Applicable State Board of Education rules
 - Race to the Top (RTTT) requirements
 - Professional standards and practices of school social work, school psychology, school counseling, and school nursing
 - School/District Improvement Plans, subject to the evaluation system
- Orientation may be provided via review of district evaluation documents, online modules, mentor sessions, or face-to-face training where awareness of district processes and expectations are identified.
- Personal reflection by evaluatee on the connection between his/her practice and the evaluation indicators. This is a “what do I know and what do I need to know” self-check aligned with evaluation standards.

PRE-PLANNING AND EVALUATION

Pre-evaluation planning should follow orientation. The evaluatee and evaluator prepare for a formal conference to address evaluation processes and expectations. At minimum, two things occur.

- The evaluatee’s self-assessment (from orientation) moves to a specific identification of improvement priorities that are supported by data or evidence. This may include School Improvement Plan (SIP), District Improvement Plan (DIP), student achievement data, prior evaluations, and evidence of systemic processes that need improvement.
- A face-to-face or teleconference meeting on “expectations” between evaluatee and supervisor to address the evaluation process; perceptions from pre-evaluation planning; specific domains, practices, and/or indicators that will be focused on during the evaluation; student growth measures; and relationship of evaluation indicators to the SIP or DIP.

MONITORING (DATA COLLECTION, APPLICATION TO PRACTICE)

Evaluators gather evidence that provides insights into the practitioner's level of proficiency on the practices reflected in the evaluation rubric.

- The student services professional shares evidence on practice(s). Evidence/data may come from site visits, formal or informal observations, evidences, or input from others. The evaluator reviews accumulated information in the context of the evaluation system indicators. Input from multiple sources is critical when the student services professional serves multiple schools.
- Specific and actionable feedback is provided to the evaluatee in a timely manner.
- Collegial groups, mentors, communities of practice (CoPs), professional learning communities, and lesson study groups in which the student services professional participates may provide specific and actionable feedback for desired improvement.

MID-YEAR PROGRESS REVIEW

At a mid-year point, a progress review is conducted.

- Actions and impacts of actions taken on priorities identified in Step 3, Initial Meeting, are reviewed.
- Any indicators the evaluator identified for specific status update are reviewed. (The student services professional is given notice of these indicators prior to the progress check, as the feedback expected is more specific than that for the general indicator overview.)
- The student services professional is prepared to provide a general overview of actions/processes that apply to all of the domains and practice areas and may include any of the indicators in the district system. Indicators that the evaluator or the student services professional wish to address should be included.
- Feedback (state or district equivalent) is used to provide information on all indicators for which there is sufficient evidence to rate proficiency. Actions or inactions resulting in an unsatisfactory rating are communicated. Indicators for which there is insufficient evidence to rate proficiency are noted. Notes or memorandums may be attached to forms to reflect discussion.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION/YEAR-END MEETING

The evaluation form is prepared and a performance rating is assigned.

- Include relevant and appropriate evidence by appropriate parties entitled to provide input into the evaluation; review evidence of proficiency; and consolidate domain ratings to calculate a proficiency level.
- Establish year-end meeting to discuss SSPEM and student growth measures.
- If the Student Growth Measurement (SGM) score is known, inform the professional how the SSPEM practice score and SGM score combine to a summative performance level of Highly Effective, Effective, Emerging, or Ineffective.
- Review priority growth issues that should be considered during the next evaluation cycle.

SSPEM and the District Framework

The SSPEM is intended to serve as Florida's model that local school districts can adopt, adapt, or use as a guide as they develop their district performance evaluation system for student services personnel. School districts may have local requirements, initiatives, mandates, or other needs that necessitate aligning the SSPEM with a district-specific evaluation system. **However, it is recommended that district's not alter existing SSPEM domains or practices.**

When implementing the SSPEM, a school district may want to consider the following:

- The research on which the Student Services Personnel Evaluation Model is based: The research associated with each domain provides a deeper understanding of how to implement the model. Evaluators can provide better feedback to evaluatees when they understand the underlying research.
- Inter-rater reliability: With a thorough understanding of the skills expected, and the levels of performance, evaluators should be able to provide similar feedback and ratings so that there is consistent use of the SSPEM across the district.
- Timely feedback: To promote improvement, evaluator feedback must be specific, actionable, and timely.
- Conference procedures: Know meetings and conference protocols and the proper use of forms and records.
- Process and procedures for implementing the SSPEM: Know the timelines, recordkeeping, scoring rules, methods for gathering evidence, and sources to be used.
- Student growth measures: Determine the requirements regarding the measurement of student growth.
- Sources of information about the SSPEM: Where can personnel access guides and documents regarding the SSPEM?
- Additional metrics: Provide training on any additional metrics used to supplement the SSPE rubric.

When adapting to the SSPEM a school district may want to consider the following:

- The SSPEM was designed using five domains and 25 professional practice standards. A school district may choose to supplement the Evaluation Rubric with additional practices that align with local requirements.
- The district may also wish to provide additional evidences of practice that support the student services professional practices that are particular to the district framework and local job responsibilities.
- A school district may choose to label the four levels of performance differently, but they should ensure clear and sufficient differentiation between the levels of performance and provide consistency in meaning across the evaluation system.

As part of the student growth component, districts may have the flexibility to base up to 20 percent of the student growth component using measurable outcomes related to student services professionals.

Glossary of Terms

ACTIVE LISTENING: Verification or feedback process, referred to as the single most important listening skill. Operationalized by a genuine interest in understanding what the other person is thinking and feeling before responding.

ASSESSMENT DATA: Student performance on screening, diagnostic, progress monitoring, and formative and summative assessments used as a measure of student achievement or growth.

BARRIERS TO LEARNING: External and/or internal factors that interfere with a student's ability to benefit from instruction.

BEHAVIORAL INSTRUCTION/INTERVENTION: Strategies, procedures, protocols, and supports implemented to modify and/or maintain a student's behavior

CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT: Ongoing strategy to identify and monitor skill and professional growth.

CRISIS INTERVENTION SERVICES: Immediate, brief and time-specific clinical response used to stabilize an emergency situation.

DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT PLANS (DIP): Florida's system of school improvement and accountability consistent with and implemented through the districts' continuing system of planning and budgeting.

EFFECTIVENESS: Degree to which instruction/intervention results in the desired outcome

EMERGING: Professional skills are developing, but require supervision, support and/or training to be effective independently.

ENGAGEMENT: Describes various aspects of attachment, belonging and enjoyment and includes perspectives related to behavioral, emotional (affective) and cognitive (investment in learning) areas. Engagement has been shown to correlate positively with achievement and success in school.

EVIDENCE-BASED: Practices/interventions for which there is consistent scientific evidence showing positive student outcomes when implemented with fidelity.

INTERVENTION DESIGN: Process of planning and developing to guide intervention implementation. (The What? Who? How? When? And Where?)

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS): Systemic use of multi-source assessment data to most efficiently allocate resources in order to improve learning for all students, through integrated academic and behavioral supports.

MULTICULTURAL UNDERSTANDING: Refers to sensitivity and appreciation of the language, history, values, experiences, and lifestyles of different groups.

PROBLEM-SOLVING FRAMEWORK: Four-step problem solving process used to identify, develop, implement and evaluate strategies to accelerate the performance of ALL students. The problem-solving process is applicable to all three tiers of instruction/intervention and can be applied at the community, district, school, classroom and/or individual student levels.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING COMMUNITY (PLC): Self-created community of professionals working in a collaborative, supportive, and interactive learning environment to expand knowledge, improve skills and increase effectiveness.

PROGRESS-MONITORING: Scientifically based practice used to assess students' academic performance through brief, frequent assessments of student performance that is used to track student response to instruction and intervention and evaluate the effectiveness of instruction or intervention.

QUALITATIVE DATA: Data collected through focus groups, interviews, opened ended questionnaire items, and other less structured situations. Qualitative data does not draw statistical inferences and often uses explicit sampling strategies and systematic data analysis

REFLECTIVE PRACTICES: The variety of practices, materials and technologies which foster critical, creative and reflective thinking aligned with standards of the profession.

SCHOOL-WIDE POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORTS: Decision making framework that guides selection, integration, and implementation of the best evidence-based behavioral practices for improving important academic and behavior outcomes for all students.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE DATA: Data measuring student achievement progress used to monitor students' academic progress, evaluate instructional practices, and make decisions in classrooms, schools, and districts.

STUDENT RISK FACTORS: Internal or external influences that potentially impede student achievement.

SUPPORT PLANS: Plan of action, which describes the system of support required to reach a desired goal

SYSTEMS LEVEL: School-wide or district-wide practices/interventions/supports.

References

- Bruns, E. J., Walrath, C., Glass-Siegel, M., & Weist, M. D. (2004). School-based mental health services in Baltimore: Association with school climate and special education referrals. *Behavior Modification, 28*, 491–512.
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Shellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development, 82*, 405–432.
- Fleming, C. B., Haggerty, K. P., Broen, E. C., Catalano, R. F., Harachi, T. W., Mazza, J. J., & Gruman, D. H. (2005). Do social and behavioral characteristics targeted by preventive interventions predict standardized test scores and grades? *Journal of School Health, 75*, 342–349.
- Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., Utne O'Brien, M., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., & Elias, M. J. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist, 58*, 466–474.
- National Alliance of Pupil Services Organizations. (2011). *Utilizing multiple measures in determining professional performance of specialized instructional support personnel* [Policy statement]. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Schumaker, J. B., & Deshler, D. D. (2010). Using a tiered intervention model in secondary schools to improve academic outcomes in subject-area courses. In M. Shinn, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), *Interventions for achievement and behavior problems in a three-tier model including RTI* (pp. 609–632). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Welsh, M., Parker, R. D., Widaman, K., & O'Neill, R. (2001). Linkages between children's social and academic competence: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of School Psychology, 39*, 463–482.
- Zins, J. E., Bloodworth, M. R., Weissberg, R. P., & Walberg, H. J. (2004). The scientific base linking social and emotional learning to school success. In J. Zins, M. R. Weissberg, M. Wang, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* (pp. 3–22). New York: Teachers College Press.

Appendix A: Resources

ELECTRONIC RESOURCES

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS),
<http://www.florida-rti.org/floridaMTSS/index.htm>

Florida Positive Behavior Support (PBS), <http://flpbs.fmhi.usf.edu>

Positive Behavioral Intervention & Supports, <http://www.pbis.org>

Florida Department of Education—District Performance Evaluation Systems,
<http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/pa.asp>

Florida Problem Solving & Response to Intervention Project, <http://www.floridarti.usf.edu/>

Student Support Services Project, <http://sss.usf.edu/>

UCLA School Mental Health Project, <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/>

National Association of School Psychologists (NASP),
<http://www.nasponline.org/index.aspx>

National Alliance of Pupil Services Organizations (NAPSO), <http://napso.org/>

National Association of School Nurses (NASN), <http://www.nasn.org>

American School Counselor Association (ASCA), <http://www.schoolcounselor.org/>

School Social Work Association of America (SSWAA), <http://www.sswaa.org/>

Appendix B: Research Support for Practices in the SSPEM Model

The following identifies research that supports practices within each of the domains of the SSPEM.

DATA-BASED DECISION MAKING AND EVALUATION OF PRACTICES

- Burns, M. K., Appleton, J. J., & Stehouwer, J. D. (2005). Meta-analysis of response-to-intervention research: Examining field-based and research-implemented models. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 23*, 381–394.
- Carey, J., & Dimmitt, C. (2008). A model for evidence-based elementary school counseling: Using school data, research, and evaluation to enhance practice. *The Elementary School Journal, 108*(5), 422–430.
- Christ, T. J. (2008). Best practices in problem analysis. In A. Thomas, & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 159–176). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Howell, K. W., & Nolet, V. (2000). *Curriculum-based evaluation: Teaching and decision making*, (3rd edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Jimerson, S. R., Burns, M. K., & VanDerHeyden, A. M. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of response to intervention: The science and practice of assessment and intervention*. New York: Springer.
- Shinn, M. R. (2010). Building a scientifically based data system for progress monitoring and universal screening across three tiers, including RTI using a curriculum-based measurement. In M. Shinn, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), *Interventions for achievement and behavior problems in a three-tier model including RTI* (pp. 259–292). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

INSTRUCTION/INTERVENTION PLANNING AND DESIGN

- Adelman, H. S., & Taylor, L. (2006). *The implementation guide to student learning supports in the classroom and school-wide: New directions for addressing barriers to learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bowen, N. K. (1999). A role for school social workers in promoting student success through school-family partnerships. *Social Work in Education, 21*(1), 34–47.

- Burns, M., Wiley, H., & Viglietti, E. (2008). Best practices in implementing effective problem-solving teams. In A. Thomas, & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 1633–1643). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Christenson, S. L. (2004). The family–school partnership: An opportunity to promote the leaning competence of all students. *School Psychology Review, 33*, 83–104.
- Kelly, M. S., Raines, J. C., Stone, S., & Frey, A. (2010). *School social work: An evidence-informed framework for practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Luiselli, J. K., Putnam, R. F., Handler, M. W., & Feinberg, A. B. (2005). Whole-school positive behavior support: Effects on student discipline problems and academic performance. *Educational Psychology, 25*, 183–198.
- Otwell, P. S., & Mullis, F. (1997). Academic achievement and counselor accountability. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 31*, 343–348.
- Upah, K. (2008). Best practices in designing, implementing and evaluating quality interventions. In A. Thomas, & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 209–219). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

INSTRUCTION/INTERVENTION DELIVERY AND FACILITATION

- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Shellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development, 82*, 405–432.
- Hoagwood, K. E., Olin, S. S., Kerker, B. D., Kratochwill, T. R., Crowe, M., & Saka, N. (2007). Empirically based school interventions targeted at academic and mental health functioning. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 15*, 66–92.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2005). *Parental involvement and student achievement: A meta-analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.
- Lehr, C. A., Johnson, D. R., Bremer, C. D., Cosio, A., & Thompson, M. (2004). *Essential tools: Increasing rates of school completion: Moving from policy and research to practice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration, National Center on Secondary Education and Transition.
- Ortiz, S. O., Flanagan, D. P., & Dynda, A. M. (2008). Best practices in working with culturally diverse children and families. In A. Thomas, & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 1721–1738). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Rosenfield, S. (2008). Best practices in instructional consultation and instructional consultation teams. In A. Thomas, & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 1645–1660). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Schlossberg, S. M., Morris, J. D., & Lieberman, M. G. (2001). The effects of a counselor-led guidance intervention on students' behaviors and attitudes. *Professional School Counseling, 4*(3), 156–164.
- Welsh, M., Parke, R. D., Widaman, K., & O'Neil, R. (2001). Linkages between children's social and academic competence: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of School Psychology, 39*, 463–482.

LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

- Brock, S., Lazarus, P. J., & Jimerson, S. R. (Eds.). (2002). *Best practices in school crisis prevention and intervention*. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Sprague, J. R., & Walker, H. M. (2010). Building safe and healthy schools to promote school success: Critical issues, current challenges, and promising approaches. In M. Shinn, & H. M. Walker (Eds.). *Interventions for achievement and behavior problems in a three-tier model including RTI* (pp. 225–257). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Whitfield, G. (1999). Validating school social work: An evaluation of a cognitive-behavioral approach to reduce school violence. *Research on Social Work Practice, 9*(4), 399–246.

PROFESSIONAL LEARNING, RESPONSIBILITY, AND ETHICAL PRACTICE

- American Nurses Association and National School Nurses Association. (2011). *School nursing: Scope and standards of practice* (2nd ed.). Silver Spring, MD: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2007). *School counselor competencies*. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcounselor.org/files/SCCompetencies.pdf>
- Jacobs, S. (2008). Best practices in developing ethical school psychological practice. In A. Thomas, & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 1921–1932). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Marzano, R. (2011). *Marzano art and science of teaching: Teacher evaluation model*. York, PA: Learning Sciences International.
- National Association of School Psychology. (2010). *Principles for professional ethics*. Bethesda, MD: Author..
- National Association of Social Work. (2012). *Code of ethics of the National Association of Social Workers*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

