**Thread:** Professional

**Subgroup:** Individual/Group

**Foci:** All Teachers After Second Year

**Program Title:** Feedback & Evaluation Program for Teachers

**Contact Person/Office/School:** Peter Musso, AP, Staff Development, De Smet Jesuit [pmusso@desmet.org](mailto:pmusso@desmet.org)

**Program Description:**

**Premise:**

Each teacher has the opportunity for formal formative and summative/evaluative feedback and evaluation once every two years.

**Description:**

The Feedback and Evaluation process uses De Smet Jesuit’s *performance standards* to allow an individual teacher to view his or her professional responsibilities & school responsibilities from different perspectives, reflect, receive written and oral feedback, and react to that feedback through writing and in ongoing conversations with both department chair and administrator.

The *performance standards* are supported by (The Profile of the Graduate at Graduation Tenants, The De Smet Jesuit Profile of the Ignatian Educator, and the JSEA Profile of the Ignatian Educator).

Documented information from the process is used to inform the individual teacher and contribute to the summative/evaluative report completed by the administration toward the end of the process. First and second year teachers, who are involved in the new teacher program called the *Excellence in Teaching Program*, do not participate in this process.

Administration is responsible for facilitating the overall process and final summary/evaluation, while department chairs contribute observation insights and notes to this process (formation). Feedback and evaluation pieces include: Cognitive Coaching conversations, classroom visits and observations (3-5, scripted and rubric evaluated), surveys (student and parent), self-reflection responses, PGP integration, Administrator Summative/Evaluative Reports, and Portfolio.

**Rationale:**

The program was initially developed to provide faculty formative feedback for the purpose of improving classroom instruction to increase student achievement. Continuous improvement (through faculty suggestions) has allowed the process to evolve to include a more evaluative piece.

**Leadership:**

The program was developed by a variety of school administrators and faculty: principal, assistant principals, and department chairs.

**Implementation:**

The assistant principal for staff development implements the program in collaboration with department chairs and other administrators.

**Processes and Resources:**

Pete Musso, Ron Rebore, Mike Dressler, Greg Densberger, Department Chairs, Teachers

**Finances:** NA

**Rewards:**

A report (ASR – Administrator Summative Report) is generated by the administrator toward the end of this process that (a) summarizes the process, (b) acknowledges commendations, (c) makes recommendations and suggestions for growth (based upon the *performance standards*).

**Time:**

**When**

**Length**

The program began in 2009, with our first two-year cycle. 2011-2012 marks the first year of cycle two.

**Location**

**Space:** NA

**Accountability/Assessment:**

**Continuous Improvement**:

During and after cycle one, department chairs and the professional development committee held conversations that led to evaluation: program strengths and challenges. At the end of cycle one, start of cycle two, we began to think about *continuous improvement* changes: adding a parent survey and adding a professional *performance standards* piece, which prompted several on-going changes to the process:

* 1. Moving from formative to formative and summative/evaluative.
  2. Move from using only scripting to using combination of scripting and rubric during class visits.
  3. Increase class visits from 1 to 4-6 (administrator):
     1. First is (somewhat) scheduled
     2. Rest are Walk-Throughs (not necessarily staying entire period)
  4. Role of department chair is consultative (to administrator)

and formative (to colleague being evaluated)

* 1. Administrator has conversation with chair relative to those being evaluated.
  2. Increase in consistency of written documents (only one administrator doing this).
  3. *Performance standards* document is a prompt at the start of the process and used in “planning conversations” at the beginning. Look at the standards. What are two that you excel in? Where to challenges emerge for you in your teaching? How would you evaluate yourself on this rubric?