TEACHER EVALUATION GUIDE
SUPPLEMENT B - PART Process

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL REVIEW FOR TEACHERS (PART)

PART is an annual process aimed at fostering a rigorous collegial examination of professional work. The teacher's professional practice will be evaluated by the teacher's Administrator Supervisor based on multiple observations (80% of APPR Observation component) AND by the teacher's PART Review Team who will review evidence submitted by the teacher, conduct a structured interview, and submit ratings based on the Danielson *Framework for Teaching* Rubric (20% of APPR Observation component).

The APPR PART Process is modeled on the PART Summative Process that was part of the RCSD-RTA Contract for many years. The PART Summative was a three-year process used in place of administrator evaluation. It has been revised in the current annual process in order to comply with New York State education law and APPR regulations. It now includes an administrator evaluation and ratings are based on the Danielson *Framework for Teaching* Rubrics.

Each teacher is to select 1-2 educators (at least one teacher should be from the same tenure area/program if possible) and his/her immediate supervisor to serve as PART Reviewers. Whenever possible members of the review team should be from the same building as the teacher who is completing the PART assignment. Teachers who choose PART may select from the two PART Options:

> **PART Option #1 Structured Review of Student Work** or
> **PART Option #2 Teacher Portfolio**.

The selection of a PART Option and PART Reviewers are recorded on **PART Form #1: "Declaration."** Evidence is collected and presented to PART Reviewers with **PART Form #2: "Evidence."** PART Reviewers come to consensus on rubric ratings and confirm with signatures on **PART Form #3: "Final Signatures."** Forms can be found on the following pages and on-line at the CIT Website: www.rcsdk12.org/CIT. Completed and signed forms and rubric ratings are uploaded into PeopleSoft (e-Performance) by the teacher's direct supervisor or designee (detailed instructions at http://rcsdk12.org/Page/25649).

TIMELINE FOR TEACHERS WHO SELECT ADMINISTRATOR/PART

In addition to the Tasks and Important Deadlines for Administrator evaluation described on page 3 of the Teacher Evaluation Guide, the following apply:

Month	Tasks	IMPORTANT Deadlines
September-October	☐ Teacher recruits PART Reviewers, selects PART Option, and develops PART Proposal. ☐ Teacher completes PART Form #1 and submits to PART Reviewers. Administrator uploads PART Form #1 into PeopleSoft (e-Performance).	**By October 15:** PART Reviewers should be selected and PART Form #1 entered into PeopleSoft (e-Performance).
October-April	☐ Teacher collects PART Evidence and consults with PART Reviewers throughout the school year.	
April-June	☐ At least one week prior to the Structured PART interview, Teacher provides binder of documentation and PART Form #2 to PART reviewers. ☐ Teacher meets with PART Reviewers for Structured PART Interview. ☐ Following the Structured Interview, PART Reviewers meet to reach consensus about the ratings for the elements in each Domain. ☐ Administrator Lead Evaluator and/or Designee inputs the team's evaluation into PeopleSoft (e-Performance), prints out the evaluation, and provides it to the other PART Reviewers. ☐ PART Reviewers confirm evaluation consensus by signing PART Form #3. Administrator Lead Evaluator and/or Designee uploads a signed copy of Form #3 to PeopleSoft (e-Performance) by May 21. ☐ Teacher acknowledges Evaluation on PeopleSoft (e-Performance) and may add comments or rebuttal. ☐ Teacher chooses evaluation process for Professional Practice Review: Administrator, Administrator/Peer Review, or Administrator/PART.	**By May 15:** Teacher provides evidence with PART Form #2 to PART Reviewers in advance of Structured PART Interview. **By May 21:** Structured PART Interview must take place and PART Evaluation Ratings and PART Form #3 must be completed and uploaded into Peoplesoft (e-Performance). **By End of School Year:** Teacher Evaluation Selection due.

PART OPTION #1 STRUCTURED REVIEW OF STUDENT WORK

A structured review of student work is a strategy for teachers and evaluators to "uncover" the immediate impact of instruction through analysis of student work products. Student work is a rich repository of evidence of teacher effort and success. Reviews of student work can be pursued by individuals, pairs, or groups of teachers working collaboratively; however, each teacher would need to submit a separate year-end PART report.

The teacher selects three students whose work will be examined all year (one working at a proficient level, one working towards standards, and one not meeting teacher standards). The teacher should prepare a Cover Sheet (see next page). The teacher should attach a narrative in which the questions listed on the Cover Sheet are answered. The teacher should provide evidence of his or her performance based on each Domain of the Danielson *Framework for Teaching* Rubric.

TIPS FOR PART OPTION #1: REVIEW OF STUDENT WORK

- Teachers might consider compiling their evidence into 4 sections of a binder: Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation), Domain 2 (Classroom Environment), Domain 3 (Instruction), Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities).

- Materials selected for the reviewers should be carefully chosen, relevant (based on the elements within each Domain) and representative of the teacher's professional practice. They form the basis for the professional conversation.

- Include a table of contents which lists all material being included in the reviewers' packet.

- Include a preface that provides an overview of the teacher's professional work as it relates to the elements within the 4 Domains.

- When meeting with the PART team, the teacher should be able to reference the rubric when discussing the Review of Student Work. For example, a teacher might have an example of the unit plans mentioned on the PART cover sheet. When discussing Domain 1, the teacher might reference how the unit plan reflects his/her knowledge of content and pedagogy, knowledge of students, instructional outcomes, knowledge of resources, etc. When discussing the Classroom Environment, the teacher might show a sample of how he/she established attention signals such as raising a hand, dimming lights, etc. or the teacher might show a sample of behavior management plan he/she used during the year, etc. When discussing the Instruction Domain, the teacher might show samples of questions asked during various units, or might describe the ways he/she engages students; for example via strategies such as Think, Pair, Share, etc. When discussing Domain 4, the teacher might show samples of communications with families. He or she might describe how a particular PD impacted his/her students' learning.

PART OPTION #1 STUDENT WORK COVER SHEET

The purpose of the Structured Review of Student Work is to show student growth over the course of the school year. This will be done by using samples of rigorous student work from three students that have different ability levels. Teachers should pre-select the students from a class that would give them an opportunity to reflect on their teaching and student learning. The selected students should represent the class as a whole. **Teachers should remember that they are not being evaluated by how students do on the assignments**.

Directions for Portfolio Piece:

1. Select the class that you are going to use_____

   A. How many students are assigned to the class?_____

   B. What is the average daily attendance?_____

   C. Describe the learning profiles of the students in this class: _____
   _____

2. Please fill out the table below. Select three students whose work you will feature and provide the attendance for each time frame indicated. Remember to choose students who have different ability levels.

Student Names	Time Frame	Attendance (Days Present/ Possible Days)
Student at Proficient Level: _____	Sept-Nov	
Student Working Toward Standards: _____	Dec-Feb	
Student Not Meeting Standards: _____	March-May	

3. Select three units of study.
   A. (Sept-Nov) _____
   B. (Dec-Feb) _____
   C. (March-May) _____

4. Select an instructional assessment that will be used for each unit of study. (Instructional assessments must be connected to learning goals. Some examples include, but are not limited to the following: experiments, essays, final projects, unit tests etc.) These work samples will be included in your portfolio.
   A. (Sept-Nov) _____
   B. (Dec-Feb) _____
   C. (March-May) _____

5. Please attach a narrative in which you answer the following questions:
   A. How did the needs of the students in this class affect your planning? Describe any instructional challenges represented in this class.
   B. What were your learning goals for each unit? How were your selected assessments connected to the overall goals of the unit?
   C. Write a separate paragraph in which you describe the following for each of the three students:
      a. Describe each student's skills.
      b. What does the student work indicate to you regarding the student's progress towards attaining the learning goals?
   D. Write a concluding analysis reflecting on the following questions:
      a. Comment on the feedback you provided the students.
      b. As you compare and contrast the student responses to the instructional assessments, what did you learn about each student's conceptual understanding?
      c. Based upon the student responses, what would you consider changing as you prepare to teach this instructional unit again?

NOTE: During the year, if a selected student is no longer assigned to the teacher or no longer attends the class, the teacher should substitute the student with another student who has a similar learning profile

PART OPTION #2 TEACHER PORTFOLIOS

A teacher portfolio demonstrates teaching performance by documenting a wide range of teaching practices, behaviors, and professional learning over time. This requires a systematic collection of multiple strands of evidence accompanied by rigorous reflection that is aligned with the Danielson *Framework for Teaching* Rubric. Portfolios:

- are authentic and practical for use by teachers of all subject areas and grade levels,
- recognize the complexity of teaching,
- encourage reflection, and
- provide clear evidence of teaching practice aligned with the district approved rubric (in ways that may or may not be visible to an evaluator during a classroom observation).

Portfolios should include a wide variety of evidence such as:

- unit and lesson plans, teacher assignments, assessments, scoring rubrics, etc.
- samples of student work from throughout the school year,
- video of a lesson,
- examples of action research or other professional learning,
- analysis of student learning data, and
- evidence of teacher reflection based on this evidence.

TIPS FOR PART OPTION #2: PORTFOLIO:

- Teachers might consider compiling their evidence into 4 sections of a binder: Domain 1 (Planning and Preparation), Domain 2 (Classroom Environment), Domain 3 (Instruction), Domain 4 (Professional Responsibilities).

- Materials selected for the reviewers should be carefully chosen, relevant (based on the elements within each Domain) and representative of the teacher's professional practice. They form the basis for the professional conversation.

- Include a table of contents which lists all material being included in the reviewers' packet.

- Include a preface that provides an overview of the teacher's professional work as it relates to the elements within the 4 Domains.

- When meeting with the PART team, the teacher should be able to reference the rubric when discussing the contents of the Portfolio. For example, a teacher might have an example of a unit plan in the portfolio. When discussing Domain 1, the teacher might reference how the plan reflects his/her knowledge of content and pedagogy, knowledge of students, instructional outcomes, knowledge of resources, etc. When discussing the Classroom Environment, the teacher might show a sample of how he/she established attention signals such as raising a hand, dimming lights, etc. or the teacher might show a sample of behavior management plan he/she used during the year, etc. When discussing the Instruction Domain, the teacher might show samples of questions asked during various units, or might describe the ways he/she engages students; for example via strategies such as Think, Pair, Share, etc. When discussing Domain 4, the teacher might show samples of communications with families. He or she might describe how a particular PD impacted his/her students' learning.

PART PROCESS: THE STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

The PART Structured Interview is very similar to the previous RCSD Traditional Summative Appraisal Structured Interview:

- Throughout the year, the teacher collects evidence of his/her teaching performance.

- At least one week prior to the Structured PART interview, the teacher provides the PART Reviewers (including the teacher's Direct Supervisor) with the Portfolio binder or Student Work documentation along with a completed **PART Form #2, "Evidence."**

- The PART Reviewers, consisting of the teacher's Direct Supervisor and 1 or 2 teachers selected by the teacher, should meet with the teacher to review the PART Portfolio or PART Review of Student Work and have a discussion about the contents.

- Using the Danielson rubrics in the Framework for Teaching, the PART Reviewers should assess the Portfolio or Review of Student Work documentation. The team should reach a consensus on the ratings and optional comments for each element in the four domains.

- The Direct Supervisor is responsible for inputting the PART Reviewer Evaluation on PeopleSoft (e-Performance). Because the PART Reviewers must have consensus on the ratings provided, Administrators must print out the PART Reviewer Evaluation and share it with the rest of the PART team to confirm consensus using **PART Form #3, "Final Signatures."**

- After this is done, the teacher's administrator should upload the PART team evaluation and PART Forms.

PART Form #1 DECLARATION
Performance Appraisal Review for Teachers (PART)

This form should be completed by the teacher and signed by the PART Reviewers. The Direct Supervisor should upload the signed document into PeopleSoft (e-Performance) by October 15th. A PART Review Team consists of the teacher's direct supervisor and at least one teacher from the same certification area when possible. A teacher may choose to select an additional 3rd reviewer.

Teacher: _____ **Empl. ID#:** _____

Position: _____ **Tenure Area:** _____

Principal _____ **School/Location:** _____

PART REVIEWER NAMES	Position	School/Location	Tenure Area
1. _____	**Direct Supervisor**	_____	not applicable
2. _____	**Teacher**	_____	_____
3. _____ (optional)	**Teacher**	_____	_____

PART Option Selection

☐ PART Option #1 Structured Review of Student Work

☐ PART Option #2 Teacher Portfolio

PART REVIEWER SIGNATURES

I agree to be a PART Reviewer for the teacher named above. I understand that prior to May 15th, I am responsible for reviewing the materials submitted by the teacher in advance of a Structured PART Interview. Following the Structured PART Interview, and after consensus is reached by the PART Reviewers (including the Direct Supervisor), the Direct Supervisor will enter the PART evaluation into PeopleSoft (e-Performance) by May 21st.

Signature of Direct Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Reviewer #1 Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Optional Reviewer #2 Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Forms available on "PART Resources" page at the CIT Website: www.rcsdk12.org/CIT.

PART Form #2 EVIDENCE
Performance Appraisal Review for Teachers (PART)

☐ At least one week prior to the Structured Interview held in the spring, this form and the PART Portfolio binder or Student Work documentation should be provided to the PART Reviewers (including the Direct Supervisor).

☐ At the Structured Interview (which must take place before May 21st), the teacher should explain how the artifacts relate to the elements within each Domain in the Framework for Teaching (Danielson Rubric).

☐ The PART Reviewers may use this form to record evidence about the elements within each Domain that are discussed during the Structured Interview.

☐ After the Structured Interview, the PART Reviewers (including the Direct Supervisor) should meet to discuss the evidence. Using the Danielson Rubric, they should reach consensus about the rating and optional narrative comments for each element within each Domain. Ratings and PART Form #3 must be uploaded into PeopleSoft by the Direct Supervisor by May 21st.

Teacher being evaluated: _____ **Direct Supervisor:** _____

Reviewer #1 Teacher: _____ **Optional Reviewer #2 Teacher:** _____

Relationship to the Framework for Teaching (Danielson Rubric)

Your PART work must align with the expectations for professional teachers in the Rochester City School District. Please consult the Teacher Evaluation Guide for detailed descriptions of the Framework.

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation	Domain 2: Learning Environment
demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy; demonstrating knowledge of students; setting instructional outcomes; demonstrating knowledge of resources; designing coherent instruction; designing student assessments	creating an environment of respect and rapport; establishing a culture for learning; managing classroom procedures; managing student behavior; organizing physical space

Domain 3: Instruction	**Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities**
communicating with students; using questioning and discussion techniques; engaging students in learning; using assessment in instruction; demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness	reflection on teaching; maintaining accurate records; communicating with families; participating in a professional community; growing and developing professionally; showing professionalism

Other Comments Or Questions:

Forms available on "PART Resources" page at the CIT Website: www.rcsdk12.org/CIT.

PART Form #3 (FINAL SIGNATURES)
Performance Appraisal Review for Teachers (PART)

These signatures indicate that the PART process as described below has been completed.

FINAL PROCESS TO BE COMPLETED BY REVIEWERS:

- ☐ After the Structured Interview, the PART Reviewers (including the Direct Supervisor) should meet to discuss and assess the evidence in the Portfolio binder or Review of Student Work documentation.
- ☐ Using the Danielson Rubric, PART Reviewers should reach consensus about the rating and optional narrative comments for each element within each Domain.
- ☐ The Direct Supervisor is responsible for inputting the PART Reviewers' Evaluation into PeopleSoft (e-Performance).
- ☐ Because the PART Reviewers must have consensus on the ratings provided, the Direct Supervisor must print out the PART Evaluation and show this to the rest of the PART team to confirm consensus.
- ☐ All parties should sign this form to confirm that the PART process has been completed and to confirm that the uploaded evaluation is the one agreed-upon by the PART Reviewers.
- ☐ After this form is signed, the Direct Supervisor should upload this form into PeopleSoft (e-Performance) by May 21st.

<u>SIGNATURES</u>

By signing this form, all of us agree that we have completed the PART process as described above.

Signature of Direct Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Reviewer #1 Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Optional Reviewer #2 Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Signature of Teacher Being Evaluated: _____ Date: _____

Forms available on "PART Resources" page at the CIT Website: www.rcsdk12.org/CIT.