

**San Diego Unified School District  
Proposal to the  
San Diego Education Association  
Proposal**

**Article 14 (Performance Evaluation Procedures)  
District Proposal Passed June 19, 2014**

---

**INTRODUCTION AND INTENT**

The District's initial proposal included an interest in developing "a new evaluation article and process, focused on fostering meaningful professional growth and development for all teachers." This interest is related directly to Vision 2020, quality teaching and professional learning for all staff (two of our indicators of quality schools), and the accomplishment of our mission to have and maintain a quality school in every neighborhood. This interest was also a common topic in the District's comprehensive information-gathering process involving various schools, departments and stakeholders.

The District's interests related to evaluation are, stated generally, to move to an evaluation system that:

- Focuses primarily on growth and development – on how all classroom and non-classroom personnel can improve their craft;
- Recognizes the difficulty and complexity of the profession by providing more specificity and guidance regarding performance expectations than a simple list of six indicators, with nothing more than a rating of "effective," "requires improvement," or "unsatisfactory;"
- Supports administrators and unit members to grow by knowing specifically what should be demonstrated in instructional and non-instructional settings, and how improved performance would look;
- Is a reflective, meaningful professional growth experience for our most outstanding unit members and for those who are struggling, and all in between – one that strives to support every unit member in their craft for having participated in it, and that is viewed by unit members and administrators positively as an opportunity for professional growth.

As has been conveyed to SDEA previously, the District is *not* seeking the implementation of a "value added" formula model. The District *does* seek a system that is a resource for the professional growth and development of our certificated staff, because it provides meaningful, relevant feedback on an ongoing basis using standards and rubrics that are detailed and comprehensive. The District's position is the current evaluation system does not meet this standard, neither in its language nor in its implementation.

Additionally, the District believes the best way to develop an evaluation system meeting the criteria above is to develop it collaboratively and carefully. Therefore, the District proposes that an existing evaluation model/tool be refined by district administrators and unit members in a systematic and collaborative way, over time, for implementation districtwide at the beginning of the 2016-17 school year.

## **PROPOSAL**

### **Model**

The District proposes that the new evaluation article/system, for classroom unit members, be based on the 5D+™ Teacher Evaluation Rubric developed by the Center for Educational Leadership at the University of Washington (copy attached). The District is not proposing the adoption of this rubric without consideration of refinements for specific district-based realities or preferences, but the District believes it is preferable to start with an existing, proven model, and to focus on refining, perfecting and implementing that model. The District considers the 5D+™ model a high quality, well-researched model/rubric that is consistent with other widely-used and accepted teaching standards and rubrics (including the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the National Standards for the Teaching Profession).

The 5D+™ Rubric is based on an instructional framework focusing on the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning: 1) Purpose; 2) Student Engagement; 3) Curriculum & Pedagogy; 4) Assessment for Student Learning; and 5) Classroom Environment & Culture. The Rubric also includes a sixth dimension related to out-of-classroom collaboration and communication: Professional Collaboration & Communication.

Each dimension in the rubric contains between 5 and 7 subdimensions (there are 37 subdimensions in total), and for each of those subdimensions there is a description of the observed performance at four different levels. Materials from the Center for Educational Leadership state the language describing each performance level has been examined by a psychometrician to assure clarity, to avoid a teacher being rated more than once for similar teaching performance, and to ensure that each indicator evaluates only one aspect of teaching practice. In addition to providing a common lens through which growth and development can be assessed, the model and its dimensions, subdimensions and descriptors were created with the involvement of classroom teachers.

These dimensions also correlate to the evaluation elements currently used (see Section 14.3.1.1), as follows:

<b>Current Evaluation Element</b>	<b>Applicable 5D+™ Dimensions</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Progress of students toward established standards</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Assessment for Student Learning</li><li>• Curriculum &amp; Pedagogy</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Instructional techniques and strategies</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Purpose</li><li>• Student Engagement</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Adherence to curricular objectives</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Purpose</li><li>• Student Engagement</li><li>• Curriculum &amp; Pedagogy</li><li>• Assessment for Student Learning</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Establishment and maintenance of a suitable learning environment</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Classroom Environment &amp; Culture</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Performance of non-instructional duties and responsibilities</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Professional Collaboration &amp; Communication</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Achievement of stated objectives</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As outlined in entire document</li></ul>

In addition to the correlation on a topical level and the different approach, the District believes the dimensions in the 5D+™ model represent a preferable set of descriptors — it focuses on the fundamentals of quality teaching, one of the twelve quality school indicators; it focuses on the act and craft of teaching more than outcomes; it addresses what teachers can control; it fosters an inquiry-based approach to evaluation; and it can be adapted to meet local realities. In short, the model is a great template from which to build an evaluation system focused on growth and development. The District also believes the 5D+™ model/rubric is consistent with current substantive expectations of District teachers, i.e. that it does not impose any performance standards or expectations on teachers that are not already encompassed within the evaluation elements in Section 14.3.1.1 of the contract.

### **Development and Implementation**

#### **Instructional Personnel**

The District proposes that the parties commit to establishing a new classroom teacher evaluation system, and that the parties demonstrate that commitment by entering into a binding agreement that a new evaluation system will be implemented, districtwide, at the beginning of the 2016-17 school year.

The District proposes the following timetable for development and action prior to July 1, 2016:

1. 2014-15 School Year: Development of SDUSD-Specific Evaluation System. During the upcoming school year a committee of up to twelve (12) people, up to six (6) appointed by the District and up to six (6) appointed by SDEA, will meet at least monthly to review the 5D+™ model, address potential modifications and refinements, identify pilot implementation schools (a group of 25% of the District's elementary, middle and high schools, with representation across the District geographically and across low/middle/high school performance levels), and plan for implementation at these pilot schools in the 2015-16 school year with teachers scheduled to be evaluated in that year. The work of this committee will include support from the Center for Educational Leadership and (if desired by SDEA) the California Teachers Association.
2. 2015-16 School Year: Implementation at Selected Pilot Schools, and Further Refinement of Evaluation System. During the 2015-16 school year the same committee will review the progress of implementation at the pilot schools, and based on that review will address potential modifications and refinements, and plan for full implementation in the 2016-17 school year. The work of this committee during this year will again include support from the Center for Educational Leadership and (if desired by SDEA) the California Teachers Association. During this school year the district and SDEA will also meet and finalize any changes to contract language (Sections 14.1 through 14.8) needed to implement the model refined/finalized by the committee.
3. 2016-17 School Year: Full Implementation. Per the development and implementation agreement proposed by the District, the new evaluation system will be implemented throughout the District commencing with the 2016-17 school year.

#### **Non-Instructional Personnel**

The District also proposes that the parties commit to establishing a new evaluation system for non-instructional personnel, using the same committee structure and timetable described above, and that the parties demonstrate that commitment by entering into a binding agreement that this new evaluation system will be implemented, districtwide, at the beginning of the 2016-17 school year. As with the proposal for instructional personnel, the District believes the best way to develop an evaluation system meeting the criteria below is to develop it systematically, collaboratively and carefully.

This system, like the system for instructional personnel, will focus on continuous professional growth and development, with non-instructional personnel being evaluated on the same time schedule as other certificated professionals. The District proposes that these employees will be evaluated by the site administrator (principal or vice-principal), and that any non-instructional personnel currently an itinerant position providing service to more than two schools will be evaluated by the department/division central office administrator.

Commencing with the 2016-17 school year, any further modifications to the evaluation system would be subject to the regular bargaining process.

This proposal addresses the District's interest in jointly developing a new evaluation system, but does not address Sections 14.10 (Personnel Files) and 14.11 (Complaints) of the current agreement. The District reserves the right to submit proposals on those sections at a later time.