



The School District of Osceola County Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel Evaluation Model and Guide *Tentatively Approved by BLT, 06-12-2014*

Student Support Services Project, University of South Florida
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services
Division of Public Schools, Florida Department of Education

This document was developed by the Student Support Services Project, University of South Florida, a special project funded by the Florida Department of Education, Division Public Schools, Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEES), through federal assistance under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B and is available online at <http://www.fldoe.org/ese>. For more information on available resources, contact the BEES Resource and Information Center (BRIC).

BRIC website: <http://www.fldoe.org/ese/clerhome.asp>

Bureau website: <http://www.fldoe.org/ese>

Email: bric@fldoe.org

Telephone: (850) 245-0477

Fax: (850) 245-0987



Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel Evaluation Model and Guide

Table of Contents

Purpose	1
Development Process	3
Responding to the Call	3
Partners in Collaboration	3
Fundamental Principles in the Process	4
Framework For Osceola’s Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel Evaluation Model (NCIPE)	5
Florida’s New Evaluation System.....	5
Comprehensive System of Learning Supports and Student Services.....	6
Comprehensive Evaluation System Model for Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel	8
Professional Practice Component—NCIPE	9
Description of the Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices.....	9
Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices—NCIPE	11
Evaluating Professional Practice—Methods and Sources of Evidence	21
Evaluation Rubric—Crosswalk with Professional Practice Standards	26
Evaluation Rubric—Crosswalk with Florida Educator Accomplished Practices and Teacher Evaluation Models	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Scoring the Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices	37
General Instructions	37
Completing the Evaluation Rubric Scoring Protocol	37
Scoring Instructions.....	38
Summative Performance Level.....	38
Student Growth Component—NCIPE	42
Student Learning Growth Component	42
Student Learning Growth: Value-Added Measure (VAM).....	42
Student Learning Growth: Measurable Student Outcomes.....	43
Summative Evaluation Form	48
The Evaluation Cycle Process	Error! Bookmark not defined.
References	55
Appendix A: Resources	57
Appendix B: Research Support for Practices in the NCIPE Model	59

Purpose

The purpose of Florida’s Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel Evaluation (NCIPE) is to assist districts by developing a state pre-approved performance evaluation system for non-classroom instructional personnel (i.e., school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, deans, district level resource teachers, compliance specialists, academic coaches, media specialists, speech and language therapists, vision instructors, credit retrieval instructors, and athletic directors) 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 NCIPE 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 NCIPE may also serve as a guide for other “non-classroom” instructional or teaching fields for which special evaluation procedures and criteria are necessary.

Development Process

Responding to the Call

The University of South Florida Student Support Services Project (SSSP) was asked to assist the Florida Department of Education's (FDOE) Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development and Retention in providing guidance in the development of an integrated model to evaluate student services personnel. The model represents school counseling, school social work, school psychology, and school nursing to reflect professional standards and research-based practices impacting student achievement.

The SSSP team developed an action plan to provide a sequence and structure for the work. The initial task was to integrate each student services discipline area's professional practices, competencies, and ethics into a foundational framework. From this structure, the team established domains, professional practices, and indicators relevant to the work of student service professionals. Identifying potential collaborators from each student services discipline area to provide input was significant to moving forward.

Partners in Collaboration

An invitation was sent to school district representatives of school counseling, school social work, and school psychology. The offer to collaborate included a stipulation that participants were required to fully commit to one face-to-face and one virtual meeting. Eleven positive responses were received. This group of leaders formed the Core Workgroup. Initially, school nursing services were not included in the evaluation model. This was attributed to the enacting legislation and the fact that delivery models for health services varied greatly among school districts. The team subsequently determined that health services school nurses provide must be included if the model was to successfully evaluate services, within a system of supports, that impact student achievement.

The draft framework was electronically distributed to Core Workgroup members prior to the virtual meeting. Following a guided discussion, the members were asked for input regarding the logic and sequence of domains and related practices. The framework was revised using targeted feedback and expanded to include performance levels.

At the second meeting (face-to-face) of the Core Workgroup, the framework was presented in model format with performance levels. Workgroup members vetted domains and practices and worked to achieve a sound model for an integrated performance evaluation grounded in evidenced-based practice and proper sequence. Initial work to adequately describe practice indicators proved a challenge. Nonetheless, workgroup members persevered to leave the team with defined examples.

The work of developing indicators for established practices required a broader perspective. The core team was expanded to form the Focus Workgroup. The Focus Workgroup included an interdisciplinary cohort of representatives from school district student services professions, school principals, student services directors, state professional associations, and student services university training programs.

The School District of Osceola County in conjunction with the Osceola County Educators Association reviewed the recommended and state adopted framework for evaluating non-classroom instructional personnel, and used it to assist in the performance evaluation of the intended target groups. Methods in applying this model to similar instructional groups, which could not be assessed through traditional instructional evaluation methods, were added to meet their formative and summative evaluation needs.

Fundamental Principles in the Process

Specific principles were discussed as fundamental to the development process. The intent of the evaluation model is to accomplish the following:

- Comply with the requirements of the Student Success Act and address both professional practices (50 percent) and student growth (50 percent), respectively
- Reflect a Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework
- Align with evidence-based practices and research-based professional standards
- Exhibit congruent support to professional growth and continuous improvement
- Integrate practices across student services professions
- Remain a dynamic process (flexible and fluid)
- Offer a state-approved evaluation framework to districts to adopt, adapt, or use as a guide in developing their own performance evaluation system for student services personnel

Framework For the Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel (NCIPE)

Florida's New Evaluation System

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

- Support effective instruction and student learning growth
- 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 learning growth 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 learning growth
- 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 learning growth as assessed annually by statewide assessments 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).

Non-classroom instructional 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 osceola's non-classroom instructional personnel disciplines or professions – school social work, school counseling, school psychology, deans, district level resource teachers, compliance specialists, academic coaches, media specialists, speech and language therapists, vision instructors, credit retrieval instructors, and athletic directors– fall in the non-classroom instructional personnel category.

Because the Student Success Act allows for special evaluation procedures and criteria for selected teaching fields, the instructional practices component of the Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel Evaluation was modified to reflect the professional practices and job responsibilities of osceola's non-classroom instructional personnel and to align with the

teacher instructional practices identified in FEAPs. The statute also allows modifications to the student learning growth component for non-classroom instructional personnel.

For non-classroom instructional personnel, the student performance portion of the evaluation will be based on a combination of student learning growth data (30 percent) and other measureable student outcomes (e.g., graduation rates, behavioral measures, truancy rates) specific to the position or assignment (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

Osceola's non-classroom instructional 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.

Non-classroom instructional 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. Osceola's non-classroom instructional 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. Non-classroom instructional 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 the osceola's non-

classroom instructional 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 Osceola's Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel

Florida's comprehensive performance evaluation system for non-classroom instructional 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 non-classroom instructional personnel 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 non-classroom instructional 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—NCIPE

Description of the Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices

The primary responsibility of Osceola’s non-classroom instructional 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 NCIPE:

- 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 non-classroom instructional 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 non-classroom instructional professional's performance related to the indicator. The indicators provide for a formative as well as a summative assessment of the non-classroom instructional 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 non-classroom instructional 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 non-classroom instructional 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 non-classroom instructional 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—NCIPE

The NCIPE is a dynamic approach that assesses the performance of non-classroom instructional 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 non-classroom instructional 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 evaluate the effectiveness of services on student achievement.			
Uses school or district data to monitor the effectiveness of multi-tiered system of 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

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, or health interventions and supports.			
Provides a leadership role by training others or 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, or 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 or behavioral interventions OR ineffectively demonstrates the practice/skill required.
2. Plans and designs instruction or interventions 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 or interventions that are aligned with school improvement priorities or other mandates.	Uses multiple sources of data, including classroom, district, and state resources, to design and plan instruction or interventions that are aligned with school improvement priorities or other mandates.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be effective independently.	Instruction or 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 or interventions.			
Applies evidenced-based research and best practices when developing and planning instruction or interventions, differentiating across all levels of multi-tiered systems of support (individual, targeted group, school, systems).	Applies evidence-based research and best practices when developing and planning instruction or intervention.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be effective independently.	Fails to apply OR poorly applies evidence-based research and best practices when developing and planning instruction or intervention.
4. Develops intervention support plans that help the student, family, or other stakeholders 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, family, or other stakeholders. Support of goal(s) is provided and seen to fruition.	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 stakeholders (eg. Parents, students, community members, district staff) in the planning and design of instruction or interventions.			
Develops systems-level strategies (e.g., validate participation, practice decision making, utilize 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 or 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 system of services (MTSS) to support the academic, social, emotional, or 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 or intervention services.			
Consults and collaborates at the school/systems level to plan, implement, and evaluate academic or 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 or 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 or 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, administrators, and/or district staff to develop and implement school-wide programs and services that evoke positive learning environments.			
Interacts with school, district, parents, and community partners to sustain and promote effective system-wide programs/services that result in a positive school climate.	Interacts with school personnel and/or students to promote and implement school-wide program or service that results in a positive learning experience.	Practice is emerging but requires supervision, support, and/or training to be independently effective.	Does not interact with school personnel or other stakeholders to promote or implement school-wide programs or services that result in positive learning experiences 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 /or 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 stakeholders 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 readiness, school failure, attendance, dropout, bullying, child abuse, youth suicide, school violence etc.).	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/or promotes multicultural understanding and dialogue through professional development 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 non-classroom instructional personnel'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

Domain A: 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 • TeenBiz • AR/STAR • FAIR <p>Reports with data analysis and interpretation (e.g., psychoeducational; psychological; psychosocial; counselors, school health report, collection development plans/analysis, Destiny Aged Titles Reports)</p> <p>Data platforms/electronic documentation systems (e.g., Data Warehouse, ODMS, MyPGS, FOCUS, Global Scholar, Performance Matters, AIMSWEB, mCLASS, EASY CBM, Destiny)</p> <p>Critical Components Checklist</p> <p>Counseling Plan and logs</p> <p>Needs Assessments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum Guides & Timelines
Domain B: 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 • Long-range Collection Development Plan (media) • Yearlong Media Center Activities Calendar <p>Inservice trainings/presentations (handouts, agenda, PowerPoint)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <p>Learning community discussions/presentations (agenda)</p> <p>School/District Improvement Plans – documentation of participation</p>

Table 1

Methods and Sources of Evidence

Domain C: 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., Rtl data, progress-monitoring data, Media Specialist run clubs, Media Squads, Battle of the Books teams)</p> <p>Monitoring intervention implementation (dosage and fidelity)</p> <p>Electronic documentation systems (electronic data panels that track and verify services, Britannia usage statistics, Destiny circulation statistics)</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>
Domain D: 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 Discipline Committee</p> <p>Positive Behavior System documentation</p> <p>Public Service Announcement (PSA) on Cyber Safety</p> <p>Cyber Citizenship</p> <p>School climate surveys</p> <p>Inservice trainings/presentations related to school climate, violence preventions, crisis intervention, cyber/internet safety, and mental health issues</p>

Table 1

Methods and Sources of Evidence

	School-based programs – development and implementation Disproportionality – risk index and ratios
--	--

Domain E: Professional Learning, Responsibility and Ethical Practice

Sources of Evidence:

- Artifacts
- Observation
- Stakeholder Feedback
- Conference/Interview
- Self-Assessment
- Professional Growth Plan
- Other:

Types of Evidence:

Professional Growth Plan

Documentation of inservice, professional conferences, and workshops

Conference/workshop follow-up activities/implementation

Professional learning community participation/facilitation (including district level specific to job assignment)

Membership in professional organization

Documentation of supervision/mentoring activities

Demonstration of time management (e.g., logs, calendars)

Evaluation Rubric—Crosswalk with Professional Practice Standards

This crosswalk (Table 2) aligns the practice standards under each domain in the NCIPE Evaluation Rubric with the evidence-based professional practice standards for school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, deans, district level resource teachers, compliance specialists, academic coaches, media specialists, speech and language therapists, vision instructors, credit recovery and grade forgiveness instructors, career specialists, and athletic directors. 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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
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
Instruction/Intervention Delivery and Facilitation			

Table 2

Professional Practice	School Counseling	School Social Work	School Psychology
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
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
Implements evidence-based practices within a multi-tiered framework.	ESSC E.2.g I-A-5	COE 2.03 Standard IV	Domain 9
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
Promotes student outcomes related to career and college readiness.	ESSC A.3 III-B-2d	COE Standard IX	Domain 8
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
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
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
Promotes safe school environments.	ESSC Preamble I-B-5	COE 1.01 Standard IV	Domain 5, 6 Principle IV.1
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

Table 2

Professional Practice	School Counseling	School Social Work	School Psychology
Provides a continuum of crisis intervention services.	ESSC Preamble III-B-3f	COE 6.03 Standard IV	Domain 6
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
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
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
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
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

Professional Practice	Dean of Students	Activities/Athletic Director	Media Specialist/ Academic Coach/Credit Recovery Instructor/ SLT/Vision	Resource Compliance Specialist/ ESE & ELL
Data-Based Decision Making and Evaluation of Practices				
Collects and uses data to develop and implement interventions within a problem-solving framework.	PR 1, 4, 6, & 7	PR 1, 5, 6, 7, 8(FHSAA HB 9.4), 9, 10	FEAPS (a) 1e, 1d, & 4a	SPP.II.A, B 1-16,C, &D
Analyzes multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data to inform decision making.	PR 1, 4, 6, & 7	PR 1, 2(SBR 5.80), 8(FHSAA HB 9.4) 9, 10	FEAPS (a) 3c & 4a	SPP.II.A, B 1-16,C, &D
Uses data to monitor student progress (academic, social/emotional/behavioral) and health and evaluate the effectiveness of services on student achievement.	PR 1, 4, 6, & 7	PR 1, 2(SBR 5.80), 8(FHSAA HB 9.4) 9, 10	FEAPS (a) 1e & 4c	SPP.II.A, B 1-16,C, &D
Shares student performance data in a relevant and understandable way with students, parents, and administrators.	PR 1, 3, 4, 6, & 7	PR 1, 2(SBR 5.80), 4, 8(FHSAA HB 9.4) 9, 10	FEAPS (a) 2e & 4e	SPP.II.A, B 1-16,C, &D
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.	PR 1, 4, 6, & 7	PR 1, 2(SBR 5.80), 8(FHSAA HB 9.4) 9, 10	FEAPS (a) 1c & 1f	SPP.II.A, B 1-16,C, &D
Plans and designs instruction/intervention based on data and aligns efforts with the school and district improvement plans and state and federal mandates.	PR 1 & 7	PR 1, 2(SBR 5.80), 8(FHSAA HB 9.4) 9, 10	FEAPS (a) 1a & 3h	SPP.II.A, B 1-16,C, &D
Applies evidence-based research and best practices to improve instruction/interventions.	PR 1, 3, 4, 6, & 7	PR 1, 2(SBR 5.80), 8(FHSAA HB 9.4) 9, 10	FEAPS (b) 1b	SPP. II B 1-16, PSPPP. CH 2 P2.F, P.3.2

Develops intervention support plans that help the student, family, or other community agencies and systems of support reach a desired goal.	PR 1, 3, 4, 6, & 7	PR 1, 2(SBR 5.80), 4, 8(FHSAA HB 9.4) 9, 10	FEAPS (b) 1c	SPP. I A-J, II D
Engages parents and community partners in the planning and design of instruction/interventions.	PR 1, 3, 4, 6, & 7	PR 1, 2(SBR 5.80), 4, 8(FHSAA HB 9.4) 9, 10	FEAPS (b) 1c	SPP. I A-J, II D
Professional Practice	Dean of Students	Activities/Athletic Director	Media Specialist/ Academic Coach/Credit Recovery Instructor/ SLT/Vision	Resource Compliance Specialist
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.	PR 1, 4, 6, & 7	PR 1, 2(SBR 5.80), 4, 5, 6, 8(FHSAA HB 9.4) 9, 10	FEAPS (a) 2b	PSPPP. CH 2 P3 1-8
Consults and collaborates at the individual, family, group, and systems levels to implement effective instruction and intervention services.	PR 1, 3, 4, 6, & 7	PR 1, 2(SBR 5.80), 4, 5, 6, 8(FHSAA HB 9.4) 9, 10	FEAPS (b) 1c	PSPPP. CH 2 B-E
Implements evidence-based practices within a multi-tiered framework.	PR 1, 4, 6, & 7	PR 2(SBR 5.8), 7, 8, 9, & 10	FEAPS (a) 2h (b) 1b	PSPPP. CH 2 P3 6-8
Identifies, provides, and/or refers for supports designed to help students overcome barriers that impede learning.	PR 1, 4, 6, & 7	PR 2(SBR 5.8), 8, 9, & 10	FEAPS (a) 3g,h	SPP. II - V
Promotes student outcomes related to career and college readiness.	PR 1, 4, 6, & 7	PR 8, 9, & 10		1007.21 FS
Provides relevant information regarding child and adolescent development, barriers to learning, and student risk factors.	PR 1, 4, 6, & 7	PR 4, 7, & 10		SP&P II B 1-16

Learning Environment				
Collaborates with teachers and administrators to develop and implement school-wide positive behavior supports.	PR 1, 4, 6, & 7	PR 2, 6, 8, 9, 10	FEAPS (a) 2b (a) 2e	SP&P 1 A-J
Collaborates with school personnel and students to foster student engagement (e.g., involvement, motivation, persistence, resilience, ownership).	PR 1, 4, 6, & 7	PR 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, & 10	FEAPS (a) 2d (a) 2f (a) 3a	PSPPP CH 2, P 2, C- D.
Promotes safe school environments.	PR 1, 2, 5, 6, & 7	PR 2, 3, & 5 -10	FEAPS (a) 2b	PSPPP CH 2, P C, G. CH 2, P 3, TA5.

Professional Practice	Dean of Students	Activities/Athletic Director	Media Specialist/ Academic Coach/Credit Recovery Instructor/ SLT/Vision	Resource Compliance Specialist
Integrates relevant cultural issues and contexts that impact family-school partnerships.	PR 2, 3, 6, & 7	PR 1,3, 4, 6, 8, & 10	FEAPS (a) 2d	PSPPP CH 2, P2, E. CH2 P3, TA3-7.
Provides a continuum of crisis intervention services.	PR 6, & 7	PR 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, & 10		PSPPP CH2, P3, TA6-10.
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.	FEAPS (b) 1d, 1e	FEAPS (b) 1d, 1e	FEAPS (b) 1d, 1e	PSPPP CH2, P3, PD 1-6
Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices (e.g., PLC).	FEAPS (b) 1d, 1e	FEAPS (b) 1d, 1e	FEAPS (b) 1d, 1e	PSPPP CH2, P3, PD 1-6

Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development activities.	FEAPS (b) 1d, 1e	FEAPS (b) 1d, 1e	FEAPS (b) 1d, 1e	PSPPP CH2, P3, PD 1-6
Demonstrates effective recordkeeping and communication skills.	PR 4, 6, & 7 FEAPS (a) 2a	PR 1, 2, 8, 9, & 10 FEAPS (a) 2a	FEAPS (a) 2a	PSPPP CH2, P3, PCE 9-17
Complies with national and state laws, district policies and guidelines, and ethical educational and professional standards.	PR 1, 4, 6, & 7 FEAPS 2	PR 2, 8, & 10 FEAPS 2	FEAPS 2	FEAPS 2

SOURCES:

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 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.

Table 3

Danielson, Charlotte (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

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 non-classroom instructional personnel, 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.. This is the domain score.
- **TOTAL:** Sum the scores from each of the five domains. This is the TOTAL score (1-4).

SUMMATIVE PERFORMANCE LEVEL

The professional's summative performance level (Highly Effective, Effective, Emerging, Ineffective) is based on the sum of the total scores from each of the domains.

Evaluation Rubric Scoring Protocol

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

Scoring Key:

HE (Highly Effective) = 4 E (Effective) = 3 Em (Emerging) = 2 InE (Ineffective) = 1

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

Domain B: Instruction/Intervention Planning and Design (Pick at minimum TWO Indicators)	Rating Scores			
	HE	E	Em	InE
B-1. Uses a collaborative problem-solving framework as the basis for identification and planning for academic and behavioral interventions and supports. <i>Evidence:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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. <i>Evidence:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-3. Applies evidence-based research and best practices to improve instruction/interventions. <i>Evidence:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-4. Develops intervention support plans that help the student, family, or other community agencies and systems of support reach a desired goal. <i>Evidence:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-5. Engages parents and community partners in the planning and design of instruction/interventions. <i>Evidence:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
TOTAL (Add the practice rating scores in Domain B, then divide by the amount of indicators scored.)				
<i>Domain B Section Comments:</i>				

Evaluation Rubric Scoring Protocol

Domain C: Instruction/Intervention Delivery and Facilitation (Pick at minimum TWO Indicators)	Rating Scores			
	HE	E	Em	InE
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 , then divide by the amount of indicators scored				
<i>Domain C Section Comments:</i>				

Domain D: Learning Environment (Pick at minimum TWO Indicators)	Rating Scores			
	HE	E	Em	InE
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 , then divide by the amount of indicators scored>				
<i>Domain D Section Comments:</i>				

Evaluation Rubric Scoring Protocol

Domain E: Professional Learning, Responsibility, and Ethical Practice (All indicators in this section must be selected)	Rating Scores			
	HE	E	Em	InE
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 , then divide by the amount of indicators scored. █)				
<i>Domain E Section Comments:</i>				

EVALUATION RUBRIC TOTAL SCORE:

Domain A Score	█
Domain B Score	█
Domain C Score	█
Domain D Score	█
Domain E Score	█
TOTAL	█

OVERALL RATING for the EVALUATION RUBRIC:

Highly Effective **Effective** **Emerging** **Ineffective**

Total Score (range)*	Performance Level Rating
3.3-4.0	<i>Highly Effective</i>
2.4-3.2	<i>Effective</i>
1.7-2.3	<i>Emerging</i>
< 1.6	<i>Ineffective</i>

Student Growth Component—NCIPE

Student Learning Growth Component

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

For instructional personnel who are not classroom teachers, the student learning growth 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 learning growth data and other measurable student outcomes that are specific to the assigned position, provided that the student learning growth 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 learning growth may be reduced to not less than 20 percent (section 1012.34, F.S.).

For non-classroom instructional personnel, the student performance portion of the evaluation is based on a combination of student learning growth data (30 percent) and other measurable growth outcomes (e.g., graduation rates, behavioral measures, truancy rates) specific to the position/assignment (20 percent). Student learning growth and other measurable growth outcomes specific to non-classroom instructional personnel:

- Must account for 50 percent of the evaluation
- Up to 20 percent of the student learning growth component may be based on measurable growth outcomes specific to the position/role
- Must be based on students assigned to the non-classroom instructional professional

Student Learning Growth: Value-Added Measure (VAM)

The following are guidelines for determining the VAM portion of the student growth component based on statewide assessments or EOC exams.

- 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 learning growth 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 School District of Osceola County must apply the criteria for determining the value-added component consistently across non-classroom instructional 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).

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 = 7 ($4+3=7 \div 2 = 3.5$). This score is entered on the Summative Evaluation Form (see Sample Form 3).

Student Learning Growth: Measurable Student Outcomes

The School District of Osceola County will utilize a measurable student outcomes component, which will be combined with the VAM. The measurable student outcomes will account for 20 percent of the student growth value. The following will be considered when identifying the source and data utilized for 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 non-classroom instructional personnel in supporting student achievement and post-school outcomes.

- Identify the metrics/tools for measuring the outcomes.
- 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, specific personnel, stake-holders, or project objectives 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.

The measurable outcome will vary based on individual assignment and/or responsibilities. 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 4 point scale. Classify the Measurable Outcomes score on an 4-point scale by assigning point values for each performance level. For example, Highly Effective = 4, Effective = 3, Needs Improvement/Developing = 2, and Unsatisfactory = 1. 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 the administrator and employee mutually agree upon 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 State Assessment Developmental Scale Score Growth Scale Value (GSV) Number/percent achieving proficiency Grades	State Assessment Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading STAR 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 ODMS FOCUS
Attendance	Attendance rates	Attendance data (e.g., days present, absent, and tardy)
District Compliance	School / Facility Data	District approved tracking systems
State Compliance	District/ School/ Facility Data	District approved tracking systems
Reductions in suspensions	Number of suspension days	Discipline data
Student engagement	Time on task Percent work completed	Student engagement instruments Structured instructional 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

SDOC employees 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	

Measurable Outcome Score	/80
---------------------------------	-----

Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel's 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 NCIPE 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 NCIPE and point values for each component: Evaluation Rubric for Professional Practices, Value-Added Measure, and Measurable Student Outcomes related to job responsibilities.

The NCIPE Summative Evaluation integrates evaluative data from Forms 1 and 2, and the Value-Added Measure score into a rating system with a 4-point scale. The NCIPE Summative Evaluation form also provides a suggested rubric for assigning the performance level based on the 4-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 4-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 NCIPE 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 4-point scale.

The district should monitor the NCIPE 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.

**Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel Evaluation (NCIPE)
Summative Evaluation Sample Form**

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

NCIPE SUMMATIVE Score:

Evaluation Rubric Score	/4
Student Growth Score:	
VAM Score School #1	
VAM Score School #2	
VAM Score School #3	
SUM	
VAM Score Total (Sum/# of schools)	/4
Measurable Outcomes Score	/4
NCIPE Summative Score:	
	/4

SUMMATIVE RATING for the NCIPE:

Highly Effective
 Effective
 Needs Improvement/Developing
 Unsatisfactory

Summative Score (range)	Performance Level Rating
> 3.3-4.0	<i>Highly Effective</i>
2.4-3.2	<i>Effective</i>
1.7-2.3	<i>Needs Improvement/Developing</i>
< 1.6	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>

Implications for professional development and/or support (specify plans to address):

Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel's Signature:
Date:

Evaluator's Signature:
Date:

THE NON-CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL 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: NCIP Evaluation Process

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

THE EVALUATION STEP PROCESS

STEP 1:

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 non-classroom instructional personnel 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
 - Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida
 - Professional standards and practices of school social work, school psychology, school counseling, deans, district level resource teachers, compliance specialists, academic coaches, media specialists, speech and language therapists, vision instructors, credit retrieval instructors, and athletic directors
 - 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.

STEP 2:

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 personal reflection (from orientation) moves to a specific identification of improvement priorities that are supported by data or evidence. This may include School Improvement Plan (SIP), Superintendent's Goals, 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 District Goals.

STEP 3:

MONITORING (DATA COLLECTION, APPLICATION TO PRACTICE)

Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel and/or Evaluator gather evidence that provides insights into the practitioner's level of proficiency on the practices reflected in the evaluation rubric.

- The non-classroom instructional 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 non-classroom instructional personnel in a timely manner.
- Collegial groups, mentors, communities of practice (CoPs), professional learning communities, and lesson study groups in which the non-classroom instructional professional participates may provide specific and actionable feedback for desired improvement.

STEP 4:

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 non-classroom instructional 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 non-classroom instructional 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 non-classroom instructional 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.

STEP 5:

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 NCIPE and student growth measures.
- If the Student Growth Measurement (SGM) score is known, inform the professional how the NCIPE 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.

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.**

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/>

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 NCIPE Model

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

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.



Gerard Robinson, Commissioner
Florida Department of Education

Florida Department of Education • Division of Public Schools
Bureau of Exceptional Education & Student Services