

| <b>University Schools</b>                                      |   |                                   |                                  |
|--|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Monitoring:<br><br><b>Review:<br/>Annually, in<br/>January</b> | Descriptor Term:<br><br><b>Evaluation</b> | Descriptor Code:<br><b>5.109</b>  | Issued Date:<br><b>June 2025</b> |
|  |   | Rescinds:<br><b>314 &amp; 305</b> | Issued:                          |

The evaluation of performance and its effectiveness shall be a cooperative and shared endeavor on the part of the Director of Schools and administrative and supervisory personnel. University Schools shall use a state-approved model for evaluating administrative and supervisory personnel. The Director of Schools is responsible for ensuring that all administrative and supervisory personnel are evaluated annually.

### **LICENSED TEACHING PERSONNEL**

University Schools will utilize a model for teacher evaluation that is compliant with Tennessee state law. The Director of Schools, or their designee, shall develop procedures to ensure that the model is implemented throughout the school district. Additionally, the Director of Schools, or their designee, shall provide information to all licensed teaching personnel regarding the nature of the evaluation and the grievance procedures prescribed by the State Board of Education.

#### **Local Level Grievance Procedure**

The Director of Schools, or their designee, shall develop procedures, consistent with state law, for processing evaluation grievances.

### **NON-LICENSED PERSONNEL**

Newly hired, non-licensed personnel shall be evaluated once during the evaluation period (up to ninety (90) days) and at least one (1) additional time following successful completion of the evaluation period during the first year of employment. Personnel employed for more than one (1) year shall be evaluated at least once a year.

Evaluations shall be used as an aid in improving an employee's performance and as a basis for continuing employment. Evaluation reports shall be discussed with the evaluated employee. Each employee shall be given a copy of the evaluation and shall sign the supervisor's copy as evidence it has been discussed.

## **TEACHER EVALUATION**

This policy applies to all University Schools classroom teachers and the following faculty members: Library Media Specialists; Guidance Counselors; Caseload Educators - Social Workers, Psychologists, SPED Supervisors; and Academic Interventionists/Coaches (Instructional Facilitators, Math, Literacy, etc.). Directors and assistant directors are not included under this policy. This policy outlines the guidelines for evaluating University Schools faculty in order (1) to improve instruction; (2) to provide ongoing feedback for teacher professional growth; (3) to facilitate communication between the professional employee and their immediate supervisor; (4) to promote high standards of excellence for teachers; (5) to identify areas to strengthen and identify supports available through the University and other resources; and (6) to establish an evaluation grievance procedure for evaluated teachers to challenge only the accuracy of the data used in the evaluation and the adherence to the evaluation policies adopted in accordance with state law.

University Schools believe that a teacher evaluation process that promotes high and sustained levels of quality instruction is essential for student academic success, growth, and achievement. Accordingly, evaluation of teachers should be conducted regularly and should reflect a fair, meaningful, and accurate depiction of a teacher's development, growth, and performance in the teaching profession. University Schools is also committed to supporting teachers in their professional practices and believes that meaningful teacher evaluations allow the University 1) to identify teachers' instructional areas that are superior and prescribe support, rewards/recognition, and leadership opportunities that enhance the strength of the teacher and 2) to identify teachers' instructional areas that need strengthening and prescribe appropriate available support and professional development. Therefore, teachers may seek available University support to improve their professional practices.

Additionally, teacher evaluation provides the University with a useful tool to inform personnel decisions. In accordance with state law, evaluations shall be a factor in employment decisions, including, but not necessarily limited to, promotion, retention, termination, compensation, and the attainment of tenure status. Moreover, the evaluation may also have implications in areas such as movement, rewards/recognitions, leadership opportunities, and support.

From a University-wide perspective, the results of regular and accurate evaluations are useful in informing systemic decisions designed to (1) improve and optimize student achievement; (2) improve overall teacher performance within the University; and (3) improve efficiency in the educational service delivery of the school system (e.g., align University professional development and teacher support programs with University-wide teacher needs identified through aggregate evaluation results).

### ***Evaluation Model and Process***

University Schools believe that in order for evaluation results to accurately reflect the performance level of a teacher, the model of evaluation should be multidimensional and include components that are valid indicators of performance. Additionally, the evaluation process should be conducted with fidelity by competent evaluators and those certified in observation, in accordance with state law and regulations. To that end, University Schools shall evaluate all teachers in accordance with standards established in applicable state laws and regulatory guidelines. The evaluation process shall be defined and implemented uniformly throughout the University. The teacher evaluation measure for University Schools shall include the following components: (1) Student Growth and Achievement Data; (2) Observation of Teaching/Classroom Instruction; (3) Teacher Professionalism; and (4) Stakeholder Perceptions.

The inputs for each evaluation component for an individual teacher shall be confidential. Inputs may include items such as a teacher's TVAAS scores, an evaluator's observation notes, video captures used for observations associated with evaluation, and individual responses to stakeholder perception surveys. The inputs for each evaluation component for an individual teacher shall be available to the teacher (or their designee); those allowed access by University Schools policy; and those required access by court order or state and/or federal law. Pursuant to state law, all records containing the results of an individual teacher evaluation shall be treated as confidential and shall not be open to the public.

In accordance with state law and the Tennessee State Board of Education policy, a University grievance process is available to teachers to provide a means for evaluated teachers to challenge only the accuracy of the data used in the evaluation and the adherence to the evaluation policies adopted in accordance with state law.

### ***Policy Monitoring***

The Vice Provost /Director of Schools or their designee shall monitor implementation of this policy and shall review the methods and definitions for measuring teacher effectiveness with appropriate stakeholders. The Vice Provost/Director of Schools or their designee shall also review for appropriateness the components of the Teacher Effectiveness Measure (TEM) to ensure the tool continues to meet the standards of University Schools mission, vision, and academic program. If the current evaluation tool does not meet these standards, a tool may be selected or drafted and submitted to the Tennessee Department of Education for approval according to the department's timeline and process.

## ***Administrative Rules and Regulations***

### **Local-Level Grievance Procedure**

To comply with Tenn. Code Ann. §49-1-302 which requires, “the development of a local-level evaluation grievance procedure to provide a means for evaluated teachers and director to challenge only the accuracy of the data used in the evaluation and the adherence to the evaluation policies adopted by the State Board of Education” University Schools has implemented a grievance procedure for University Schools faculty members and personnel. Minor procedural errors in implementing the evaluation model shall be resolved at the lowest possible step in the grievance procedure but shall not constitute grounds for challenging the final results of an evaluation. Minor procedural errors shall be defined as errors that do not materially affect or compromise the integrity of the evaluation results. The final results of an evaluation may only be challenged if the person being evaluated can demonstrate, no later than during step II of the grievance procedure, that the procedural errors made could materially affect or compromise the integrity of the evaluation results. The department of education shall provide guidance on which procedural errors may materially affect or compromise the results of the evaluation. The Vice Provost/Director of Schools shall be responsible for the proper effectuation of this policy at the local level and shall charge Directors of University Schools with the responsibility for ensuring that all teachers, directors, and administrators are aware of the provisions of this policy, including the identification of the administrator designated to conduct Step I of this procedure.

### **Basic Standards.**

To resolve grievances as expeditiously as possible pursuant to policy above, grievances may be filed at the end of each of the three components of the evaluation model: 1) qualitative appraisal; 2) student growth measures; and 3) other measures of student achievement. A grievance must be filed no more than 15 days from the date teachers receive the results for each component, otherwise the grievance will be considered untimely and invalid. The State Department of Education or University Schools may develop and make available to teachers standard grievance forms. No grievance may be denied because a standard form adopted by a school has not been used as long as the components required by this policy are included. At the informal hearing before the Vice Provost/Director of Schools, an attorney or a representative of an employee may speak on behalf of the employee.

Each grievance submitted at every step of the process provided below shall contain:

- the teacher’s name, position, school, and additional title if any;
- the name of the teacher’s immediate supervisor;
- the name of the evaluator/reviewer;
- the date the challenged evaluation was received; 5. the evaluation period in question;
- the basis for the grievance;

- the corrective action desired by grievant; and
- sufficient facts or other information to begin an investigation.

A failure to state specific reasons shall result in the grievance being considered improperly filed and invalid. All student achievement data used in evaluations must be made available to individual educators prior to the completion of their evaluations.

#### Procedures:

Grievances shall be processed by working through the three (3) steps to finality as follows:

#### Step I: Evaluator

1. Written grievance submitted to evaluator pursuant to timeline outlined in the policy with copy submitted to the teacher's school director (if different from the evaluator).
2. Administrative investigation and fact finding.
3. Decision clearly communicated in writing to grievant within fifteen (15) days of receipt of the complaint.
4. To allow disputes to be resolved at the lowest level possible, the Evaluator may take any action necessary, based on the circumstances, to immediately correct any procedural errors made in the evaluation process.

#### Step II: Vice Provost/Director of Schools (or their designee), who shall have had no input or involvement in the evaluation for which the grievance has been filed.

1. Written grievance and prior step decision submitted to the Director of Schools (the Vice Provost/Director of Schools) or their designee within fifteen (15) days of receipt of decision from Step I.
2. Informal discussion or hearing of facts, allegations, and testimony by appropriate witnesses as soon as practical.
3. Investigation, fact finding, and written final decision communicated to grievant in writing within fifteen (15) days of discussion.
4. To allow disputes to be resolved at the lowest level possible, the Director of Schools (the Vice Provost/Director of Schools) may take any action necessary, based on the circumstances, to immediately correct any procedural errors made in the evaluation process.

---

#### Legal References

1. TRR/MS 0520-02-01-.01; TRR/MS 0520-02-01-.02
2. TRR/MS 0520-02-01-.18; State Board of Education Policy 5.201