



Educator  
and  
Support Professionals

Evaluation Handbook  
2017- 2018

## **Narragansett School System Educator and Support Professional Evaluation Handbook**

This handbook was put together by the District Evaluation Committee (DEC) to assist Narragansett Teachers with additional information specific to the Narragansett School System. The Rhode Island Model Educator Evaluation Guidebook and Addendum and the Support Professionals Guidebook provided by the state is to be utilized as the primary resource for all teachers. Rhode Island guidebooks and other valuable resources for educator evaluation can be located at: [www.ride.ri.gov/TeachersAdministrators/EducatorEvaluation.aspx](http://www.ride.ri.gov/TeachersAdministrators/EducatorEvaluation.aspx).

## **NEW!! Transition from EPSS to Employee Evaluation Management (EEM)**

Rhode Island districts who use EPSS will transition to a new Frontline system called Employee Evaluation Management (EEM) for the 2017-18 school year.

This handbook addresses the “flexibility factors” as determined by the DEC.

Suggested Timeline

Annual Conference

Anatomy of SOO/SLO

SLO/SOO Resources

Artifacts

Teacher Performance Plan

Appeals Process

The DEC meets to discuss current evaluation issues and development as the state revises the educator evaluation expectations and guidelines. The members of the committees also participate in ongoing professional development to assist staff in understanding the evaluation process.

### **District Evaluation Committee Members**

Chair: Ann Marie Zaborski

High School Reps: Jen Biafore  
Mary Boyle  
Kathy Couchon  
Judy Maynard

Middle School Reps: Brian Tetreault  
Susan Craven

Elementary Reps: Susan Moniz  
Marnie Deluca  
Lauren Corbeil  
Jen Ibsen

District Reps: Leslie Brow  
Lauren Durney

## Educator and Support Professional Evaluation Timelines

### For the Evaluation Cycle 2017-2018

Suggested Completion Date	Action
9/22	Schedule Beginning of the Year Conference with administrator
10/13	Beginning of the Year Conference to set SLOs/SOOs (2-4 goals) and 1 Professional Growth Goal (PGG) with administrator.
10/27	Upload SLOs/OOs for approval
11/22	1 unannounced (minimum 20 minutes)
1/19	Schedule announced observation with your administrator prior to this date
2/2	1 announced (minimum 20 minutes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lesson plan must be submitted 1 day in advance</li> </ul>
2/9	Schedule Mid-Year Conference with administrator
Month of February	Prepare for Mid-Year Conference: <b>Required</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upload evidence of SLO/SOO progress data and analysis</li> </ul> <b>Recommended for feedback</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upload evidence of PGG</li> <li>• Upload Professional Responsibilities artifacts and evidence</li> </ul>
3/9	Complete Mid-Year Conference
4/27	1 unannounced observation (minimum 20 minutes)
5/4	Schedule End of Year Conference with administrator
Month of May	Prepare for End of Year Conference: <b>Required</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upload evidence of SLO/SOO progress data and analysis</li> <li>• Upload Professional Responsibilities artifacts and evidence.</li> <li>• Upload progress/status of PGG</li> </ul>
6/1	End of Year Conference

**Rhode Island Model at a Glance**  
**Requirements for Teachers in the Full Evaluation Year**

The table below outlines the minimum requirements for teachers in the full evaluation year.

<b>Element</b>	<b>Minimum Requirements</b>
<b>Evaluation Conferences</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Three conferences between the teacher and the evaluator (beginning-of-year, middle-of-year and end-of-year)</li> </ul>
<b>Professional Practice</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● At least three classroom observations (one announced at least a week in advance and two unannounced) of at least 20 minutes each using the Teacher Professional Practice Rubric (Classroom Environment &amp; Instruction)</li> <li>● Written feedback after each observation</li> <li>● Component-level scores and rationales after each observation</li> </ul>
<b>Professional Responsibilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Holistic ratings on each of the nine components of the Teacher Professional Responsibilities Rubric</li> </ul>
<b>Professional Growth Goal</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● One professional growth goal written by the teacher and approved by the evaluator at the beginning of the year and scored by the evaluator at the end of the year</li> </ul>
<b>Student Learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● At least two but no more than four SLOs/SOOs</li> </ul>
<b>Final Effectiveness Rating</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Calculated using a points-based system, with each measure having the following weights:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ Professional Practice: Classroom Environment (25 percent)</li> <li>□ Professional Practice: Instruction (25 percent)</li> <li>□ Professional Responsibilities (20 percent)</li> <li>□ Student Learning (30 percent)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Performance Improvement Plans</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Development and implementation of a Performance Improvement Plan for any teacher receiving a final effectiveness rating of <i>Developing</i> or <i>Ineffective</i> as defined in Standard Four of the Educator Evaluation System Standards</li> </ul>

## **Considerations and Suggested Talking Points for 2017-2018 NSS Annual Conference In a Non Summative Year**

- Those teachers who are not being formally evaluated will participate in an Annual Conference.
- It is a conversation between your building administrator or Special Services Director and yourself
- It can be done individually/or with grade level/content area/ team teachers
- It is not an evaluative process that is documented, but an opportunity to share your professional goal(s) for the school year.
- Contact your administrator for a meeting time. It is to be completed by December 15, 2017

### **Suggested Planning Sheet for your Annual Conference**

<b>Professional Goal:</b>
<b><u>Support Statement:</u> Explain the reason for choosing this goal, and include its connection to district/school goals or previous evaluation results.</b>
<b><u>Measure:</u> a. What data or evidence will you use to support this goal? (Options for data: MAP, Class Data, Other.....)</b>  <b>b. How do you plan to measure progress of your goal? (i.e. timeline, chart...)</b>  (How will you keep track of your work?)
<b><u>Outcome:</u> What do you hope to achieve as a professional, and how will your goal impact your students' learning?</b>
<b><u>Reflection:</u> How did this goal assist your growth as a professional, and how did it impact your instruction and/or student achievement? Share any concerns and/or difficulties regarding not attaining the goal.</b>

Anatomy of a Student Outcome Objective (Form)

A short name for the SOO

---

Content/Service Area:

---

Grade Level:

---

The grade level(s) of the students:

---

The number and grade/class of students to whom this SLO applies Interval of Instruction:

---

The length of the course (e.g., year, semester, quarter):

---

Essential Question: What are the most important outcome that will enable students to have better access to education through your service?

PRIORITY OF CONTENT

Element	Description
Objective Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Describes the specific outcome that the support professional is working to achieve</li> <li>● Should be specific enough to clarify the focus of the SOO</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>1. Does the Objective Statement describe the specific outcome(s) that will increase access to learning for students? Yes No</p> <p>2. Is the Objective Statement broad enough that it captures critical aspects of the Support Professional's role, but specific enough to clarify the focus of the SOO? Yes No</p>

	<p>3. Does the objective rationale provide a data-driven explanation for the focus of the SOO? Yes      No</p> <p>4. Based on your answers to the questions above, would you rate the Priority of Content as acceptable?    Yes      No</p>
--	---

Essential Question: Where are my students now with respect to the objective?

<p>Baseline Data/Information</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supports the overall reasoning for the student outcome objective</li> <li>● Could include survey data, statistics, participation rates, or references to historical trends or observations</li> </ul> <hr/>
----------------------------------	--

Essential Question: Based on what I know about my students, where do I expect them to be by the end of the interval of service? How will I measure this?

RIGOR OF TARGET

<p>Targets</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Describes where it is expected for groups of students or the school community as a whole to be at the end of the interval of service</li> <li>● Should be measurable and rigorous, yet attainable</li> </ul> <hr/>
----------------	---

<p>Rationale for Target(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Explains the way in which the target was determined, including the baseline information sources and why the target is appropriate for the group of students or the school community</li> <li>● Explains the way in which the target was determined, including the data source (e.g., benchmark assessment, trend data, or historical data from past students) and evidence that indicate the target is both rigorous and attainable for all students</li> <li>● Rationale should be provided for each target and/or tier</li> </ul> <hr/>
--------------------------------	--

5. Does the SOO describe related baseline data or information?    Yes      No

6. Based on the related data and information, is the target possible to realistically attain, while also representing a rigorous outcome for the interval of service?    Yes      No

	<p>7. If appropriate, is the target tiered to reflect differing starting points? Yes No</p> <p>8. Does the target rationale explain how the target was determined in connection with baseline data or information (e.g. benchmark assessment, historical data, trend data, etc.)? Yes No</p> <p>9. Based on your answers to the questions above, would you rate the Rigor of Target as acceptable? Yes No</p>
--	---

QUALITY OF EVIDENCE

Evidence Source	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes how the objective will be measured and why the evidence source(s) is appropriate for measuring the objective ( e.g. logs, scoring guides, screening procedures, surveys)</li> <li>• Describes how the measure of the student outcome will be collected or administered (e.g., once or multiple times; during class time or during a designated testing window; by the support professional or someone else)</li> <li>• Describes how the evidence will be analyzed and/or scored (e.g., scored by the support professional individually or by a team of support professionals; scored once or a percentage double-scored)</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>10. Does the evidence source(s) clearly articulate how the outcome of the Objective Statement will be measured? Yes No</p> <p>11. Does the explanation of the evidence source(s) include how often, when it is administered and by whom, along with a description of how the evidence will be scored (e.g., including description of scoring guides, logs, or screening procedures, surveys)? Yes No</p> <p>12. Based on your answers to the questions above, would you rate the Quality of Evidence as acceptable? Yes No</p>
-----------------	---

Strategies	Describe the method, strategies, or plan to achieve your goal.
------------	--



	<hr/> <p>Are there clear strategies included that will be used to achieve the goal? Yes      No</p> <p>14. Based on your answers to all of the above questions, would you approve this SOO? Yes      No</p>
--	---

**Anatomy of a Student Learning Objective (Form)**

A short name for the SLO:	
<hr/>	
The content area(s) to which this SLO applies:	
<hr/>	
The grade level(s) of the students:	
<hr/>	
The number and grade/class of students to whom this SLO applies:	
<hr/>	
Interval of Instruction: The length of the course (e.g., year, semester, quarter):	
<hr/>	
Element	Description
Essential Question: What are the most important knowledge/skills I want my students to attain by the end of the interval of instruction?	
Objective Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Identifies the priority content and learning that is expected during the interval of instruction</li> <li>● Should be broad enough that it captures the major content of an extended instructional period, but focused enough that it can be measured</li> <li>● If attained, positions students to be ready for the next level of work in this content area</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>1. Does the Objective Statement identify specific knowledge and/or skills that are essential for students to attain in the course/grade?    YES      NO</p>

	<p>2. Is the objective statement broad enough that it captures the major content of the extended instructional period, but focused enough that it clearly pertains to the course subject/grade/students and can be measured? YES NO</p> <p>3. Does the objective rationale provide a data-driven and/or curriculum-based explanation for the focus of the SLO? YES NO</p> <p>4. Based on your answers to the questions above, would the Priority of Content be acceptable? YES No</p>
--	---

Rational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a data-driven and/or curriculum-based explanation for the focus of the Student Learning Objective</li> </ul> <hr/>
----------	--

Aligned Standards	
-------------------	--

Essential Question: Where are my students now (at the beginning of instruction) with respect to the objective?

Baseline Data/ Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describes students' baseline knowledge, including the source(s) of data/ information and its relation to the overall course objectives</li> </ul> <hr/>
----------------------------	--

Essential Question: Based on what I know about my students, where do I expect them to be by the end of the interval of instruction and how will they demonstrate their knowledge/skills?

**RIGOR OF TARGET**

Targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describes where the teacher expects all students to be at the end of the interval of instruction</li> <li>Should be measurable and rigorous, yet attainable for the interval of instruction</li> <li>In most cases, should be tiered to reflect students' differing baselines</li> </ul> <hr/>
---------	---

<p>Rationale for Target(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Explains the way in which the target was determined, including the data source (e.g., benchmark assessment, historical data for the students in the course, historical data from past students) and evidence that indicate the target is both rigorous and attainable for all students</li> <li>● Should be provided for each target and/or tier</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>5. Does the SLO describe the baseline knowledge of all current students and how it was assessed, and reference historical data, if available? YES NO</p> <p>6. Based on the student's starting point, is the target possible for all students to realistically attain, while also representing a rigorous interval of learning with an effective teacher? YES No</p> <p>7. If appropriate is the target tiered to reflect students' differing starting points? YES No</p> <p>8. Does the target rationale explain how the target was determined in connection with baseline data or information (benchmark assessment, historical data, trend data, etc.) YES NO</p> <p>9. Based on your answers to the questions above, would the Rigor of target be acceptable? YES NO</p>
<p>QUALITY OF EVIDENCE</p>	
<p>Evidence Source</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Describes how student learning will be assessed and why the assessment(s) is appropriate for measuring the objective</li> <li>● Describes how the measure of student learning will be administered (e.g., once or multiple times; during class or during a designated testing window; by the classroom teacher or someone else)</li> <li>● Describes how the evidence will be collected and scored (e.g., scored by the classroom teacher individually or by a team of teachers; scored once or a percentage double-scored)</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>10. Does the evidence source measure the identified content/skills of the Objective Statement? YES NO</p>

11. Does the explanation of assessment administration include when it is administered, how often, and by whom, along with a description of how the evidence will be collected and scored (e.g., description of scoring guides, rubrics, or instruction)? YES NO

12. Does the scoring process have safeguards in place to ensure consistent scoring aligned to clear expectations of student work (e.g., a percentage of the evidence will be scored by more than one educator through collaborative scoring, double scoring, blind scoring)? YES NO

13. Based on the answers to the questions above, would the Quality of Evidence be acceptable?  
YES NO

## SLOs/SOOs RIDE Online Guidance Modules

- Understanding SLOs

[http://media.ride.ri.gov/PD/Eval/Understanding\\_SLOs\\_output/story.html](http://media.ride.ri.gov/PD/Eval/Understanding_SLOs_output/story.html)

- Writing an Objective Statement

[http://media.ride.ri.gov/PD/Eval/Writing\\_an\\_Objective\\_Statement\\_output/story.html](http://media.ride.ri.gov/PD/Eval/Writing_an_Objective_Statement_output/story.html)

- Using Baseline Data and Information to set SLO Targets

[http://media.ride.ri.gov/PD/Eval/Using\\_Baseline\\_Data\\_and\\_Information\\_to\\_Set\\_SLO\\_Targets\\_output/story.html](http://media.ride.ri.gov/PD/Eval/Using_Baseline_Data_and_Information_to_Set_SLO_Targets_output/story.html)

- Special Educators SLOs and SOOs

[http://media.ride.ri.gov/PD/Eval/Special\\_Educators\\_output/story.html](http://media.ride.ri.gov/PD/Eval/Special_Educators_output/story.html)

- The Assessment Toolkit

[http://media.ride.ri.gov/PD/Eval/Assessment\\_Toolkit\\_output/story.html](http://media.ride.ri.gov/PD/Eval/Assessment_Toolkit_output/story.html)

Artifacts  
*Guidance for Educators*

### General Guidelines

1. Read/review your entire Teacher Evaluation Manual Edition IV
2. It is the teacher's responsibility to upload applicable artifacts to show evidence of Professional Responsibility, and Student Learning Objectives documentation.
3. Quality is more important than quantity – five artifacts that qualify as a 2 rating do not equal a 3 rating. If you have one 3 you only need to upload one 3.
4. One artifact can be applied to many goals/criteria.
5. Artifacts can be removed and replaced.
6. Although uploading artifacts is not required for observable criteria, be sure to keep accurate records for verification with your evaluator.
7. All artifacts must be labeled with: date of event, event and outcome of event, and the domain that the artifact is representing.

### Specific Guidelines

#### Professional Practice:

1. All components are scored through classroom observation.

#### Professional Responsibility:

1. If evaluators choose to review artifacts, artifact review should focus on quality rather than quantity. One artifact could be used to demonstrate proficiency on more than one component of the rubric
2. Adjustments can be made at the mid-year conference if necessary

#### Student Learning Objectives/ Student Outcome Objective

1. High-quality assessments are essential for accurately measuring student learning. In Rhode Island, a teacher may use a variety of summative assessments as evidence for SLOs, including performance tasks, extended writing, research papers, projects, portfolios, unit assessments, final assessments, or a combination. Teachers may use assessments purchased from a commercial vendor or created by individual teachers, teams of teachers, LEA leaders. However, all assessments must be reviewed by evaluators

## **Teacher/Support Professional Performance Plan:**

*(Adapted from the Narragansett School District Teacher Assistance Plan)*

### **Performance Improvement Plans**

A Performance Improvement Plan provides intensive support for teachers/ support professionals who are not meeting expectations. A Performance Improvement Plan may be utilized at any time during the school year, but must be put in place if a teacher/ support professional receives a final effectiveness rating of Developing or Ineffective.

A teacher/ support professional who has a Performance Plan will work with an improvement team to assist him or her to develop a plan. An improvement team may consist solely of the teacher's/ support professional's evaluator or multiple people depending on the teacher's needs and the school and district context. More specifically, Performance Improvement plans should identify specific supports and teacher actions and establish timelines for improvement as well as frequent benchmarks and check- ins.

Narragansett School System will approach the Performance Improvement Plan as a response to intervention. The educator will be told of the possibility of eligibility for a plan after observations/ conferences or as a result of the final effectiveness rating at the end of the year.

### **Assistance Tier Timeframe**

Although the purpose of teacher/ support professional evaluation is to promote professional growth, it may be necessary to place a teacher on a Teacher Performance Plan. This will be done when an administrator determines that the teacher/support professional has deficiencies that seriously affect performance relating to the Professional Practice Standards, may be put on a plan at any time during the school year, but must be put on a plan when a teacher/support professional receives a final effectiveness rating of Developing (D) or Ineffective (I). The length of time of the Teacher Performance Plan will vary with each individual.

### ***Purposes:***

- To demonstrate the commitment of the Narragansett School System to the ongoing growth and development of all teachers/support professionals
- To improve the performance of the staff members who have been identified by their administrators as needing assistance in meeting the expectations of the Professional Practice Standards
- To implement a process that is positive and should assist in professional growth
- To fairly assess performance that may result in recommendations related to contract non-renewal

## ***Responsibilities***

The responsibility of the administrator and the teacher/ support professional will be to establish performance criteria for areas in which improvement is needed, state the assistance or resources which will be provided, and appraise performance through regular observation and/or data/evidence collection. Although both parties are still working in a cooperative manner in this situation, when agreement cannot be reached, the administration maintains the responsibility for the statement and selection of goals. The responsibility of meeting those goals and similar expectations will belong to the teacher.

## **Teacher Performance Plan Procedure**

When an administrator's observations and/or evaluation (utilizing the Rhode Island Teacher Evaluation Model) of any teacher/support professional indicates a performance problem, the evaluator will hold a conference to discuss specific concerns and to inform the teacher of the need to be placed on a Teacher/Support Professional Performance Plan.

The teacher/support professional and evaluator will develop a personalized performance plan that states areas of concern and is linked to the specific Professional Practice Standards needing improvement. The plan will state areas of concern and will include specific actions, forms of assistance, and a timeline for completion of the plan. Actions may include course work, readings, workshops or conferences, school or classroom visitations, or other types of activities. The teacher/support professional will compose progress monitoring notes linked to each area of improvement indicating the action and evidence connected to the focus areas. The teacher/support professional and evaluator may identify a support team or mentor to provide specific assistance or support. Other forms of assistance will also be specified as part of the Teacher/ Support Professional Performance Plan.





- Timeline to demonstrate achievement

# Progress Monitoring

(Progress monitoring notes to be completed by teacher and discussed with administrator)

<u>Date</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Evidence</u>

\_\_\_\_\_

Administrator's Signature      Date

\_\_\_\_\_

Teacher's / Support Professional's Signature      Date

## Progress Monitoring (cont 'd)

<u>Date</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>Evidence</u>

---

Administrator's Signature

Date

---

Teacher's / Support Professional's Signature

Date

## Concluding Comments/Recommendations

---

Administrator's Signature

Date

---

Teacher's / Support Professional's Signature

Date



## Narragansett School System Evaluation Appeals Process

Evaluations can be appealed if the final rating result is Developing or Ineffective. If a teacher receives a final rating of Developing or Ineffective he/she can then request an appeal following the process outlined:

1. Once a teacher/support professional receives their Final Summative Rating, he/she may file a written appeal with the building principal within 10 (ten) calendar days of receipt of the Final Summative Rating. A copy of the request for appeal must also be sent to the President and Vice-President of NEA/Narragansett, and the Superintendent of Schools.
2. Once an appeal has been filed, the Final Summative Rating will not be reported to RIDE until the appeal is resolved.
3. The evaluator of the school where the educator is employed must schedule a meeting with the educator, and Union leadership within 5(five) calendar days of receipt of the written appeal. Priority in hearing appeals will be the following: Ineffective then Developing.
4. **Level 1**-As a result of the appeal, the evaluator will:
  - a. Review all data on the evaluation (Announced and Unannounced Observation ratings, Professional Foundations ratings and Student Learning Objective ratings).
  - b. Review all data on the evaluation with the educator (Announced and Unannounced

Observation ratings, Professional Foundations ratings and Student Learning Objective ratings).

19

Offer a resolution, or make a determination as to whether or not any changes will be made to the educator's evaluation and provide a written decision to the educator, Union leadership, and Superintendent within 2 (two) business days of the meeting.

- c. If, after conferencing with the educator, the evaluator believes that changes cannot be made, and a resolution is unsatisfactory, then the educator has the right to appeal the evaluator's decision.

5. If the educator appeals the evaluator's decision, then the appeal will automatically proceed to a Level 2. Within 2 (two) calendar days of receiving the level 1 written decision by the evaluator, the Superintendent of Schools will schedule a meeting with the educator, administrator and Union leadership. This meeting needs to occur within 10 days of the receipt of the appeal. Priority in hearing appeals at this level will be the following: Ineffective then Developing.

6. **Level 2**-As a result of the level 2 appeal, the Superintendent will:

- a. Review all data on the evaluation (Announced and Unannounced Observation ratings, Professional Foundations ratings and Student Learning Objective ratings).
- b. Review all data on the evaluation with the educator and administrator (Announced and Unannounced Observation ratings, Professional Foundations ratings and Student Learning



Objective ratings).

- c. Offer a resolution, or make a determination as to whether or not any changes will be made to the educator's evaluation and provide a written decision to the educator and Union leadership within 2 calendar days of the meeting.

- d. If, after conferencing with the educator, the Superintendent believes that changes cannot be made, and a resolution is unsatisfactory, then the educator has the right to appeal the Superintendent's decision.
7. If the educator appeals the level 2 decision rendered by the Superintendent of Schools, then the appeal will automatically proceed to a level 3. Priority in hearing appeals at this level will be the following: Ineffective then Developing.
  8. **Level 3**-Union leadership will work with NEA/RI to determine a cause of action.
    - a. NEA/RI or Union leadership shall submit a written request for a level 3 appeal hearing within 10 (ten) calendar days of receipt of the Superintendent's Level 2 decision. Priority in hearing appeals at this level will be the following: Ineffective or Developing.
    - b. A level 3 appeal shall be heard by the District Evaluation Committee. The evaluator, educator, and union leadership may be present at the hearing. A ruling will be made by the School Committee or District Evaluation Committee on the appeal within (2) calendar business days of the appeal hearing.
    - c. All level 3 hearings will take place before the start of the next school year.

**The District Evaluation Committee shall:**

- d1. Review all data on the evaluation (Announced and Unannounced Observation ratings, Professional Foundations ratings and Student Learning Objective ratings.)

d2. Review all data on the evaluation with the educator (Announced and Unannounced Observation ratings, Professional Foundations ratings and Student Learning Objective ratings)

d3. Offer a resolution, or make a determination as to whether or not any changes will be made to the educator's evaluation and provide a written decision to the educator, Superintendent, and Union leadership within 2 (two) calendar days of the meeting.

9. If the District Evaluation Committee upholds the evaluation, NEA/RI may appeal the District Evaluation Committee's decision to RIDE (Rhode Island Department of Education).

10. Nothing herein shall limit the right of any teacher to file a grievance concerning his/her evaluation rating.

