# Final Evaluation Conference Summary Sheet

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Teacher’s name** |  | | | |  |  | | | |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **District** |  | | | |  | **School** |  | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Grade level(s)/Subject area(s)** | |  | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Academic year** |  | |  | **Contract level** | | | | |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Evaluation Chair** |  | |  | **Evaluator 2**  **(if applicable)** | | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Evaluator 3**  **(if applicable)** |  | |  |  | | | | | | |

**Observations of Professional Practice**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Overall Domain Score** | **Overall Performance Level**  Exemplary, Proficient,  Needs Improvement, Unsatisfactory |
| **Instruction** |  |  |
| **Planning** |  |  |
| **Environment** |  |  |
| **Professionalism** |  |  |
| **Composite Score**  (*See scoring explanation on reverse)* |  |  |

**Student Learning Objective**

| **Overall Score (1-4)** | **Overall Performance Level** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

**Overall Evaluation Rating**

Exemplary Proficient Needs Improvement Unsatisfactory

**Overall Evaluation Status**

Met Not Met

Teacher Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*By signing, I verify that I have received the results of this evaluation. My signature does not necessarily imply that I agree with these results.*

Evaluation Chair Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator 2 (if applicable) Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator 3 (if applicable) Signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*By signing, I verify that (1) the ADEPT process was properly implemented, (2) I was a full participant in the process, and (3) I am in agreement with the above judgments*

# Overall Evaluation Ratings Worksheet

\*Districts must choose either the consensus or average approach in cases where there are multiple evaluators\*

**Domain Scores**

* **Instruction Domain Score** (*overall score of Instruction indicators*): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* **Planning Domain Score** (*overall score of Planning indicators*): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* **Environment Domain Score** (*overall score of Environment indicators*): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* **Professionalism Domain Score** (*overall score of Professionalism indicators*): \_\_\_\_\_\_

**Domain Weighted Scoring**

*Domain score \* Domain weighting = Domain weighted score*

*Domain weightings: Planning 20%, Instruction 50%, Environment, 20%, Professionalism 10%*

**Domain Weighted Scores**

* Planning \_\_\_\_\_\_
* Instruction \_\_\_\_\_\_
* Environment \_\_\_\_\_\_\_
* Professionalism \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Composite Scoring**

*Sum of domain weighted scores (Planning + Instruction + Environment + Professionalism) =Composite score*

Overall Composite Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

SLO Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*(If SLO score is “4”, increase composite score by 0.25; if SLO score is “1”, decrease composite score by 0.25.)*

Final Overall Composite Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Overall Evaluation Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## Overall Evaluation Ratings

The table below can be used to determine the appropriate rating associated with each composite domain score.

| **Composite Score Range** | **SCTS Ratings** | **Overall Effectiveness Rating** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.00 – 1.24 = 1.0 | Unsatisfactory | Not Met |
| 1.25 – 1.75 = 1.5 | Needs Improvement | Not Met |
| 1.76 – 2.25 = 2.0 | Needs Improvement | Not Met |
| 2.26 – 2.75 = 2.5 | Proficient | Met |
| 2.76 – 3.25 = 3.0 | Proficient | Met |
| 3.26 – 3.75 = 3.5 | Proficient | Met |
| 3.76 – 4.00 = 4.0 | Exemplary | Met |