The purpose of the Network for Educator Effectiveness (NEE) is to facilitate professional growth in educators. NEE has evaluation and growth systems for teachers and other education professionals (e.g., principals, library media specialists, counselors), including speech-language pathologists (SLP).

Three resources are available to assist with implementation of the SLP evaluation and growth system:

1. User Guide
2. SLP Evaluation Worksheet
3. Scoring Guide

Both the SLP Evaluation Worksheet and the Scoring Guide are available on the NEE website at http://nee.missouri.edu/. The User Guide, SLP Evaluation Worksheet, and SLP Scoring Guide may be used by non-member school districts with permission. Permission may be obtained by contacting nee@missouri.edu.

As an evaluator uses the Scoring Guide, scores and feedback are recorded on the Evaluation Worksheet. These would then be entered in the online data tool. The SLP portion of the online data tool is currently in development and scheduled to come online in the 2014-2015 academic year.

This guide takes you through the steps for NEE’s SLP evaluation and growth system. It is intended for use by administrators responsible for evaluation and growth of staff, and SLPs (or Speech Implementers working under the supervision of a credentialed SLP).

**Step 1 – Initial Meeting.** Review the SLP Evaluation Worksheet and SLP Scoring Guide together (i.e., the administrator and SLP).

**Step 2 – Decide on an SLP Evaluation Model.** There are two different models:

*Simple Model* – Use the SLP Evaluation Worksheet as a stand-alone measure. Also, NEE recommends that SLPs complete a Professional Development Plan (PDP) even if this model is chosen because SLPs are expected to set goals for professional growth across the school year.

*Full Model* – Use the SLP Evaluation Worksheet in conjunction with the teacher evaluation system. The SLP can be evaluated in the same way as teachers with only minor modifications. The SLP Evaluation Worksheet replaces the Unit of Instruction; the remaining components of the teacher model could be applied to the SLP. In this model, SLPs may receive evaluation feedback based on classroom observation, student surveys, professional development plans, and student achievement data.
The table below shows the data sources used for the teacher evaluation system, the SLP full model, and the SLP simple model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Evaluation System</th>
<th>SLP Full Model</th>
<th>SLP Simple Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Classroom Observation</td>
<td>Classroom Observation</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student Survey</td>
<td>Student Survey</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional Development Plan</td>
<td>Professional Development Plan</td>
<td>(PDP Recommended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unit of Instruction</td>
<td>SLP Evaluation Worksheet</td>
<td>SLP Evaluation Worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Achievement Data</td>
<td>Student Achievement Data</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 3 – Collect Data.** Use the appropriate scoring guides and templates biannually. The SLP evaluation system is based on national standards from the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA).

**Step 4 – Enter Data.** NEE provides an online database tool capable of generating annual summative reports.

**Step 5 – Provide Feedback.** The evaluator should provide feedback to the SLP at least twice per year. The SLP evaluation system provides opportunities for feedback conversations between the SLP and the evaluator at the beginning and end of the school year. The SLP evaluation system includes input from the SLP because school administrators charged with evaluating and supporting an SLP may not fully understand the role of an SLP. **It is important to provide high-quality feedback.** An evaluator’s feedback has significant impact on performance. Research shows effective feedback:

- Is frequent.
- Is face to face.
- Links performance to subsequent training.
- Compares the current score with the goal, and outlines the steps needed to reach the goal. Identifies gaps between current behavior and desired behavior with clear correct solutions.
- Focuses on behavior and not the person. If feedback strays from behavior to the person, it slows growth.
- Breaks down the multiple tasks involved in teaching to specific tasks.
- Focuses on standards and describes specific observations so that evaluators and educators identify strengths and weaknesses and together decide how to improve performance.
- Includes areas needing growth. If only positive feedback is given, it actually slows or stops growth.

**Step 6 – Access Professional Growth Resources.** The SLP accesses resources for professional growth in areas tailored for each individual, based on data collected in Step 3. The purpose of NEE is to promote growth and support professional development. To facilitate these activities, NEE’s online database tool links to online resources at EdHub. EdHub is a system of learning modules designed to support the professional growth of educators, based on their individual needs. ASHA, found online at [http://www.asha.org/](http://www.asha.org/), may also be referenced for professional development resources.
There is a strong push from the US Department of Education (DoED) for states to create teacher evaluation systems. In 2010, members of the University of Missouri’s College of Education decided to create a system that was fair, teacher-friendly, focused on the promotion of growth, and helpful to principals to develop the skills to support teachers in becoming their best professional selves. This system is the Network for Educator Effectiveness (NEE).

NEE focuses on one simple goal: Effective teachers in every classroom led and supported by effective leaders in every school. While schools across Missouri have many talented teachers, all educators can improve as professionals. NEE is a comprehensive system designed to provide useful feedback with focused support to help teachers and administrators improve on an individual basis.

At the same time in 2010, the State of Missouri passed Senate Bill 291, directing Missouri school districts to adopt teaching standards, with each board of education responsible for adopting standards. The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) developed model standards that school districts could use as a starting point. The Missouri Model Teacher Standards build on research-based practices and are aligned with the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Standards created by the Council of Chief State School Officers. There are nine broad standards that are divided into 36 specific indicators.

NEE members use five sources of data to measure educator performance on these 36 indicators:

1. Classroom observations
2. Units of instruction
3. Professional development plans
4. Student surveys
5. Student achievement data (still in development)

Scoring rubrics were developed based on the Missouri Model Teacher Standards. Principals are trained to use the rubrics and provide feedback to teachers that is genuinely useful. Teachers are given professional development resources tied to their individual needs for growth.

As NEE was developing, additional federal and state policies were enacted. The ESEA Waiver Agreement between DESE and the DoED stipulated that all school districts in Missouri review their current teacher evaluation system and ensure that it have seven essential components. These are:

1. System is aligned to research-based performance targets
2. System includes a minimum of 3 performance levels (ideally 4 or maybe 5)
3. System highlights the importance of probationary period
   a. Includes multiple observations/evaluations and deliberate feedback
4. System uses student performance measures and evidence of student learning
   a. As a “preponderant” criterion, it “significantly” informs evaluation
5. System provides ongoing, regular, timely and meaningful feedback for all
   a. Everyone at every level grows every year
6. System includes ongoing training for evaluators to ensure rating reliability
7. System uses results/data to inform personnel decisions, determinations and policy
   a. Identifies who is in need of targeted interventions (includes timeframes)
   b. Identifies who has earned recognition, tenure and/or compensation

NEE fully meets the requirements of the ESEA Waiver Agreement, so member districts are assured of compliance. NEE is available to any Missouri school district. The program now has over 200 member districts with more enrolling regularly.

There are six significant differences between typical evaluation practices of the past and the new NEE.

1. In the past, consistency or reliability of evaluators was not routinely checked. Many evaluators never received formal training. In contrast, NEE requires evaluators to pass an exam on each of the system measures prior to gaining access to the system. Then, evaluators are required to recertify each summer to continue use of the system.

2. In the past, evaluation results were loosely connected or not connected at all to professional development activities of the individual. Consequently, the effect of professional development on instruction was not used in the evaluation process. In contrast, NEE makes the execution of the professional development plan and the impact on student learning part of the evaluation process.

3. In the past, educators were placed in broad categories, such as “Does not Meet Expectations”, “Meets Expectations”, or “Exceeds Expectations.” Use of such broad categories is uninformative because they are ill-defined. In addition, broad categories are not adequately sensitive to show incremental growth. In contrast, NEE uses a numeric system in which scores are tied to specific benchmark behaviors separately for each indicator the school is prioritizing (typically 4 to 6). Thus, scores are informative, and growth is detected.

4. In the past, evaluations were largely based on limited observations of just some teachers (with observations occurring no more frequently than once or twice a year). In contrast, NEE asks evaluators to observe all teachers 8 to 10 times per year, for brief, unannounced visits. This provides a better picture of what is actually happening in classrooms, and facilitates informed feedback.

5. In contrast to the past, NEE employs multiple sources of data in addition to classroom observation. Multiple measures provide a better picture of teaching effectiveness. Well-designed scoring guides that are clear and precise are used.

6. In the past, evaluation results were not directly linked to professional development resources. In contrast, after evaluators enter data into the NEE online database, NEE automatically provides links to professional development resources targeted at the specific indicators each educator needs growth in. The professional development activities are 6 to 8 weeks duration and include regional and state-level conferences/workshops, online resources, and print materials. They are tied to specific performance levels on each indicator, similar to the Response to Intervention (RtI) process used with students.
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