

# Mid-State Special Education Evaluation Plan for Non-Teaching Speech Language Pathologists



**Mid-State Speech-Language Evaluation Committee:**

Angela Armour, Assistant Director

Lyn Becker, Program Coordinator

Brandy Buske, Program Coordinator

Jamie Garrett, Christian Region SLP

Emily Repscher, Christian Region SLP

Crystal Schmidt, Montgomery County/Carlinville Region SLP

Myra Tosh, Montgomery County/Carlinville Region SLP

Non-Teaching Speech-Language Pathologists (SLPs) employed by the Region of Mid-State Special Education, through the Legal and Fiscal Agent Mid-State Special Education Joint Agreement, will be evaluated according to this "Evaluation Plan for Non-Teaching Speech-Language Pathologists" by an administrator who is qualified and is responsible for the evaluation of the certified employees assigned to the Region. Additional input and observation may be made by member district and joint agreement administrators who are qualified to evaluate. Evaluations are based upon the cumulative evidence of the SLPs performance gathered from the date of the previous evaluation through the date of the current evaluation.

### **Philosophy of the Plan**

This evaluation plan models all domains and critical attributes after Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2007) and the American Speech-Language Hearing Association's Performance Assessment of Contributions and Effectiveness of Speech-Language Pathologists (PACE, 2012). This plan seeks to use this rubric to define effective practice, encourage conversations about therapy, and identify areas for professional growth.

### **Statement of Purpose**

Mid-State Special Education and its member districts will conduct continuous evaluation of the professional performance of all licensed employees. The primary goals of the evaluation process are to:

1. improve the quality instruction and performance of staff to enhance student learning as defined in the professional competencies;
2. enrich therapy by identifying certified employees' strengths and weaknesses and to provide assistance for improvement;
3. encourage staff to reflect upon their practice and continually improve their performance;
4. create positive attitudes toward the purposes and value of appraisal and professional development;
5. collect reliable and varied data for making employment decisions.

### **Identification of Evaluators**

The Mid-State Special Education Assistant Director and Program Coordinators are qualified and are responsible for the evaluation of speech/language pathologists assigned to the Region. Other qualified member district and joint agreement evaluators may be contributors to evaluations.

### **Description/Standards of Performance**

Mid-State Special Education presently employs licensed SLPs for the following job classifications: Speech/Language Pathologist. Each SLP is expected to achieve a "proficient" or "excellent" summative rating (Appendix A: Summative Evaluation Report). The procedures set forth in the Illinois School Code (105 ILCS 24A-5) will be followed for a tenured certified employee receiving a rating of "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory."

### **Evaluation Schedule**

Tenured SLPs: The performance of tenured licensed region employees in contractual continued service will be evaluated at least once in the course of every two school years. For tenured SLPs who received an "excellent" or "proficient" on his or her last summative performance evaluation, each professional practice rating will be based upon a minimum of two observations during the cycle, one of which must be a formal observation. Each tenured SLP who received a "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" rating in his or her last summative performance evaluation must be evaluated at least once in the school year following the receipt of such rating. A minimum of three observations shall be required, two of which must be formal observations.

Non-Tenured SLPs: The performance of each SLP not in contractual continued service will be evaluated at least once every school year. A minimum of three observations shall be required two of which must be formal.

Part-Time SLPs: SLPs who work less than full-time and who have received a proficient or excellent rating on their two most recent evaluations will follow the evaluation schedule for tenured teachers.

The administration reserves the right to evaluate any licensed employee at any time.

## **Evaluation Performance Areas**

The primary focus of evaluation is the continual improvement of the quality of instruction to improve student learning. This evaluation process requires speech language pathologists to meet or exceed expectations in the following areas of professional responsibility:

### Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

The components in Domain 1 describe how a SLP prepares for and organizes the content that the students are to learn—how the SLP *designs* instruction. This domain relies on the knowledge and skill of the SLP in school-based therapy as well as the knowledge of the individual students. Setting therapeutic outcomes, knowledge of resources, and accessing materials are required for designing effective therapeutic interventions for individual children. The components of Domain 1 are demonstrated through the plans that SLPs prepare to guide their therapy.

### Domain 2: Environment

The components of Domain 2 establish a comfortable and respectful therapeutic environment that cultivates a culture for learning and creates a safe place for risk taking. It consists of the non-instructional routines and procedures being handled efficiently, student behavior that is cooperative and non-disruptive, and a physical environment that supports instruction. The components of Domain 2 are demonstrated through therapeutic interaction and are observable.

### Domain 3: Instruction/Delivery of Service

The components contained in Domain 3 are those that actually engage students in the content which enhances student learning. SLPs demonstrate, through their instructional skills, that they can successfully implement their therapy plans. Their students are engaged in meaningful work. The therapist's work during the session is fluid and flexible. The therapist's questions probe student thinking and extend understanding, and she or he carefully monitors student understanding. The SLP consistently collects and interprets assessment information making the necessary changes in the treatment plan when needed. The components of Domain 3 are demonstrated through therapeutic interaction and are observable.

### Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

The components in Domain 4 encompass the professional educator's roles outside of and in addition to those demonstrated during therapy. These professional responsibilities include self-reflection and professional growth, interactions with families and the community, maintenance of records and accuracy of paperwork, demonstrating integrity, advocating for students, and maintaining confidentiality. It is through the skills of Domain 4 that highly professional educators distinguish themselves. The components of Domain 4 are demonstrated through observations of interactions with colleagues, families, other professionals, and the larger community as well as artifacts.

(Excerpts and summaries taken from *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* by Charlotte Danielson.)

## **Evaluation Process**

The evaluation of licensed staff performance will be conducted in accordance with state law, board policy, and professional agreement. At the start of the school term, each SLP will be provided specific, written notice regarding the performance evaluation. Before any formal evaluation takes place, an administrator will acquaint licensed staff members with the evaluation procedures and the Speech-Language Pathologist Rubric (Appendix B). Each summative evaluation will be based upon at least one announced formal classroom observation and will include additional information compiled from informal and/or unannounced observations by administrator(s) since the last summative evaluation. Evidence gathered during informal observation may be considered in determining the performance evaluation rating, provided it is documented in writing and the SLP is provided the opportunity to have an in-person discussion with the evaluator. Any evidence collected during an observation shall be consistent with the evaluation rubric. The summative evaluation will include consideration of the certified employee's attendance, planning, instructional methods, classroom management, and competency in the subject matter taught as well as specify the employee's strengths and weaknesses (105 ILCS 5/24A-5). Conferences/meetings may be conducted electronically or in person.

### Pre-observation conference

A pre-observation conference will be conducted prior to each formal observation. In advance of this conference, the SLP shall submit a written lesson or therapy plan and/or other evidence of planning for the instruction during the window of time when the formal observation may occur and make recommendations for the areas on which the qualified evaluator should focus during the observation. In addition, the purpose of this conference will be to:

- discuss the lesson or therapy plan and any areas the evaluator should focus on during the observation, if applicable.
- discuss evaluative criteria listed on the evaluation form and share evidence related to the evaluative criteria;
- discuss the assignment(s) and the make-up of the group;
- discuss the pre-observation worksheet;
- discuss other pertinent information, including artifact collection;
- confirm the formal observation date and time.

### Formal Observation

A formal observation allows the evaluator to acquire evidence of the SLPs planning, delivery of therapy, and classroom management skills. It involves one of the following activities: observation of the SLP for at least 45 minutes at a time; or an observation during a complete lesson; or an observation during an entire class period. Formal observations will be conducted after the first two weeks of student attendance at the start of the school year.

### Post-Observation Conference(s)

A post-observation conference will be held following a formal observation. The purpose of this conference will be to:

- discuss the post-observation reflection worksheet in which the SLP reflects upon instruction and, if applicable, may provide additional information of explanations about the lesson presented;
- discuss the evidence collected following the observation and judgements made about the evidence;
- identify instructional and classroom management behaviors that promoted engaged learning and to discuss why they were effective;
- discuss alternatives to behaviors which did not produce the desired instructional and/or behavioral outcomes;
- notify the SLP if the evaluator determines that evidence collected to date may result in either a “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” performance evaluation rating;
- discuss goal setting and continued professional growth.

### Summative Evaluation Conference

The summative evaluation review may occur during the post-observation conference or at a subsequent conference. The Summative Evaluation Report (Appendix B) will be completed by the evaluator and will include the cumulative evidence of the certified employee’s performance gathered from the date of the previous summative evaluation through the date of the current evaluation. It will include information obtained from informal and formal observations as well as evidence provided by the SLP. It may also include observations, evidence, and recommendations provided by other member district and joint agreement administrator(s) who are qualified evaluators. Both the evaluator and employee will sign the evaluation report. The employee’s signature indicates only that the evaluation has been reviewed and discussed. An employee may submit additional comments to the written evaluation if he or she so desires. A copy of the Summative Evaluation Report will be provided to the certified employee and placed in the personnel file.

If a Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory Summative Performance Evaluation Rating is the resulting rating for any SLP, the Illinois Administrative Code 105 ILCS 5/24A-5 and 105 ILCS 5/34-85 will be followed. Professional development will be provided as determined in the Professional Development Plan or Remediation Plan.

### **Summative Evaluation Rating Categories**

**Excellent:** The speech-language pathologist’s professional performance clearly exceeds the normal expectations and is noticeably distinguished. The employee is able to take on extra projects and tasks, anticipate problems and take appropriate actions, requires minimal direction, and seeks continual improvement. The speech/language pathologist is rated “excellent” in the majority of the elements on the Summative Evaluation Report with no “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” ratings.

**Proficient:** The speech-language pathologist’s performance is successful and professional therapy is consistently at a high level, clearly meeting the expectations of the position. It would be expected that most experienced SLPs would frequently perform at this level. The speech-language pathologist is rated “proficient” in most elements with no more than three “needs improvement” and no “unsatisfactory” ratings.

**Needs Improvement:** The speech-language pathologist’s performance is at a basic level and below professional expectations. Enhancement of skills and/or consistent performance is necessary. The speech-language pathologist has met some components but has a total of four or more “needs improvement” and no more than four “unsatisfactory” ratings.

**Unsatisfactory:** The speech-language pathologist’s performance does not meet the job expectations for professional staff. Improvement is required. The speech-language pathologist has five or more elements rated as “unsatisfactory.”

**Note:** The failure by the employer to strictly adhere to the procedures or procedural timelines contained in this Plan shall not invalidate or have a negative effect on the substantive evaluation received by the employee.

### **Appendices**

Appendix A: Speech-Language Pathologist Rubric

Appendix B: Summative Evaluation Report

# EVALUATION RUBRIC

## Speech Pathologist

### Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

---

#### 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge and Skill in School-Based Speech-Language Pathology

##### Unsatisfactory

In planning and practice, educator makes content errors or does not correct errors made by students. Educator's plans and practice display little understanding of prerequisite relationships important to student learning of the content. Educator's plans and practice display little knowledge of the instructional practices specific to Speech-Language interventions which would address social, communication, academic and/or behavioral student goals.

##### Needs Improvement

Educator is familiar with the important concepts in the discipline but displays lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another. Educator's plans and practice reflect a limited range of therapeutic approaches and Speech-Language interventions which would address social, communication, academic and/or behavioral student goals. Educator demonstrates familiarity with the Scope of Practice as outlined by ASHA.

##### Proficient

Educator's plans and practice reflect solid knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate to one another. Educator's plans and practice reflect accurate understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts. Educator's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective therapeutic approaches and Speech-Language interventions. Educator demonstrates a fluent understanding of the Scope of Practice as outlined by ASHA.

##### Distinguished

Educator displays extensive knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate both to one another and to other disciplines. Educator's plans and practice reflect understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts and a link to necessary cognitive structures by students to ensure understanding. Educator's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective therapeutic approaches in the discipline. Educator actively seeks out new knowledge, incorporates new interventions into their practice and shares this knowledge collaboratively with team members.

#### 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students

##### Unsatisfactory

The educator demonstrates little or no knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, and does not seek such understanding. The educator demonstrates little or no knowledge of typical and atypical development and of students' skills and needs in communication, motor, social/emotional and cognitive/academic domain areas.

##### Needs Improvement

The educator indicates the importance of understanding students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs, but inconsistently gathers and uses this knowledge for designing instruction. The educator demonstrates foundational knowledge of typical and atypical development and of students' skills and needs in communication, motor, social/emotional and cognitive/academic domain areas.

##### Proficient

The educator actively seeks knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs from a variety of sources, and attains this knowledge in order to design instruction. The educator demonstrates strong knowledge of typical and atypical development and of students' skills and needs in developmental domain areas, and consistently attempts to apply this knowledge in developing instruction.

##### Distinguished

The educator actively seeks knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special needs from a variety of sources, and attains this knowledge in order to design instruction and promotes student advocacy and independence. The educator demonstrates intricate knowledge of typical and atypical development and of students' skills and needs in developmental domain areas, and successfully applies this knowledge to developing instruction and to expand student's learning

opportunities.

## **1c: Setting Therapeutic Outcomes**

### **Unsatisfactory**

Therapeutic goals are unsuitable for students, lack measure for progress, represent minimal or low-level learning, or are stated only as activities without correlation to the established objectives within student educational programs. They do not permit appropriate methods of assessment designed to measure student performance.

### **Needs Improvement**

Therapeutic goals may not all be measurable, of moderate rigor and are suitable for some students, but do not incorporate the needs of all students involved in the instruction. The plans consist of a combination of activities and goals, some of which permit viable methods of assessment. They reflect more than one type of learning, but the educator has minimal knowledge of skill acquisition or pedagogy.

### **Proficient**

Instructional outcomes are stated as measurable therapeutic goals reflecting high-level learning, curriculum standards, and progression of skills. They are individualized, utilize a multi-model approach, and can be assessed with integrity given the educational needs of the students.

### **Distinguished**

Instructional outcomes are stated as measurable therapeutic goals that reflect rigorous expectations. Therapeutic goals address a progression of skills that leads to skill generalization and student ownership for learning. Goals are individualized, utilize a multi-model approach, enhance student independence and can be assessed with integrity given the educational needs of the students.

## **1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources**

### **Unsatisfactory**

Educator demonstrates little or no familiarity with resources to enhance instruction. Educator does not seek such knowledge.

### **Needs Improvement**

Educator demonstrates basic knowledge of resources available through the school or district but is inconsistent in using resources to inform educational practice or to accommodate student learning. Educator does not seek to extend such knowledge.

### **Proficient**

Educator is fully aware of the resources available through the school and district to enhance instructional knowledge, to use in teaching, in consultation, or to accommodate student learning. Educator uses resources to provide interventions that increase student performance. Educator shows solid knowledge of speech-language resources available at a district, state and federal level and regularly disseminates these resources to parents, teachers and staff.

### **Distinguished**

Educator seeks out resources in and beyond the school or district (in professional organizations, on the Internet, and in the community) to enhance instructional knowledge, to use in teaching, consultation, or for accommodating student learning. Educator shares found resources with parents, educators, outside therapists and support staff working with students with communication impairments. Educator acts as an advocate and a resource for district, state and federal regulations or guidelines related to the field of speech language pathology.

## **1e: Designing Speech-Language Therapy Interventions**

### **Unsatisfactory**

The series of learning experiences is poorly aligned with IEP and programmatic goals, and does not represent a coherent structure. The activities and are not designed to engage students in active intellectual activity and have unrealistic time allocations. Instructional groups do not support the instructional outcomes and offer no variety. Speech-Language therapy interventions are rarely designed in collaboration with the educational team.

### **Needs Improvement**

Some of the learning activities and materials are suitable to the IEP and programmatic goals, and represent a moderate cognitive challenge, but with no differentiation for different students. Instructional groups partially support the instructional outcomes, with an

effort at providing some variety. The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure; the progression of activities is uneven, with most time allocations reasonable. . Speech-Language therapy interventions are sometimes designed in collaboration with the educational team.

### **Proficient**

Educator coordinates knowledge of content, of students, and of resources, to design a series of learning experiences aligned to IEP and programmatic goals which are suitable to different groups of students. The learning activities have reasonable time allocations; they represent significant cognitive challenge, with some differentiation for different groups of students. The lesson or unit has a clear structure with appropriate and varied use of instructional groups. Speech-Language therapy interventions are usually designed in collaboration with the educational team.

### **Distinguished**

Plans represent the coordination of in-depth content knowledge, understanding of different students' needs and available resources (including technology), resulting in a series of learning activities designed to engage students in high-level cognitive activity. These are differentiated, as appropriate, for individual learners. Instructional groups are varied as appropriate, with some opportunity for student choice. The lesson's or unit's structure is clear and allows for different pathways according to diverse student needs. Speech-Language therapy interventions are consistently designed in collaboration with the educational team.

## **1f: Designing Speech-Language Assessments**

### **Unsatisfactory**

Assessment procedures are not congruent with instructional outcomes; the proposed approach contains no criteria or standards. Educator has no plan to incorporate formative assessment in the lesson or unit, nor any plans to use assessment results in designing future instruction. The results of assessment have minimal impact on the design of future instruction. The educator does not select or design assessment instruments that are relevant, valid and reliable.

### **Needs Improvement**

Some of the instructional outcomes are assessed through the proposed approach, but others are not. Assessment criteria and standards have been developed, but they are not clear. Approach to the use of formative assessment is rudimentary, including only some of the instructional outcomes. Educator intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for the class as a whole. The educator inconsistently selects or designs assessment instruments that are relevant, valid and reliable.

### **Proficient**

Educator's plan for student assessment is aligned with the instructional outcomes; assessment methodologies may have been adapted for groups of students. Assessment criteria and standards are clear. Educator has a well-developed strategy for using formative assessment and has designed particular approaches to be used. Educator intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for groups of students. The educator typically selects or designs assessment instruments that are relevant, valid and reliable.

### **Distinguished**

Educator's plan for student assessment is fully aligned with the instructional outcomes, with clear criteria and standards that show evidence of student contribution to their development. Assessment methodologies have been adapted for individual students, as needed. The approach to using formative assessment is well designed and includes student as well as educator use of the assessment information. Educator intends to use assessment results to plan future instruction for individual students. The educator is fluent in selecting and designing assessment instruments that are relevant, valid and reliable.

## **Domain 2: The Environment**

---

### **2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the educator and students and among students, are mostly negative, inappropriate, or insensitive to students' ages, cultural backgrounds, and developmental levels. Interactions are characterized by sarcasm, put-downs, or conflict. Educator does not deal with disrespectful behavior.

#### **Needs Improvement**

Patterns of classroom interactions, both between the educator and students and among students, are generally appropriate but may



reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, and disregard for students' ages, cultures, and developmental levels. Students rarely demonstrate disrespect for one another. Educator attempts to respond to disrespectful behavior, with uneven results. The net result of the interactions is neutral: conveying neither warmth nor conflict.

### **Proficient**

The therapist establishes rapport through positive verbal and nonverbal exchanges. Student/therapist interactions are respectful, reflecting warmth and caring and are culturally and developmentally appropriate. Students exhibit respect for the educator.

Interactions among students are generally polite and respectful. Educator responds successfully to disrespectful behavior among students.

The net result of the interactions is polite and respectful, but business-like.

### **Distinguished**

Classroom interactions among the educator and individual students are highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring and sensitivity to students as individuals. Students exhibit respect for the educator and contribute to high levels of civility among all members of the class. The net result of interactions is that of connections with students as individuals

## **2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning**

### **Unsatisfactory**

The educator creates or allows a negative culture for learning, characterized by low commitment to the subject, low expectations for student achievement, and little or no student ownership.

### **Needs Improvement**

The educator creates a culture for learning that is partially successful, with little commitment to the subject, modest expectations for student achievement, and minimal student ownership.

### **Proficient**

The educator creates a culture that is characterized by high expectations for all students and a genuine commitment to the subject by both the educator and students, with students demonstrating ownership. Student expression / communication / participation is encouraged and elicited.

### **Distinguished**

The educator creates a culture for learning in which everyone shares a belief in the importance of the subject and all students hold themselves to high standards of performance. Student expression / communication / participation is encouraged and elicited, and the educator provides a system or structure to enable students to encourage expression amongst themselves to the best of their ability.

## **2c: Managing Therapeutic Procedures**

### **Unsatisfactory**

Therapeutic time is minimal due to inefficient or nonexistent instructional routines; procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, student grouping and performance of non-instructional duties.

### **Needs Improvement**

Therapeutic time is inefficient due to inconsistent instructional routines; procedures for transitions, handling of supplies, student grouping and performance of non-instructional duties.

### **Proficient**

Therapeutic time is efficient due to established instructional routines, efficient procedures for transitions, organized handling of supplies, student grouping and execution of non-instructional duties.

### **Distinguished**

Therapeutic time is maximized as a result of established instructional routines, efficient procedures for transitions, organized handling of supplies, and execution of non-instructional duties incorporating and teaching student participation. Sessions across student populations and programs are scheduled, organized and designed to promote predictable structure, smooth transitions, generalization of skills and student independence.

## **2d: Managing Student Behavior**

### **Unsatisfactory**

The educator has no clear standards of student conduct and there is little or no monitoring of students' behavior. The educator's response to challenging student behavior is repressive and/or disrespectful of student dignity.

### **Needs Improvement**

The educator tries, with uneven results, to monitor student conduct and respond to challenging student behavior. Behavior intervention plans and systems are implemented inconsistently. Expectations are developed but not clearly or consistently defined for staff and students.

### **Proficient**

The educator has clear standards of student conduct and monitor behaviors in accordance with classroom expectations and behavior intervention plans. The educator responds to student misbehavior appropriately and in a dignified manner.

Educator's response to challenging student behavior reflects understanding of the communicative function of students' behaviors and of the problem solving process.

### **Distinguished**

The educator has clear standards of student conduct and monitors behaviors in accordance with classroom expectations and behavior intervention plans. The educator responds to challenging student behavior appropriately and in a dignified manner.

Educator's response to challenging student behavior reflects understanding of the communicative function of students' behaviors and of the problem solving process.

The educator reflects and processes with the student and colleagues and adapts instruction per data and to promote student ownership of their behavior.

The educator actively teaches students to manage their own behaviors to the best of their ability.

## **2e: Organizing Physical Space**

### **Unsatisfactory**

The physical space is unsafe, or many students don't have access to learning. There is poor alignment between the arrangement of furniture and resources, including computer technology, and the lesson activities.

Educator makes little or no effort to document unsafe environments or advocate for improvements.

### **Needs Improvement**

The physical space is safe, and essential learning is accessible to most students, The educator's use of physical resources, including computer technology, is moderately effective. Educator may attempt to modify the student placement or physical arrangement to suit learning activities, with partial success.

Educator's efforts to document unsafe environments or advocate for improvements is partly successful.

### **Proficient**

The physical space is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; educator ensures that student placement and the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities. Educator makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology.

Educator's efforts to document unsafe environments or advocate for improvements is effective.

### **Distinguished**

The physical space is safe, and learning is accessible to all students including those with individual needs. Educator makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology. The educator ensures that student placement and the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities. Students contribute to the use or adaptation of the physical environment to advance learning.

Educator engages all team members in efforts to document unsafe environments or advocate for improvements.

## **Domain 3: Delivery of Service**

---

### **3a: Communicating with Students**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

Expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of content are unclear or confusing to students. The educator's use of language contains errors or is inappropriate for students' cultures, age or developmental level. Educator displays little or no effort to use communication modalities and systems that are accessible to all students.

#### **Needs Improvement**

Expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of content are clarified after initial confusion; the educator's use of language is correct, but may not be completely appropriate for students' cultures, age, and functioning level. Educator makes an inconsistent effort to use communication modalities and systems that are accessible to all students.

#### **Proficient**

Expectations for learning, directions and procedures, and explanations of content are clear to students. Communication is appropriate to students' cultures, age, and functioning level. Educator consistently models and utilizes communication modalities and systems that are accessible to all students.

#### **Distinguished**

Educator's explanation of content is thorough and clear, developing conceptual understanding through artful scaffolding and connecting with students' interests. Students contribute to extending the content, and in explaining concepts to their classmates. Educator's spoken and written language is expressive, and the educator finds opportunities to extend students' vocabularies. Educator consistently models and utilizes communication modalities and systems that are accessible to all students. Educator ensures that students' communication modalities and systems are accessible to that student in their broader community.

### **3b: Implementing Therapeutic Interventions**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

The educator's questions are not appropriate for the students' functioning levels, resulting in limited student participation, and encouraging recitation rather than discussion. Students are not provided access to the communication modalities or systems aligned with their abilities, preventing student participation.

#### **Needs Improvement**

Some of the educator's questions elicit a thoughtful response extending student understanding to a more advanced level, but most are low-level. The educator's attempts to engage students in the discussion are partially successful. Students are provided with inconsistent access to the communication modalities or systems aligned with their abilities, resulting in limited student participation.

#### **Proficient**

Most of the educator's questions have been targeted to extend student performance and the educator allows sufficient time for student(s) to answer. Student participation in the discussion has been extended to attain educational objectives, with the educator stepping aside to encourage independent performance as appropriate. Students are consistently provided with access to communication modalities or systems aligned with their abilities, resulting in active student participation.

#### **Distinguished**

Questions reflect high expectations and are culturally and developmentally appropriate as aligned with student functioning levels. Student(s) participate in formulating many of the high-level questions with diminishing levels of support. Educator demonstrates fluency in using a variety of communication modalities and systems, resulting in active student participation. Educator provides students with opportunities to demonstrate and share their alternate modalities and communication systems with others in their broader community.

### **3c: Engaging Students in Therapy**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

The learning tasks and activities, materials, resources, instructional groups and technology are poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes, or require only rote responses. The pace of the lesson is too slow or rushed. Lessons have not been adapted to ensure

comprehension. Few students are intellectually engaged or interested.

#### **Needs Improvement**

The learning tasks and activities are partially aligned with the instructional outcomes but require only minimal thinking by students, allowing most students to be passive or merely compliant. The pacing of the lesson may not provide students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.

#### **Proficient**

The learning tasks and activities are aligned with the instructional outcomes and are designed to challenge student thinking, resulting in active intellectual engagement by most students with important and challenging content, and with educator scaffolding to support that engagement. The pacing of the lesson is appropriate, providing most students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.

#### **Distinguished**

Virtually all students are intellectually engaged in challenging content through well-designed learning tasks and suitable scaffolding by the educator. Learning tasks and activities are fully aligned with the instructional outcomes. In addition, there is evidence of some student initiation of inquiry, and student contributions to the exploration of important content. The pacing of the lesson provides students the time needed to intellectually engage with and reflect upon their learning, and to consolidate their understanding.

Students may have some choice in how they complete tasks and may serve as resources for one another.

### **3d: Using Assessment in Therapy**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

Assessment is not used in instruction, either through monitoring of progress by the educator and/or students, or feedback to students. Students are not aware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work. Educator shows little knowledge of or fluency with formal evaluation tools used to measure specific communication skills. Educator rarely shares progress with students, family and staff. Therapeutic plan does not reflect information gained through the evaluation process.

#### **Needs Improvement**

Assessment is occasionally used in instruction, through some monitoring of progress of learning by the educator and/or students. Feedback to students is uneven, and students are aware of only some of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work. Educator shows some knowledge of formal evaluation tools used to measure specific communication skills. Educator sometimes shares progress with students, family and staff but does not do so in a consistent manner. Therapeutic plan inconsistently reflects information gained through the evaluation process.

#### **Proficient**

Assessment is regularly used in instruction, through self-assessment by students, monitoring of progress of learning by the educator and/or students, and high-quality feedback to students. Students are fully aware of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work. Educator shows solid knowledge of formal evaluation tools used to measure specific communication skills. Educator often shares progress with students, family and staff. Therapeutic plan consistently reflects information gained through the evaluation process.

#### **Distinguished**

Assessment is used in a sophisticated manner throughout instruction with student involvement in establishing the assessment criteria, self-assessment by students, monitoring of progress by both students and the educator, and high-quality feedback to students from a variety of sources. Educator shows extensive knowledge of formal evaluation tools used to measure specific communication skills. Educator systematically shares progress with students, family and staff. Therapeutic plan consistently reflects information gained through the evaluation process. Educator actively evaluates new tools as they come available.

### **3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

The educator is unable to determine when a change is needed in instruction. The educator does not respond to students' individual needs. Educator may blame environmental or other sources to explain a student's lack of progress.

#### **Needs Improvement**

The educator attempts to modify the lesson when needed and is responsive to student questions, with moderate success. The educator accepts responsibility for student success, but has only a limited repertoire of strategies to draw upon when flexibility of

instruction is necessary.

### **Proficient**

The educator promotes the successful learning of all students, making adjustments as needed to instruction plans and accommodating student questions, needs, and interests. The educator consistently adapts instruction based on student response, and demonstrates flexibility and responsiveness to team members during service delivery.

### **Distinguished**

The educator seizes an opportunity to enhance learning, building on a spontaneous event or student interests. The educator ensures the success of all students, using an extensive repertoire of therapeutic techniques. The educator fluently and seamlessly adapts instruction based on student response. The educator demonstrates flexibility and responsiveness to team members during service delivery, and makes necessary adjustments to accommodate ongoing and changing needs of both students and staff.

## **Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities**

---

### **4a: Reflection on Practice**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

The educator does not accurately assess the effectiveness of the practice and has few or no ideas about how the lesson could be improved. The educator does not attempt to review or improve future practice.

#### **Needs Improvement**

The educator provides a partially accurate and objective description of the lesson, but does not cite specific evidence. The educator makes some general suggestions as to how the lesson might be improved. The educator attempts to review or improve student / therapist interactions with inconsistent accuracy and success.

#### **Proficient**

The educator provides an accurate and objective description of the lesson, citing specific evidence. Educator makes specific suggestions as to how the lesson might be improved. The educator makes consistent, clear attempts to review or improve student / therapist interactions with general success.

#### **Distinguished**

The educator's reflection on the lesson is thoughtful and accurate, citing specific evidence. Educator draws on an extensive repertoire to suggest alternative strategies and predicting the likely success of each instructional objective. The educator makes consistent, clear and insightful attempts to review or student/therapist interactions, leading to deeper connections and increased student independence and understanding.

### **4b: Maintaining Accurate Records**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

The educator's systems for maintaining records are either nonexistent or in disorganized, resulting in errors and unsupported outcomes in IEP management.

#### **Needs Improvement**

The educator's systems for maintaining records contains some errors, is inefficient and timelines have been inconsistently met. Data is lacking for monitoring all aspects of student's performance.

#### **Proficient**

The educator's systems for maintaining records are accurate, efficient and timely. Student performance is data driven and consistently monitored.

#### **Distinguished**

The educator's systems for maintaining records are accurate, efficient, and timely. The educator makes decisions regarding future instruction that are relevant to the data collected. Student performance is data driven and consistently monitored. Students contribute to data collection in measurement of their educational performance as appropriate.

### **4c: Communicating and Collaborating with Stakeholders: Team Members, Administrators, District**

## **Personnel, and Families**

### **Unsatisfactory**

The educators' communication/collaboration with all stakeholders around data, resources, assessments, programming, IEP planning is non-existent or not timely. The educator does not follow up on tasks assigned and/or fails to follow through on agreed plans. The educator makes no attempt to engage families in the educational process.

### **Needs Improvement**

The educators' communication/collaboration with all stakeholders around data, resources, assessments, programming, IEP planning is sporadic. The educator's communication is unproductive or irrelevant. The educator demonstrates inconsistent follow up on agreed upon timelines and/or plans.

The educator provides information inconsistently to families.

### **Proficient**

The educators engages in frequent and productive communication/collaboration with all stakeholders around data, resources, assessments, programming, and IEP planning. The educator takes an active role in problem solving and team dialogue.

The educator's communication is clear, concise, and relevant. The educator's engages families frequently.

### **Distinguished**

The educator engages in frequent and productive communication with all stakeholders around data, resources, assessments, programming, and IEP planning. The educator's follow up is thorough, timely, and meaningful. The educator's feedback/suggestions during problem solving is valued by stakeholders. The educator actively engages families and adapts his/her communication style to meet their needs.

## **4d: Participating in a Professional Community**

### **Unsatisfactory**

Educator's relationships with colleagues and students are negative and educator displays a negative attitude in the professional environment.

### **Needs Improvement**

Educator's relationships with colleagues and students are cordial, and educator displays a neutral attitude in the professional environment. Educator participates in a professional community, school, township, and department meetings and committees/projects when assigned. Educator is present but inattentive as a member of the multidisciplinary team. Educator inconsistently participates in discipline-specific professional opportunities.

### **Proficient**

Educator's relationships with colleagues and students are positive and productive, and educator displays a positive attitude in the professional environment. Educator actively participates in and makes substantial contributions to the professional community, school, township, and department meeting and committees/projects. Educator actively contributes as a member of the multidisciplinary team. Educator participates in discipline-specific professional opportunities.

### **Distinguished**

Educator's relationships with colleagues and students are positive and characterized by mutual support and cooperation, and educator displays a positive and enthusiastic attitude in the professional environment. Educator actively participates in and makes substantial contributions to the professional community, school, township, and department meetings and committees/projects, and assumes a leadership role. Educator is highly involved as a member of the multidisciplinary team and shares resources as available. Educator frequently seeks out discipline-specific professional opportunities (conferences, workshops, leading presentations, etc), and welcomes supervision of interns, students, and observers.

## **4e: Growing and Developing Professionally**

### **Unsatisfactory**

The educator does not participate in professional development activities and makes no effort to share knowledge with colleagues. The educator does not apply feedback from supervisors or colleagues.

### **Needs Improvement**

The educator participates in professional development activities that are convenient or require and makes limited contributions to the

profession and/or organization. The educator inconsistently applies feedback from supervisors and colleagues.

**Proficient**

The educator seeks out opportunities for professional development based on an individual assessment of need and/or the needs of the students assigned to his/her caseload and actively shares expertise with others. The educator welcomes feedback from supervisors and colleagues.

**Distinguished**

The educator actively pursues professional development opportunities and initiates activities to contribute to the profession. In addition, the educator seeks feedback from supervisors, colleagues and students (when appropriate), and thoughtfully applies feedback in developing their practice.

**4f: Demonstrating Professionalism**

**Unsatisfactory**

The educator has little sense of ethics and professionalism and contributes to practices that are self-serving or harmful to students. The educator fails to comply with school and district regulations and timelines, providing an insufficient level of service in case management responsibilities. Educator violates practices of confidentiality as defined by district, state, and federal laws. Educator does not advocate for the needs of the students on his/her caseload.

**Needs Improvement**

The educator's attempts to serve students are limited. Educator complies minimally with school and district regulations, providing a minimal level of service in case management responsibilities. Educator inconsistently practices confidentiality as defined by district, state, and federal laws. Educator moderately advocates for the needs of the students on his/her caseload.

**Proficient**

The educator is proactive in making sure that instructional practices and procedures ensure that students have a reasonable opportunity to be active members of their school community. The educator displays a high level of ethical practice and professionalism in dealings with both students and colleagues and complies fully and voluntarily with school and district regulations and policies. Educator demonstrates a high level of confidentiality as defined by district, state, and federal laws. Educator advocates for the needs of the students on his/her caseload.

**Distinguished**

The educator is proactive and assumes a leadership role in making sure that instructional practices and procedures ensure that students have a reasonable opportunity to be active members of their school community. The educator displays the highest standards of ethical conduct and professional leadership complying fully and voluntarily with school and district regulations and policies. Educator demonstrates an exceptional level of confidentiality as defined by district, state, and federal laws. Educator always advocates for the needs of the students on his/her caseload.