Standards

Lines of Evidence

Benchmark Criteria

### Domain 1: Planning

**Standard 1:** Implements rules and procedures to effectively maintain a positive learning environment

#### Lines of Evidence
- **CTESS Dashboard**
- **IPOP – Behavior Coding** – (Positive, Corrective, and Harsh)
- **IPOP – Classroom Management** (C1-C5)

#### Standard 1: Benchmark Criteria – *Optional Targeted Observation Evidence in Italics*

**Highly Effective:**
All of the following (for all formal IPOPs):
- Classroom rules are “Posted and prominently displayed” (C1)
- Classroom Management (C2-C5) ratings are all “Highly Evident”
- Instructional Priorities Observation Protocol (IPOP):
  - Ratio of positive to corrective feedback is greater than 3:1
  - Positive feedback delivered at a rate of 60 per hour
  - No instances of harsh feedback

**Effective:**
- Classroom rules are “Posted and prominently displayed” (C1) on all formal IPOPs
- Classroom Management (C2-C5) ratings are all at least “Evident” on all formal IPOPs
- Instructional Priorities Observation Protocol (IPOP):
  - Ratio of positive to corrective feedback is greater than 2:1 on at least one formal IPOP
  - Positive feedback delivered at a minimum rate of 40 per hour on at least one formal IPOP
  - No instances of harsh feedback on all formal IPOPs

**Minimally Effective/Emerging:**
- Classroom rules are “Posted, but not prominently displayed” (C1) on at least one formal IPOP
- Behavior Expectations, Classroom Routines, and Lesson Pacing (C2, C3, & C5) ratings include one or more “Minimally Evident” on at least one formal IPOP
- Student Monitoring (C4) rating is at least “Evident” on all formal IPOPs
- Instructional Priorities Observation Protocol (IPOP):
  - Positive feedback delivered at a rate of at least 12 per hour on at least one formal IPOP
  - No more than 1 instance of harsh feedback on at least one formal IPOP

**Ineffective:**
- Classroom rules “Not posted” (C1) on all formal IPOPs
- Student Monitoring (C4) rating is “Minimally Evident” on one or more formal IPOPs
- Instructional Priorities Observation Protocol (IPOP):
  - Positive feedback delivered at a rate of less than 12 per hour on one or more formal IPOPs OR
  - More than 1 instance of harsh feedback on one or more formal IPOPs
## Domain 1: Planning

### Standard 2: Uses the Utah State Core Standards or approved state curriculum when planning lessons

#### Lines of Evidence

- **CTESS Dashboard**
- **IPOP – General Information (Instructional Goals)**
- **IPOP – Curriculum Alignment (A1-A4)**

#### Standard 2: Benchmark Criteria

**Highly Effective:**
- Lesson focuses on the Utah Core Grade Level Standards (A1) “All of the time” on **all** formal IPOPs
- Lesson follows CSD’s curriculum scope and sequence (A2) within a “5-day time frame” on **all** formal IPOPs
- Lesson objective (A3) is rated “Highly Evident” on **all** formal IPOPs
- Observed learning task(s) increased student knowledge or performance of lesson objective (A4) on **all** formal IPOPs

**Effective:**
- Lesson focuses on the Utah Core Grade Level Standards (A1) a “Majority of the time” on **all** formal IPOPs
- Lesson follows CSD’s curriculum scope and sequence (A2) within a “2-week time frame” on **all** formal IPOPs
- Lesson Objective (A3) is rated “Highly Evident” on **at least one** formal IPOP
- Observed learning task(s) “Supported student knowledge or performance of lesson objective” (A4) on **at least one** formal IPOP

**Minimally Effective/Emerging:**
- Lesson focuses on the Utah Core Grade Level Standards (A1) “Some of the time” on **at least one** formal IPOP
- Lesson follows CSD’s curriculum scope and sequence (A2) within a “2-week time frame” on **at least one** formal IPOP
- Lesson Objective (A3) is rated “Evident” on **at least one** formal IPOP
- Observed learning task(s) “Partially supported student knowledge or performance of lesson objective” (A4) on **at least one** formal IPOP

**Ineffective:**
- Lesson focuses on the Utah Core Grade Level Standards (A1) “Not at all” on **one or more** formal IPOPs
- Lesson does NOT follow CSD’s curriculum scope and sequence (A2) within a “2-week time frame” on **one or more** formal IPOPs
- Lesson Objective (A3) is rated “Not Evident” on **one or more** formal IPOPs
- Observed learning task(s) “Did not support student knowledge or performance of lesson objective” (A4) on **one or more** formal IPOPs
## Domain 1: Planning

### Standard 3: Actively problem solves as a collaborative team member by problem-solving with data, giving and receiving feedback, building a productive shared culture of learning, enhancing knowledge and skills of self and others

#### Lines of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Knowledge of educator meeting participation and contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTESS Dashboard</td>
<td>Template – <em>Meeting Participation Checklist</em> (MPC) (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 &amp; 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 3: Benchmark Criteria

The *Meeting Participation Checklist* (MPC) will assist in evaluating teachers on this standard.

1. Arrives to meeting with assigned tasks completed
2. Follows established meeting norms
3. Listening: Encourages participation/inclusion others
4. Active participation: Offers strategies, resources and ideas
5. Uses data for decision making
6. Identifies problems in clear measurable terms
7. Analyzes root causes of the problem with an eye towards the solution
8. Develops plans to resolve problems that address root causes

#### Highly Effective:

- Four or more of the *Meeting Participation Checklist* items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) are rated “Exceeds Expectations” and none are rated “Does not meet Expectations”
  - AND
- Consistently attends meetings, contributes, and leads problem solving

#### Effective:

- All of the *Meeting Participation Checklist* items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) are rated at least “Meets Expectations” and none are rated “Does not meet Expectations”
  - AND
- Consistently attends meetings and contributes to problem solving

#### Minimally Effective/Emerging:

- One of the *Meeting Participation Checklist* items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) is rated “Does not meet Expectations”
  - AND
- Does not consistently attend meetings or attends but does not contribute to problem solving

#### Ineffective:

- Two or more of the *Meeting Participation Checklist* items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8) are rated “Does not meet Expectations”
  - OR
- Does not attend or derails or undermines meetings
### Domain 1: Planning

**Standard 4: Makes interdisciplinary connections to purposefully engage learners to integrate content knowledge**

**Lines of Evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Documents – Unit/Lesson Plans, IPLC Notes, School-Wide Initiatives &amp; Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher provides a statement and evidence of interdisciplinary connections through shared vocabulary that purposefully engages learners in applying cross-content knowledge. These are identified through section #7 Interdisciplinary Connections on the Unit/Lesson Plan, IPLC notes, showing implementation of school-wide or team interdisciplinary initiatives (e.g. starters, themes, etc.) and/or Culminating Project description.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 4: Benchmark Criteria**

**Highly Effective:**
- Interdisciplinary connections made through shared vocabulary that purposefully engages learners in applying cross-content knowledge as reflected by **three or more** of the following:
  - Lesson Plans (section #7) – more than one
  - IPLC Notes (more than one)
  - Evidence of implementing school-wide or team interdisciplinary initiative (starters, themes, etc.)
  - Culminating projects – reflects learning that results in a student-developed product (e.g. research paper, experiment, simulation, performance, capstone)

**Effective:**
- Interdisciplinary connections made through shared vocabulary that purposefully engages learners in applying cross-content knowledge as reflected by **any two** of the following:
  - Lesson Plan (section #7)
  - IPLC Notes
  - Evidence of following school-wide or team interdisciplinary initiative (starters, themes, etc.)

**Minimally Effective/Emerging:**
- Interdisciplinary connections made through shared vocabulary that purposefully engages learners in applying cross-content knowledge as reflected by **one (1)**, but not all of the following:
  - Lesson Plan (section #7)
  - Evidence of following school-wide or team interdisciplinary initiative (starters, themes, etc.)

**Ineffective:**
- No evidence of interdisciplinary connections
## Domain 2: Instructing

### Standard 5: Uses a variety of evidence-based instructional techniques to promote student engagement, learning, and communication skills through various questioning strategies (CSD instructional priorities)

### Lines of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTESS Dashboard</th>
<th>IPOP – Behavior Coding (Active Engagement &amp; Passive Engagement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPOP – Behavior Coding (Group and Individual OTRs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPOP – Quality of Engagement (B1-B2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 5: Benchmark Criteria – Optional Targeted Observation Evidence in Italics

**Highly Effective:**
- Students are engaged (actively and passively) at least 90% of the time and a minimum of 30% active engagement on all formal IPOPs
- Teacher delivers OTRs (group and individual) at a rate of 70 per hour on all formal IPOPs
- Teacher effectively uses opportunities to respond (B1) “All of the time” on all formal IPOPs
- Universal Engagement (B2) is rated “Highly Evident” on all formal IPOPs

**Effective:**
- Students are engaged (actively and passively) at least 80% of the time with a minimum of 20% active engagement (on all formal IPOPs)
- Teacher delivers OTRs (group and individual) at a rate of 40 per hour on at least one formal IPOP
- Teacher effectively uses opportunities to respond (B1) “Most of the time” on all formal IPOPs
- Universal Engagement (B2) is rated “Evident” on all formal IPOPs

**Minimally Effective/Emerging:**
- Students are engaged (actively and passively) at least 70% of the time with a minimum of 10% active engagement (on at least one formal IPOP)
- Teacher delivers OTRs (group and individual) at a rate of 20 per hour on at least one formal IPOP
- Teacher effectively uses opportunities to respond (B1) “Some of the time” on one or more formal IPOPs
- Universal Engagement (B2) rated “Somewhat Evident” on one or more formal IPOPs

**Ineffective:**
- Students are engaged (actively and passively) less than 70% of the time on one or more formal IPOPs
- Teacher delivers OTRs (group and individual) at a rate of less than 20 per hour on one or more formal IPOPs
- Teacher effectively uses opportunities to respond (B1) “Rarely” on one or more formal IPOPs
- Universal Engagement (B2) is rated “Not Evident” on one or more formal IPOPs
Domain 2: Instructing

Standard 6: Uses effective feedback practices in the instructional setting to provide timely and descriptive feedback that will promote quality student work

Lines of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Documents – The teacher provides Feedback Rubrics that are grounded in standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTESS Dashboard</td>
<td>IPOP – Behavior Coding (Positive, Corrective, &amp; Other Feedback, Feedback Sequences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPOP – Feedback (D1-D2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard 6: Benchmark Criteria – Optional Targeted Observation Evidence in Italic

**Highly Effective:**
- Demonstrates a minimum of 2 full feedback sequences on all formal IPOP(s)
- Rate of feedback (positive and corrective and other) is 80 per hour or greater on all formal IPOP(s)
- Teacher gives specific feedback (D1) “All of the time” on all formal IPOP(s)
- Teacher provides corrective feedback effectively (D2) “All of the time” on all formal IPOP(s)
- Regularly (weekly within a unit of study) shares feedback rubrics (that are grounded in standards) with students, that make expectations clear and concise and has students track their progress toward meeting the standard

**Effective:**
- Demonstrates a minimum of 2 full feedback sequences on at least one formal IPOP
- Rate of feedback (positive and corrective and other) is a minimum of 60 per hour on all formal IPOP(s)
- Teacher gives specific feedback (D1) “Almost all of the time” on all formal IPOP(s)
- Teacher provides corrective feedback effectively (D2) “Almost all of the time” on all formal IPOP(s)
- At least two times within a unit of study, shares feedback rubrics (that are grounded in standards) with students that make expectations clear and concise and occasionally has students track their progress toward meeting the standard

**Minimally Effective/Emerging:**
- Demonstrates a minimum of one full feedback sequence on one formal IPOP
- Rate of feedback (positive and corrective and other) is at least 40 per hour on one or more formal IPOP(s)
- Teacher gives specific feedback (D1) “Some of the time” on all formal IPOP(s)
- Teacher provides corrective feedback effectively (D2) “Some of the time” on all formal IPOP(s)
- Infrequently (once per unit of study) shares feedback rubrics (that are grounded in standards) with students that make expectations clear and concise

**Ineffective:**
- Does not demonstrate a full feedback sequence on one or more formal IPOP(s)
- Rate of feedback (positive and corrective and other) is less than 40 per hour on one or more formal IPOP(s)
- Teacher gives specific feedback “Rarely or not at all” (D1) on one or more formal IPOP(s)
- Corrective feedback is needed, but teacher gives corrective feedback “Rarely or not at all” (D2) on one or more formal IPOP(s)
- Feedback rubrics not present or not shared with students
**Domain 2: Instructing**

**Standard 7:** Provides students with meaningful opportunities to engage in higher level thinking to solve applied problems using academic skills such as analyzing, synthesizing and decision making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educator Documents – Unit/Lesson Plan(s), The teacher provides Unit/Lesson Plan(s) (section #13) Depth of Knowledge (DOK) Level including description OR a Student Learning Rubric; sample of completed student assignment linked to the Lesson Plan reflecting DOK 3 or 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 7: Benchmark Criteria – Optional Targeted Observation Evidence in Italics**

**Highly Effective:**
- All of the following
  - At least one lesson plan (section #13) includes learning tasks and or activities requiring applied problem-solving (depth of knowledge – DOK level 3 or 4)
  - Evidence of a student learning rubric that clearly outlines expectations for students in a learning task that reflects DOK level 3 or 4
  - Sample of a completed student assignment linked to a submitted Lesson Plan that reflects implementation of a DOK level 3 or 4 activity

**Effective:**
- Sample of a completed student assignment linked to a submitted Lesson Plan that reflects implementation of a DOK level 3 or 4 activity
  - AND one of the following
    - At least one lesson plan (section #13) includes learning tasks and or activities requiring applied problem-solving (DOK level 3 or 4)
    - Evidence of a student learning rubric that clearly outlines expectations for students in a learning task that reflects DOK level 3 or 4

**Minimally Effective/Emerging:**
- At least one lesson plan (section #13) includes learning tasks and or activities requiring applied problem solving (DOK level 3 or 4)

**Ineffective:**
- Lesson plan or rubric does not include learning tasks and or activities requiring applied problem-solving (DOK level is less than 3 & 4)
  - OR
    - Sample of completed student assignment does not reflect DOK 3 or 4 (DOK level is less than 3)
# Domain 3: Adjusting

## Standard 8: Independently and collaboratively uses assessment data to document student progress to promote student growth of all

### Lines of Evidence

| Administrator | Teacher Leader (e.g. BLT, IPLC and PBIS)  
Data Focused Professional Development |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Educator                           | Documents – IPLC Notes, Unit/Lesson Plan(s)                                         
The teacher provides IPLC Notes indicating the use of formative assessments to guide instruction, and  
Unit/Lesson Plan (section #9 Assessment for Student Learning), and  
Unit/Lesson Plan (section #16 Formatively Assesses Student Learning) |

### Standard 8: Benchmark Criteria

**Highly Effective:**
- Meets all criteria for Effective  
AND  
- Establishes self as a teacher leader by contributing to the development of responsive and proactive solutions to school-wide, grade-level, and course-level problems through:  
  - Serving as a teacher leader on a problem-solving team (e.g. BLT, IPLC, and PBIS)  
  OR  
  - Leading professional development that includes using data to adjust instruction (e.g. SLOs, CFAs, district assessments)

**Effective:**
- Consistently uses formative assessments to guide instruction (e.g. common formative assessments, Student Learning Objectives, District Common Formative Assessments, CBM). Educators who teach singleton courses (e.g. Orchestra, Theatre, Choral, etc.) present assessments used to guide instruction.  
- Lesson plans (sections #9 & #16) demonstrate consistent use of formative assessment for student learning as well as checks for understanding (e.g. starters, exit tickets, daily student work samples)

**Minimally Effective/Emerging:**
- Inconsistently uses formative assessments to guide instruction (e.g. common formative assessments, Student Learning Objectives, District Common Formative Assessments, CBM)  
- Lesson plans (sections #9 & #16) demonstrate inconsistent use of formative assessment for student learning as well as checks for understanding (e.g. starters, exit tickets, daily student work samples)

**Ineffective:**
- Does not show use of formative assessments to guide instruction (e.g. common formative assessments, Student Learning Objectives, District Common Formative Assessments, CBM)  
- Lesson plans (sections #9 & #16) do not show use of formative assessment for student learning or daily checks for understanding
## Domain 3: Adjusting

### Standard 9: Designs, adapts and delivers appropriate and challenging learning experiences based on students’ diverse strengths and needs

#### Lines of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Documents – Unit/Lesson Plans, Scaffolding examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher provides Unit/Lesson Plans(s) (section #15) Scaffolding and Grouping Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher provides samples of scaffolded instruction/learning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTESS Dashboard</td>
<td>IPOP – Quality of Engagement (B4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Standard 9: Benchmark Criteria – *Optional Targeted Observation Evidence in Italics*

**Highly Effective:**
- At least **two** lesson plans (section #15) reflect differentiated learning experiences that are designed to meet the full range of student strengths and needs
- **AND** one of the following:
  - Teacher demonstrates **two or more** scaffolding strategies (B4) that are based on formative assessment (e.g. changing up questioning based on checks for understanding, learning task scaffolded for readiness levels, choice menus that scaffold for readiness levels, scaffolded graphic organizers, or scaffolded feedback rubrics) on at least **one** formal IPOP
  - Teacher submits **two or more different** pieces of evidence that show how adjustments were made for diverse learners as a result of formative assessment (e.g. scaffolded quizzes, learning task scaffolded for readiness levels, choice menus that scaffold for readiness levels, scaffolded graphic organizers, or scaffolded feedback rubrics)

**Effective:**
- At least **two** lesson plans (section #15) reflect differentiated learning experiences that are designed to meet the full range of student strengths and needs
- **AND** one of the following:
  - Teacher demonstrates **one** scaffolding strategy (B4) that is based on formative assessment (e.g. changing up questioning based on checks for understanding, learning task scaffolded for readiness levels, choice menus that scaffold for readiness levels, scaffolded graphic organizers, or scaffolded feedback rubrics) on at least **one** formal IPOP
  - Teacher submits **one** piece of evidence that shows how adjustments were made for diverse learners as a result of formative assessment (e.g. scaffolded quizzes, learning task scaffolded for readiness levels, choice menus that scaffold for readiness levels, scaffolded graphic organizers, or scaffolded feedback rubrics)

**Minimally Effective/Emerging:**
- **One** lesson plan (section #15) reflects differentiated learning experiences that are designed to meet the full range of student strengths and needs
- **AND** one of the following:
  - Teacher does not demonstrate a scaffolding strategy (B4) on **one or more** formal IPOS
  - No evidence shown or teacher submits evidence that does not show adequately how adjustments were made for diverse learners as a result of formative assessment. (e.g. quizzes differentiated only by number of items, learning task only scaffolded by amount of work, choice menus that do not scaffold for readiness levels, graphic organizers or feedback rubrics that do not differentiate for readiness levels)

**Ineffective:**
- No lesson plans reflect differentiated learning experiences that are designed to meet the full range of student strengths and needs
## Domain 4: Reflecting

### Standard 10: Actively investigates and considers new ideas that improve teaching and learning and draws on current education policy and research as sources of reflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Evidence</th>
<th>Leadership Position(s) (School/District/State – e.g. ELA Leads, BLT, Secondary New Teacher Coach, SAC, DAC, SCC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educator</strong></td>
<td>Documents – Educator Statement and Certificate(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The educator provides:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A brief statement how the educator has implemented school or District professional development,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Evidence to demonstrate progress towards attainment of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-- School’s goal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-- Team’s goal, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-- Yearly Professional Learning goal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AND</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Evidence of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-- Certificate(s) of Professional Development participation (copies), and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-- Certification(s) (e.g. HYPE, National Board etc.), and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-- Endorsement(s) State or District approved endorsements (within last five years), and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-- Membership(s) in curriculum-based professional organizations (e.g. NSTA, NAfME etc.), and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-- Collaboration on teaching strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 10: Benchmark Criteria

**Highly Effective**: Provides evidence of...
- Participation in all required school and district professional development and implementation of learned techniques and programs
- Provides evidence that shows significant progress towards School’s, Team’s, and Yearly Professional Learning Goal(s)

**AND**
- Two of the following:
  - Documentation of Lesson Study that follows the CSD Lesson Study Protocol for more than one lesson
  - Helps plan and implement professional development within the school, district and/or state (e.g. HYPE instructor, USOE Curricular instructor)
  - Leadership in curriculum-based state or national professional organizations or workgroups (e.g. CEC, NSTA, UAHPERD, NMSA, UMLA)
  - State or district approved endorsement earned within the last 5 years (e.g. reading, math, ESL, Ed. Tech, gifted)
  - Current Certifications (e.g. current HYPE or National Board certification)
Effective: Provides evidence of...
  • Participation in all required school and district professional development and implementation of learned
techniques and programs
  • Provides evidence that shows progress towards School’s, Team’s, and Yearly Professional Learning Goal(s)
  AND
  • One of the following:
    o Documentation of Lesson Study that follows the CSD Lesson Study protocol for one lesson
    o Participates in HYPE course offerings as a learner
    o Collaborates with other teachers by sharing strategies to improve teaching
    o Participates on school or district level committees (e.g. BLT, SCC, DAC, SAC etc.)
    o Membership in curriculum-based professional organizations (e.g. NSTA, UAHPERD, NMSA, UMLA etc.)
    o Completed graduate level course work in education related subject within the current school year
      OR
    o One of the items listed on the third bullet for Highly Effective

Minimally Effective/Emerging: Provides evidence of...
  • Attends most required school and district professional development
  • Provides evidence that shows minimal progress towards School’s, Team’s, and Yearly Professional Learning
    Goal(s)

Ineffective:
  • Attends few or no required school and district professional development
  • Provides no evidence of progress towards School’s, Team’s, and Yearly Professional Learning Goal(s)
    OR
  • Behavior has resulted in removal or exclusion from one or more curriculum-based professional development
    opportunities
## Domain 4: Reflecting

### Standard 11: Advocates for learners, the school, the community and the profession

#### Lines of Evidence

| CTESS Dashboard | Template – Canyons – Ethical Conduct Checklist – Advocates for learners and the school (1, 2, and 3) |

#### Standard 11: Benchmark Criteria

Benchmarks below refer to items 1-3 of the *Advocacy for Learners and Ethical Conduct Checklist*

**Advocates for learners and the school**

1. The teacher uses strategies to identify and engage those students who seem to be least connected academically, socially, or emotionally.
2. The teacher makes concerted efforts to affect change to the school climate, curriculum, or policy when it would benefit students.
3. The teacher considers input from parents and the broader community regarding adjustments that can be made in the classroom to support learning.

**Highly Effective:**
- Ratings of “Exceeds Expectations” on all three items on the Canyons – Ethical Conduct Checklist (1, 2, and 3)

**Effective:**
- Ratings of at least “Meets Expectations” on all three items on the Canyons – Ethical Conduct Checklist (1, 2, and 3)

**Minimally Effective/Emerging:**
- Rating of “Does not meet Expectations” on any one of the three items on the Canyons – Ethical Conduct Checklist (1, 2, and 3)

**Ineffective:**
- Ratings of “Does not meet Expectations” on two or more of the three items on the Canyons – Ethical Conduct Checklist (1, 2, and 3)
## Domain 4: Reflecting

**Standard 12: Demonstrates the highest standards of legal, moral and ethical conduct as specified in Utah State Board Rule R277-515 – 10 and CSD policies**

### Lines of Evidence

| CTESS Dashboard | Template – Canyons – Ethical Conduct Checklist – Demonstrates the highest standards of legal, moral and ethical conduct (4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9) |

### Standard 12: Benchmark Criteria

Benchmarks below refer to items 4-9 of the *Advocacy for Learners and Ethical Conduct Checklist*

Demonstrates the highest standards of legal, moral, and ethical conduct

1. The teacher promotes positive interactions about students and parents; proactively engages in positive conversations and does not participate in negative conversations in the school and outside community.
2. The teacher promotes productive interactions with colleagues that support student learning.
3. The teacher maintains records according to school, district, state, and federal expectations.
4. The teacher demonstrates awareness and sensitivity of cultural, linguistic, and social backgrounds of students and families.
5. The teacher respects and maintains the confidentiality of student, family, and school information.
6. The teacher follows laws, rules, and policies of the school district and state.

### Highly Effective:

- Ratings of “Exceeds Expectations” on all five items on the *Canyons – Ethical Conduct Checklist* (4, 5, 6, 7, and 8)
- AND
- Rating of “Yes” on item nine

### Effective:

- Ratings of at least “Meets Expectations” on all five items on the *Canyons- Ethical Conduct Checklist* (4, 5, 6, 7, and 8)
- AND
- Rating of “Yes” on item nine

### Minimally Effective/Emerging:

- Rating of “Does not meet Expectations” on any one of the five items on the *Canyons – Ethical Conduct Checklist* (4, 5, 6, 7, and 8)
- AND
- Rating of “Yes” on item nine

### Ineffective:

- Ratings of “Does not meet Expectations” on any two or more of the five items on the *Canyons – Ethical Conduct Checklist* (4, 5, 6, 7, and 8)
- OR
- Rating of “No” on item nine