

2019-20

Union County / College Corner Joint School District Evaluation Model

This document covers the evaluation of all certificated employees.



Table of Contents

<u>Content</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
General Description of Recent Legislation Impacting the Model	1
Teacher Status	1
Performance Level Ratings	1-2
Professional Practice	3
Teacher Effectiveness Rubric	3
Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Scoring	4-5
School Wide Learning Measure	5
Negative Impact on Student Learning	5
Summative Scoring – Classroom Teacher	6
Summative Scoring – Other	7-9
Following the Evaluation and Rating Process	10
Evaluation Plan Discussion	10
Appendices	
Rubrics	
Teacher	
Hearing Impaired and Visually Impaired Consultant	
Librarian	
Principal	
Assistant Principal	
School Counselor	
Special Education Administrator	
Speech and Language Pathologist	
Superintendent	
School Psychologist	

Contents – Continued

Summative Scoring Forms

Summative Form – Teacher

Summative Form – Assistant Superintendent

Summative Form – Counselor

Summative Form – Librarian

Summative Form – Principal / Assistant Principal

Summative Form – Special Education Administrator

Summative Form – Special Education School Psychologist

Summative Form – Superintendent

Summative Form – Technology Director

UCCCJSD Evaluation Model for Certificated Employees

In the spring of 2011, the Indiana legislature passed IC20-28-11.5, a new law relating to the evaluation of certified teaching staff. The new law introduced 6 main requirements.

1. Every certified employee must receive an evaluation annually
2. Every evaluation system must include four performance categories: Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Ineffective.
3. Every evaluation system must incorporate objective measures of student growth and achievement as a significant portion of a teacher's evaluation.
4. Rigorous measures of effectiveness, including observations and others performance indicators.
5. An explanation of the evaluator's recommendations for improvement and the time in which improvement is expected.
6. A provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective.

Teacher Status

Effective July 1, 2012 status for teachers has been changed by Indiana law to include:

Established Teachers – All teachers given a continued contract by July 1, 2012.

Probationary Teachers – All new hires for the 2012-13 year.

Professional Teachers – Teachers rated as highly effective or effective in three of five years.

Changes in Professional Status Based on Performance Level Ratings

One ineffective or two consecutive improvement necessary ratings can lead to dismissal of a probationary educator.

Professional status is lost with one ineffective rating. These educators move to probationary status.

A contract with an established educator may be cancelled if the educator receives two consecutive ineffective ratings or if the educator receives an ineffective or improvement necessary rating in three years of any five year period.

Performance Level Ratings:

Each educator will receive a rating at the end of the school year at one of four performance levels as developed by the Indiana Department of Education:

Highly Effective: A highly effective teacher consistently exceeds expectations. This is a teacher who has demonstrated excellence, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning

outcomes. The highly effective teacher's students, in aggregate, have generally exceeded expectations for academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the Indiana Department of Education.

Effective: An effective teacher consistently meets expectations. This is a teacher who has consistently met expectations, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes. The effective teacher's students, in aggregate, have generally achieved an acceptable rate of academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the Indiana Department of Education.

Improvement Needed: A teacher who is rated as improvement needed requires a change in performance before he/she meets expectations. This is a teacher who a trained evaluator has determined to require improvement in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes. In aggregate, the students of a teacher rated improvement necessary have generally achieved a below acceptable rate of academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the Indiana Department of Education.

Ineffective: An ineffective teacher consistently fails to meet expectations. This is a teacher who has failed to meet expectations, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes. The ineffective teacher's students, in aggregate, have generally achieved unacceptable levels of academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the Indiana Department of Education.

The Performance Level Rating at UCCCJSD for each educator will be based on three categories.

1. Professional Practice – Assessment of instructional knowledge and skills that impact student learning as measured by competencies set forth in the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric. This rubric includes domains for planning, instruction, leadership, and core professionalism. For those positions that the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric is not appropriate, alternate rubrics specific to that position are used.
2. School Wide Learning Measure – The school grade assigned by the Indiana Department of Education. The grade incorporates both student achievement and growth in the calculation.
3. Student Learning Measure – Student learning will be measured by the Indiana Growth Model for those teachers having this data supplied by the Indiana Department of Education.

- a. For teachers who are not measured by the Indiana Growth Model, the corporation is researching the incorporation of the following data sources: NWEA and PSAT. We are currently evaluating the effectiveness of those data sources as potential growth measures. The plan includes evaluating this data at the end of the 2019-2020 school year to determine effectiveness. The corporation is working with the teachers association to develop a fair, consistent, and accurate means of measuring student growth.

Professional Practice

Evaluators

Evaluators include principals, assistant principals, superintendent, assistant superintendent, and special education administrators. All evaluators are trained in the use of this model. We utilize our Educational Service Center for training. Each certificated employee is evaluated by a primary evaluator. In some instances a secondary evaluator may be utilized. The primary evaluator completes the rubric designed for the position they are evaluating. Evaluations are based on formal and informal observations of instruction, planning, leadership, and the core professionalism traits.

Formal Observations

Each teacher has a minimum of one short observation and one long observation. Short observations are at least 10 minutes in length and long observations are at least 40 minutes in length. All short observations are followed with written feedback to the teacher within two days. All long observations are followed by written feedback and a conference within seven days.

Teacher Effectiveness Rubric

The Teacher Effectiveness Rubric is used to assess professional practice for teachers.

Domain 2: This domain reflects observations of the teacher's instruction. Any teacher who receives an overall ineffective rating in this domain will not be eligible for a performance level rating of effective or highly effective.

Domain 1: Planning and Domain 3: Leadership

These domains are difficult to assess through classroom observations. Evaluators should collect material outside of the classroom to assess these domains. Teachers should be proactive in the demonstration of their proficiency in these areas. However, evidence collection in these two domains should not be a burden on teachers that detracts from instruction. Examples of evidence for these domains may include (but are not limited to):

Planning – lesson and unit plans, planned instructional materials and activities, assessments, links from assessment to instruction, record keeping systems

Leadership – documents from team planning and collaboration, call-logs or notes from parent conferences and communication, records of participation in professional development or school based events and activities

Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Scoring Steps

1. Compile ratings and notes from observation, conferences, and other sources of information.
2. Use professional judgment to establish three final ratings in planning, instruction, and leadership.
3. Use established weights to roll-up three domain ratings into one rating for domains 1-3. The weights are as follows:

Planning 10%
 Instruction 75%
 Leadership 15%

4. Incorporate core professionalism. Core professionalism has four criteria. They are attendance, on-time arrival, policies and procedures, and respect. This domain has only two rating levels: Does Not Meet Standard or Meets Standard. The evaluator uses available information and professional judgment to decide if a teacher has not met the standards for any of the four indicators.

Core Professionalism Rubric

Indicator	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard	Value
Attendance	More than 10 absences*	10 or less absences	.25
On-Time Arrival	Individual demonstrates a pattern of unexcused late arrivals.	Individual has not demonstrated a pattern of unexcused late arrivals.	.25
Policies and Procedures	Individual demonstrates a pattern of failing to follow state, corporation, and/or school policies and procedures.	Individual demonstrates a pattern of following state, corporation, and/or school policies and procedures.	.25
Respect	Individual demonstrates a pattern of failing to interact with students, colleagues, parents, and community	Individual demonstrates a pattern of interacting with students, colleagues, parents, and community	.25

	members in a respectful manner.	members in a respectful manner.	
--	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--

* Absences due to professional leave, jury duty, bereavement, or FMLA leave that has been approved by the Corporation do not count toward the 10 day mark.

Example

Domain	Rating (1-4)	Weight	Weighted Rating
Planning	3	10%	.3
Instruction	3	75%	2.25
Leadership	2	15%	.3
Total Weighted Ratings for Teacher Effectiveness Rubric			2.85
Core Professionalism			-0
Final Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Score			2.85

School Wide Learning Measure – The grade assigned by the Indiana Department of Education will be the school wide learning measure. When a teacher or administrator serves in more than one school, an average of the grades of all schools in which the teachers serves will be used. Averaging will most commonly be used with special education personnel and district level administrators.

Teachers in a school receiving an A will earn a 4 on this measure.

Teachers in a school receiving a B will earn a 3 on this measure.

Teachers in a school receiving a C will earn a 2 on this measure.

Teachers in a school receiving a D or F will earn a 1 on this measure.

Negative Impact on Student Learning – A teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective. Negative impact on student learning shall be defined as follows:

- For classes measured by statewide assessments with growth model data, the IDOE shall determine and revise at regular intervals the cut levels in growth results that would determine negative impact on growth and achievement.

- For classes that are not measured by statewide assessments, negative impact to student growth shall be defined where data show a significant number of students across a teacher’s classes fails to demonstrate student learning or mastery of standards established by the state. Data will include, but not be limited to, grades, classroom assessments, ECAs, student performance, etc. This negative impact on student growth shall be determined by the primary evaluator.
- For classes that are not measured by statewide assessments, negative impact to student growth shall be defined as a 25% or higher failure rate across a teacher’s classes. This negative impact on student growth shall be determined by the primary evaluator. Additional data that may be considered will include, but are not be limited to grades, classroom assessments, statewide and local testing, student performance, remedial efforts, and teacher documentation, etc.

Summative Scoring

The following list identifies the performance level rating that corresponds to the weighted summative score.

Ineffective	1.0-1.74
Improvement Needed	1.75-2.49
Effective	2.5-3.49
Highly Effective	3.5-4.0

Teacher

Component	Percentage
Teacher Effectiveness Rubric	90%
School Wide Learning Measure (School Grade)	10%
Total	100%

Example

Component	Rating (1-4)	Weight	Weighted Rating
Teacher Effectiveness Rubric	2.85	90%	2.565
School Grade	3	10%	.3
Total Weighted Rating			2.865

			(Effective)
--	--	--	-------------

Teacher For Whom The IDOE Provides Growth Model Data

Component	Percentage
Teacher Effectiveness Rubric	90%
School Wide Learning Measure (School Grade)	4%
Indiana Growth Model Score	6%
Total	100%

School Counselors

Component	Percentage
Counselor Rubric	90%
School Wide Learning Measure (School Grade)	10%
Total	100%

Librarian

Component	Percentage
Librarian Rubric	90%
School Wide Learning Measure (School Grade)	10%
Total	100%

Building Principals and Assistant Principals

Principals will be evaluated using a modified version of the RISE Principal Rubric. Their final summative scoring is shown below:

Component	Percentage
Principal Rubric	90%
School Wide Learning Measure (School Grade)	10%
Total	100%

Superintendent

The Superintendent will be evaluated by the School Board using the rubric designed for superintendents. The final summative scoring is shown below:

Component	Percentage
Superintendent Rubric	60%
School Wide Learning Measure (Average of all 4 School Grades)	25%
Goals	15%
Total	100%

Assistant Superintendent

The Assistant Superintendent will be evaluated using a rubric designed for superintendents. The rubric may be modified to meet the responsibilities of the specific position. The final summative scoring is shown below:

Component	Percentage
Assistant Superintendent Rubric	85%
School Wide Learning Measure (Average of all 4 School Grades)	15%
Total	100%

Technology Coordinator

The Technology Coordinator will be evaluated using a rubric designed to fit the specific job responsibilities of this position. The final summative scoring is shown below:

Component	Percentage
Technology Coordinator Rubric	90%
School Wide Learning Measure (Average of all 4 School Grades)	10%
Total	100%

Special Education Administrators

The special education administrators will be evaluated using a modified version of the RISE Principal Rubric designed to more closely fit the specific job responsibilities of these positions. The final summative scoring is shown below:

Component	Percentage
Special Education Administrator Rubric	90%
School Wide Learning Measure (Average of all schools served)	10%
Total	100%

School Psychologists

The school psychologists will be evaluated using a modified rubric designed by the Indiana Association of School Psychologists. The final summative scoring is shown below:

Component	Percentage
School Psychologist Rubric	90%
School Wide Learning Measure (Average of all schools served)	10%
Total	100%

Speech Language Pathologists

The speech language pathologists will be evaluated using a modified teacher evaluation rubric designed to more closely fit the specific job responsibilities of this position. The final summative scoring is shown below:

Component	Percentage
Speech Language Pathologist Rubric	90%
School Wide Learning Measure (Average of all schools served)	10%
Total	100%

Blind/Low Vision and Deaf/Hard of Hearing Consultants

The blind/low vision and deaf/hard of hearing consultants will be evaluated using a modified teacher evaluation rubric designed to more closely fit the specific job responsibilities of these positions. The final summative scoring is shown below:

Component	Percentage
Consultant Rubric	90%
School Wide Learning Measure (Average of all schools served)	10%
Total	100%

Following the Evaluation and Rating Process:

Procedures established by Indiana law will be followed:

1. A copy of the completed evaluation must be provided to a certificated employee not later than seven days after the evaluation is completed.
2. If a certificated employee receives a rating of ineffective or improvement necessary, the evaluator and the certificated employee shall develop a remediation plan of not more than ninety school days in length to correct the deficiencies noted in the certificated employee’s evaluation. The remediation plan must require the use of the certificated employee’s license renewal credits in professional development activities intended to help the certificated employee achieve an effective rating on the next performance evaluation.
3. An educator who receives a rating of ineffective may file a request for a private conference with the superintendent or the superintendent’s designee not later than five days after receiving notice that the educator received a rating of ineffective. The educator is entitled to a private conference with the superintendent or superintendent’s designee.
4. Union County / College Corner will assign students appropriately to assure that no student receives instruction for two consecutive years from a teacher rated as ineffective the previous year. Inability to reassign students receiving instruction for two consecutive years from a teacher rated ineffective will require parent notification from the building principal.

Evaluation Plan Discussion:

1. The Evaluation Plan will be discussed at one of the monthly Teacher Discussion Meetings.
2. The Evaluation Plan will be explained to the School Board in a public meeting.

