

Henry-Senachwine CUSD 5 Teacher Evaluation Plan

Version dated: 10/04/16

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Introduction..... | pg. 4 |
| Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA) | pg. 4 |
| HSCUD5 Joint Committee | pg. 5 |
| System of Observation and Evaluation | pg. 7 |
| Overview of Evaluation Process | pg. 7-9 |
| Four-Tiered Rating System | pg. 10 |
| Informal Observations | pg. 10 |
| Formal Observations | pg. 11 |
| Pre-Conference | pg. 11 |
| Post-Conference | pg. 12 |
| Collection of Artifacts and Evidence | pg. 12 |
| Formal Evaluation | pg. 12 |
| Formal Evaluation Rating System: Component and Domain Ratings..... | pg. 13 |
| Summative Evaluation | pg. 14-17 |
| Summative Evaluation Rating System..... | pg. 18 |
| Professional Development Plan and Remediation | pg. 19 |
| Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory Rating | pg. 19 |
| Unsatisfactory Rating and Remediation | pg. 19 |
| Additional Considerations | pg. 20 |
| Introduction of Teacher Evaluation Plan | pg. 20 |
| Medical Leave and Other Unforeseen Events | pg. 20 |
| Association Representation | pg. 21 |
| Personnel File | pg. 21 |
| Other Considerations | pg. 21 |

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Forms and Appendices | pg. 22 |
| Appendix B: Evaluation Sequence, Forms, and Deadlines | pg. 23 - 24 |
| Appendix C: Pre-Observation Self-Evaluation | pg. 25 - 27 |
| Appendix D: Pre-Observation Conference Guiding Questions | pg. 28 |
| Appendix E: Post-Observation Reflection Conference | pg. 29 - 30 |
| Appendix F: Annual Professional Responsibilities Data Collection | pg. 31 |
| Appendix G: Professional Development Plan | pg. 32 -33 |
| Appendix H: Teacher Job Description | pg. 34 - 36 |
| Appendix I: Formal Evaluation Framework | pg. 37 |
| Appendix J: Final Summative Evaluation Report | pg. 38 – 41 |
| Appendix K: Student Learning Objective (SLO) | pg. 42 - 43 |

Introduction

The contents of this Henry-Senachwine CUSD 5 Teacher Evaluation Plan have been developed in compliance with PERA. In addition, this plan has been developed through a collaborative process involving members of a joint committee.

PERA

In summary, PERA:

1. Links tenure accrual to teacher performance
2. Groups teachers based on performance/evaluation ratings
3. Requires the adoption a four tiered rating system
4. Requires the establishment of a comprehensive evaluation plan that meets legal requirements
5. Establishes new protocols for remediation.

The HSCUD5 Joint Committee was developed, in part, to address transitional and implementation issues. It is expected that the HSCUD5 Joint Committee agree on an evaluation plan that meets legal standards.

HSCUD5 Joint Committee

The joint committee met numerous times to discuss and develop a consensus on how to address transitional issues. As required, the HSCUD Joint Committee has agreed on the following:

1. To use the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching as a foundation for our evaluation plan. Professional discussion, collaboration, and reflection between the evaluator and teacher are embedded within the teacher evaluation plan. However, to be clear, the evaluator is the sole determiner of the professional ratings for teachers.
2. Based on the numerical average of his or her last three summative evaluation ratings, a teacher will be placed in a group as prescribed by the numerical ranges below:

| | |
|-------------------|-------------|
| Excellent | 3.50 - 4.00 |
| Proficient | 2.50 - 3.49 |
| Needs Improvement | 1.50 - 2.49 |
| Unsatisfactory | 0.00 - 1.49 |

The Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching

The HSCUD5 Joint Committee has agreed to adopt the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching as the foundation for the Teacher Evaluation Plan. An overview of Danielson's Framework for Teaching is provided in **Appendix I**.

Appendix I outlines the Danielson Framework **Domains** [e.g. Domain 3- Instruction], **Components** [e.g. 3a Communicating with Students], and **Elements** [e.g. elements for components 3a are: expectations for learning, directions and procedures, explanations of content, use of oral and written language].

The Danielson Framework will be used and is imbedded in the evaluation process. For example, evaluators will use the Formal Evaluation Framework [**Appendix I**] to provide evaluator feedback to teachers/staff. The Formal Evaluation Framework is constructed using the Danielson domains and components and expects that evaluators provide feedback to teachers/staff by rating teachers per component.

In another example, the Danielson Framework is imbedded in the Final Summative Evaluation Report [**Appendix J**]. In this report, evaluators will provide teachers with both component and domain ratings that will translate into a final summative evaluation rating.

It is ultimately the responsibility of each individual teacher to become completely familiar with the teacher evaluation process, timelines, forms, and teacher responsibilities.

System of Observation and Evaluation

Overview of Evaluation Process

This Teacher Evaluation Plan communicates a specific evaluation process that has been agreed upon, adopted, and meets the legal requirements of PERA. In summary, the evaluation process requires that:

1. The Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching serves as the foundation for evaluation.
2. A four-tiered rating system, with associated numerical ratings be used. Excellent [4], Proficient [3], Needs Improvement [2], and Unsatisfactory [1] will be used as the four ratings.
3. Non-tenured teachers are evaluated once a year, or as often as necessary to determine a teachers' performance rating and right to reemployment.
4. Tenured teachers are evaluated once every two years, unless performance requires an alternative evaluation cycle.
5. As part of the evaluation process, Non-tenured teachers are formally observed twice and informally observed at least once.
6. As part of the evaluation process, tenured teachers are formally observed once and informally observed at least once.
7. As part of the evaluation process, teachers will be provided a formal evaluation as a means to provide the teacher evaluator feedback and Formal ratings.
8. Tenured teachers issued Needs Improvement and/or Unsatisfactory performance ratings at any time must adhere to Professional Development Plan and remediation requirements.

The following chart highlights key events and timelines relative to the evaluation process:

| Event | Appendix/Form | Description/Timeline |
|---|--------------------------|--|
| Formal Observation Schedule | Developed by Evaluator | <p>Distributed to teachers by the first day of student attendance.</p> <p>If circumstances dictate the need for changes to the observation schedule, the evaluator or teacher will notify the other a minimum of one week prior to the scheduled date.</p> |
| Pre-Observation Self-Evaluation Form/Pre-Observation Conference | Appendix C | Form Appendix C is to be completed by the teacher and submitted to the evaluator at least one [1] day prior to the Pre-Observation Conference |
| Formal Observation | Appendix I | This form will be used to provide teachers formal feedback and performance ratings that will be referenced when the evaluator assigns a final summative rating. Note that professional discussion, collaboration, and reflection between the evaluator and teacher are embedded within the teacher evaluation plan. However, to be clear, the evaluator is the sole determiner of the professional ratings for teachers. |
| Post-Observation Reflection Conference Form | Appendix E | <p>Form Appendix E is to be completed by the teacher and submitted to the evaluator at least one [1] day prior to the Post-Observation Reflection Conference.</p> <p>If necessary, the evaluator will provide any additional post-observation conference documents/requests to the teacher at least one [1] day prior to the Post-Observation Reflection Conference.</p> |
| Post-Observation Conference | Appendix E Appendix I | The evaluator and teacher will conduct a post observation reflection conference within ten [10] school days of a formal observation. Form Appendix E and I will be referenced during the conference. |

| Event | Appendix/Form | Description/Timeline |
|--|----------------------|---|
| Annual Professional Responsibilities Data Collection Form & Artifacts/Evidence | Appendix F | By February 1 st of every school year, the teacher may submit any artifacts and/or evidence to the evaluator on or with the Annual Professional Responsibilities Data Collection Form. However, it is required that this form is submitted during the year of a teacher's evaluation cycle. |
| Final Summative Evaluation Report | Appendix J | The evaluator provides a copy of the Final Summative Evaluation Report at least 24 hours prior to the review of the summative evaluation. Within ten [10] working days of receipt of the Final Summative Evaluation Report [Appendix J], the teacher may attach written comments for inclusion in his/her personnel file [if necessary]. |
| Professional Development Plan | Appendix G | The evaluator and teacher must develop Professional Development Plan [Appendix G] within thirty [30] school days after the completion of a summative evaluation rating in which a teacher is rated as Needs Improvement in any one or more domains, or on the summative evaluation rating. |
| Observations, Conferences, and Summative Evaluation | | It is the goal to complete all formal observations, post conferences, and final summative evaluations by March 1 st The evaluator will provide the teacher a summative evaluation and summative rating, which will serve as the formal performance rating and be used in the creation of the reduction in force/sequence of dismissal list. |
| Student Learning Objective | Appendix K | SLOs are due to the evaluator by October 30 th in 2016-17; September 15 th in 2017-18 and beyond. |

Four-Tiered Rating Process

As required by PERA and agreed upon by the Joint Committee, the teacher evaluation plan includes four rating categories and subsequent numerical values for each rating; Excellent [4], Proficient [3], Needs Improvement [2], and Unsatisfactory [1]. Teachers will be rated on their performance using a formal evaluation and a final summative evaluation.

Informal Observations

In addition to the required number of formal observations for Non-tenured and tenured teachers, at least one informal observation must be conducted during the evaluation cycle. Informal observations do not require any notifications or forms; however, if any information from the informal observation is used in the final summative rating, then this information must be shared in writing to the teacher within ten [10] days after the completion of the informal observation and the teacher must have an opportunity to discuss this with the evaluator following the informal observation.

Formal Observations

Non-tenured teachers shall be formally observed at least two [2] times every evaluation year. Tenured teachers shall be formally observed at least one [1] time every evaluation cycle. Formal observations shall be at least 45 minutes in length or a complete lesson or an entire class period.

A schedule outlining teachers/staff to be evaluated, the evaluator, and the week in which the evaluation is to occur will be distributed to teachers by the evaluators by the first day of student attendance. The specific dates and times of the formal observation will be established by the evaluator and teacher.

If circumstances dictate the need for changes to the observation schedule, the evaluator or teacher will notify the other a minimum one-week prior to the scheduled date of the formal observation.

Note that formal observations will not be conducted during the first week of school or in the last full week and remaining days before winter break. It is the goal to have formal observations completed in time to allow for summative evaluations to be completed by the March 1st deadline.

Professional discussion, collaboration, and reflection between the evaluator and teacher are embedded within the teacher evaluation plan. However, to be clear, the evaluator is the sole determiner of the professional ratings for teachers.

Pre-Conference

A pre-conference is a required component of the formal evaluation process. The specific dates and times of the formal observation will be established by the evaluator and teacher.

At least one [1] day prior to the scheduled pre-conference, the teacher will provide the evaluator with the completed Pre-Observation Self-Evaluation Form [Appendix C]. Also, while the Pre-Observation Conference Guiding Question Form [Appendix D] is not required to be completed in writing or submitted, both the teacher and evaluator should refer to Appendix D prior to the scheduled pre-conference. The guiding questions in Appendix D are intended to promote discussion and direction between the teacher and evaluator about the lesson to be formally observed. As a result, Appendix D may be used as a resource for discussion and note-taking.

Post-Conference

As required by PERA, a post-conference including the evaluator and teacher must take place within ten [10] school days of a formal observation. The specific dates and times of the post-conference will be established by the evaluator and teacher.

At least one [1] day prior to the scheduled post-observation conference, the teacher will provide the evaluator with the completed Post-Observation Reflection Conference Form [Appendix E]. Any additional requests for required post-observation conference documents will be provided by the evaluator to the teacher at least one [1] day prior to the scheduled post-observation conference.

Collection of Evidence and Artifacts

A requirement of the HSCUD5 Teacher Evaluation Plan is that the teacher submit the Annual Professional Responsibilities Data Collection Form [Appendix F] to the evaluator by February 1st each school year. Evidence, artifacts, and information submitted using Appendix F will be included when determining the teacher's summative evaluation rating. By February 1st of every school year, the teacher may submit any artifacts and/or evidence to the evaluator on or with the Annual Professional Responsibilities Data Collection Form. However, it is required that this form is submitted during the year of a teacher's evaluation cycle.

Formal Evaluation

The evaluator will provide the teacher formal feedback, evaluation, and rating using Appendix I. The formal evaluation process supports professional discussion, collaboration, and reflection between the evaluator and teacher. However, to be clear, the evaluator is the sole determiner of the professional ratings for teachers.

Formal Evaluation Rating System: Component and Domain Ratings

As outlined in the Danielson overview, there are a total of twenty components through which teachers will be rated. In reference to the Formal Evaluation Framework [Appendix I] that will be used to provide Formal performance ratings to teachers, the four domains [Planning & Preparation, The Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities] contain five components each. An evaluator will rate a teacher per each component of each domain. The component ratings under each domain are then used to determine the overall rating for the corresponding domain based on the following system:

Excellent

Excellent ratings in at least half of the components of the domain, with the remaining components rated no lower than Proficient.

Proficient

No more than one component rated as Needs Improvement, with the remaining components rated as Proficient or higher.

Needs Improvement

One component rated as Unsatisfactory; OR more than one component rated as Needs Improvement, with the remaining components rated as Proficient or higher.

Unsatisfactory

Any two or more components rated as Unsatisfactory

The formal ratings provided by using Appendix I will be used as a part of developing a final summative evaluation rating. In the event there are multiple Appendix I forms used throughout the evaluation cycle, the evaluator will use the ratings on most recent Appendix I form as part of developing the teacher's final summative evaluation rating.

Summative Evaluation

The evaluator and teacher will schedule a conference to review the summative evaluation of the teacher. The goal is to schedule this conference by March 1st. The summative evaluation will be formalized using the Final Summative Evaluation Report [Appendix J]. Typical information, evidence, and forms to be used by an evaluator to determine the final summative rating of a teacher includes:

1. documented evidence from informal observations
2. evidence from formal observations, ratings and information documented using the Formal evaluation framework [Appendix I]
3. evidence/artifacts included using the annual professional responsibilities data collection form[Appendix F]
4. If pertinent, information/evidence gathered using an individual growth plan [Appendix G] and/or remediation plan.
5. Other information/evidence deemed pertinent when determining a teacher's final summative rating.

The goal is to complete all formal observations, conferences, and final summative evaluations by March 1st of the summative evaluation year. Teachers shall be provided with a copy of the final summative evaluation report (Appendix J) at least 24 hours prior to the meeting to review the final document with the evaluator. One final copy must be signed and dated at that meeting with both the teacher and the evaluator indicating receipt of the summative evaluation. This original hard copy is to be placed in the teacher's personnel file.

Signing the summative evaluation by the teacher shall indicate receipt, but not agreement with, the contents of the evaluation. If the teacher disagrees with the summative evaluation and/or narrative, his/her written response to the evaluation must be submitted within ten [10] working days of its receipt. Any written response will be attached to the summative evaluation in the personnel file.

Henry-Senachwine CUSD #5 Student Growth Components

Summative performance evaluation ratings will include 1] professional practice ratings and 2] student growth ratings.

Student Growth Guidelines

Each teacher will need to use at least 2 SLOs (Type 1 Assessment, Type 2 Assessment, or Type 3 Assessment). During each teacher evaluation cycle 2 SLOs will need to be used. Note that a teacher cannot use more than 4 SLOs during a 2 year evaluation cycle. SLO's must be approved by your evaluator before use. This school year (2016-2017) the deadline to submit your SLOs is October 30th. Next school year (2017-2018) and beyond, the deadline to submit your SLOs is September 15th.

Examples:

- Tenured teacher not being evaluated in 2016-17, but is being evaluated in 2017-18. The teacher may choose to use 1 SLO in 2016-17 and 1 SLO in 2017-18.
- Non-tenured teacher who is being evaluated in 2016-17 and 2017-18 will have to use 2 SLOs in 2016-17 and 2 SLOs in 2017-18, for a total of 4 SLOs over a 2 year cycle.

| Performance Ratings | Thresholds |
|-----------------------|--|
| Unsatisfactory (1) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Did not use approved assessment ● Did not correctly score assessment ● Did not accurately administer assessment ● Did not use approved SLO ● Less than 50% met target growth |
| Needs Improvement (2) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Use approved SLO ● 50% - 64% of students met targeted growth |
| Proficient (3) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Use approved SLO ● 65% - 79% of students met targeted growth |
| Excellent (4) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Use approved SLO ● At least 80% of students met targeted growth |

First Two (2) Years of Full Implementation

Student growth represents a percentage of the summative performance evaluation rating as follows:

Year 2016-17: 25%

Year 2017-18: 25%

Year 2018-19: 30%

The following formula provides an example of how the summative performance evaluation rating will be determined:

$25\% \times (\text{summative student growth rating}) + 75\% (\text{summative professional practice rating}) =$
summative performance evaluation rating

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Excellent (4) | 3.50 – 4.00 |
| Proficient (3) | 2.50 – 3.49 |
| Needs Improvement (2) | 1.50 – 2.49 |
| Unsatisfactory (1) | 0.00 – 1.49 |

Example 1:

A teacher has a 3 ‘Proficient’ on the professional practice piece. This same teacher ends up with an SLO with a 3 ‘Proficient’ and the second one with a 4 ‘Excellent’.

The number for the professional practice would be a ‘3’, and the number for the summative student growth rating would be a ‘3.5’ (the average of the 3 and the 4). The summative performance evaluation rating would be determined as follows:

$25\% \times 3.5 + 75\% \times 3 = 3.125$, which would result in a ‘Proficient’ for the summative performance evaluation rating.

Example 2:

A teacher has a 4 ‘Excellent’ on the professional practice piece. This same teacher ends up with both SLOs at 3 ‘Proficient’.

$25\% \times 3 + 75\% \times 4 = 3.75$, which would result in an ‘Excellent’ for the summative performance evaluation rating.

Summative Evaluation Ratings

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| Excellent (4) | 3.50 – 4.00 |
| Proficient (3) | 2.50 – 3.49 |
| Needs Improvement (2) | 1.50 – 2.49 |
| Unsatisfactory (1) | 0.00 – 1.49 |

Midpoint Check

In completing the SLO, the teacher and evaluator will discuss and establish the parameters for a midpoint check. There are many reasons to evaluate progress levels and a midpoint check will support communication between the evaluator and teacher (e.g. notable changes in student population, re-evaluate targeted results). Note that it is the responsibility of the teacher to schedule a midpoint check with the evaluator to address concerns or issues relating to SLO implementation.

Student Attendance

The teacher can submit in seat attendance data to show a student missed an inordinate amount of time of class, to have the student's data removed from the SLO roster. Teachers can remove all students with less than 80% attendance. Attendance is considered to be "in seat" attendance, and teachers must track "in seat" attendance to remove any students. If the teacher does not track in-seat attendance, then attendance may be determined by the district attendance program. Teachers can request to an evaluator that a student (with less than 80% attendance) be added back onto the final SLO roster. The teacher must provide evidence for the request using allowable baseline data and documented student performance.

Summative Evaluation Rating System

Utilizing the summative evaluation process, the evaluator will provide the teacher with a final summative performance rating. The Final Summative Evaluation Report [Appendix J] will document an assigned overall performance rating for individual teachers. Domain ratings will be assigned by using the rating process described on page 13 under the heading *Formal Evaluation Rating System: Component and Domain Ratings*. The final summative evaluation rating for a teacher rating is based on the four domain ratings as follows:

Excellent

Excellent ratings in at least two or more of the domains, with the remaining domains rated as proficient

Proficient

No more than one domain rated as Needs Improvement, with the remaining domains rated as Proficient or higher.

Needs Improvement

More than one domain rated as Needs Improvement, with the remaining domains rated as Proficient or higher.

Unsatisfactory

Any domain rated as Unsatisfactory

Professional Development Plan and Remediation

Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory Ratings

In the event a tenured teacher is:

- Rated as Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory in any one or more components and/or domains, or
- Rated as Needs Improvement on the final summative evaluation rating,

then a Professional Development Plan (Appendix G) must be developed between the teacher and the evaluator within thirty (30) school days after the completion of the summative evaluation rating. The plan should address any or all domains and/or components rated as Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory.

In addition, a tenured teacher receiving a component and/or domain rating of Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory or a summative rating of Needs Improvement shall be evaluated again for the next ensuing school term with a minimum of two [2] formal observations and one [1] informal observation during the new evaluation cycle. The Professional Development Plan is not utilized for non-tenured teachers who receive a rating of Needs Improvement.

Unsatisfactory Rating and Remediation

In the event a tenured teacher receives an overall summative evaluation rating of Unsatisfactory, a remediation plan will be developed in accordance with current statute. The remediation process includes a number of specific requirements for the teacher under remediation, the evaluator(s), and the consulting teacher, and also includes specific timelines per the law.

If a tenured teacher exhibits evidence of Unsatisfactory practice at any time, the summative evaluation process may be commenced to determine the rating. Should the rating be determined to be Unsatisfactory, then a remediation plan will be developed as described above.

The teacher will be provided with the opportunity to provide any artifacts or evidence in response to an Unsatisfactory rating, with the understanding that the timeline will follow the schedule determined in the remediation plan, rather than any other references contained in the Teacher Evaluation Plan.

Additional Considerations and Information

Introduction of the Teacher Evaluation Plan

Once the Teacher Evaluation Plan is enacted, formal training and development on the new plan will be provided to all teachers. This training is defined as 1] An overview of the HSCUD5 Teacher Evaluation Plan by the HSCUD5 Joint Committee 2] An opportunity for question and clarification regarding the HSCUD5 Teacher Evaluation Plan with HSCUD5 Joint Committee administrators and teachers. From that point on, new teachers in the district will be provided the aforementioned training on the evaluation plan prior to completion of any formal observations or summative evaluations.

It is ultimately the responsibility of each individual teacher to become completely familiar with the teacher evaluation process, timelines, forms, and teacher responsibilities. Questions or clarifications should be directed to the evaluator or superintendent. Prior to conducting any formal observations or summative evaluations, evaluators must complete required training that is in compliance with current state statute.

Medical Leave and Other Unforeseen Events

Any teacher who is not evaluated during their scheduled evaluation year due to timelines missed by the evaluator will have a letter placed in his/her personnel file with a copy to the teacher stating that the lack of an evaluation signifies that the teacher is performing at a “proficient” level.

In the event a teacher on medical leave or other unforeseen, long-term absence prevents the issuance of a final summative evaluation rating, a rating will not be provided and the teacher will be placed on the evaluation cycle the following year.

Association Representation

Upon request of the teacher, a representative of the teacher association may be present during post-observation and/or summative evaluation conferences.

Personnel File

Each teacher's personnel file shall contain the following minimum items of information: 1] signed copies of all summative teacher evaluations, 2] current transcripts and any other information which could be used as a basis for discipline, re-employment, assignment, termination, transfer, or determined salary.

Materials related to discipline or re-employment may not be placed in the teacher's personnel file without first giving the teacher a copy and an opportunity to place a written response to this material in his/her file.

Other Considerations

It is understood that the evaluator will generally be principal/assistant principal at the particular building to which a teacher is assigned. In the event a teacher has a dual assignment, it will be clarified to the teacher at the beginning of the school term to which evaluator he/she is assigned. In the unlikely event an evaluator other than the building principal/assistant principal needs to be assigned, this will also be indicated at the beginning of the school term, or at the time it becomes necessary.

This Teacher Evaluation Plan is intended to be flexible and adaptable to all the various teaching positions within the district. Evaluators will consider the uniqueness of each teachers' assignment when making judgments about their effectiveness. Specific job variations such as the number of students taught and the instructional time available may impact such factors as the ability to individualize and differentiate instruction, communicate individually with parents and devote large amounts of time doing assessments.

Any issues or conflicts that may arise with the Henry-Senachwine CUSD5 Teacher Evaluation Plan or throughout the evaluation process will be brought forth to the appropriate parties so that any issues may be resolved in writing.