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**Executive Summary**

Teacher evaluations will be based on evidence collected in two areas: Professional Practice and Student Learning. In each area, the data collected is quantified into a 1 to 4 point scale with weights being given to each category within an area, and sometimes, where noted, within a category.

For the Professional Practice, a rubric will be used in assigning a value. This will be 70% of the overall evaluation. At least one extended classroom observation (at least 40 minutes) will be conducted before December 1, with a focus on Domain 2. Other observations composed of classroom walkthroughs (3-5 minutes in length) will be conducted with at least one done per grading period. At least one additional extended observation will be conducted with probationary teachers, or those who receive a “Needs Improvement” or “Ineffective” rating on the first semester observations.

For evaluation purpose, teachers are divided into two groups: Group 1 is those teachers that will have Individual Growth Model (IGM) data (i.e. ISTEP+ scores) in grades 4 through 8 in mathematics or language arts. Group 2 is those teachers that do not have IGM data. This distinction is noted in the weights given in the Student Learning portion of the evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Practice</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Evaluation Rubric (TER)</td>
<td>Domain 1: Planning (10%)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain 2: Instruction (75%)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain 3: Leadership (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domain 4: Core Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Growth Model (IGM)</td>
<td>The IGM indicates a student’s academic progress over the course of a year based on the student’s ISTEP+ scores.</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Wide Learning (SWL)</td>
<td>It is important for teachers to have a common mission of improving student achievement, all teachers will have a component of their evaluation score tied to school-wide student learning by aligning with Indiana’s new A – F accountability model.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Objectives (SLO)</td>
<td>Teachers will select one (1) SLO based on a classroom objective.</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All data will be quantified into a 4 point rating scale for the teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Improvement Necessary</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Points</td>
<td>1.75 Points</td>
<td>2.5 Points</td>
<td>3.5 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Borderline points always round up.
Tipton Community School Corporation’s
Mission, Vision, and Beliefs

The mission of Tipton Community School Corporation is that all segments of the school community are working together for student success.

We envision “[T]he future success of TCSC is dependent upon our school’s strong partnership between students, staff, parents, and community. This collaboration provides opportunities for student success and growth in their academic, vocational, and personal pursuits. It is an environment where students take ownership of their future while becoming respected, responsible, citizens in an ever-changing world. A highly motivated staff implements best practices through a well-articulated K12 curriculum and oversees development in students’ character, social, and collaborative skills.”

As a school community, we share the following common beliefs and values:

We believe...

... that all students can learn and achieve.
... that education is a partnership between schools, families, and community.
... that a diverse learning environment with high expectations maximizes student success and achievement.
... that content, instruction and assessments must be stimulating, intellectually challenging and relevant to the lives and future success of the students.
... that professional development is essential for all staff members.
... that every person is a teacher and role model through their actions.
... that in recruiting, retaining, and developing a highly qualified, highly effective staff.
... that our schools are a positive reflection and an integral part of the community.
... that family and community integration enables students to see value in learning, fosters a sense of responsibility, and provides safe and secure learning environments.
... that sound financial planning and implementation is essential to achieve district/corporation goals.
... that fine arts, creative arts, academic clubs, and athletic experiences facilitate personal growth, leadership and positive relationships.
... that a responsible education also includes values, personal reflection, interpersonal relationships, and social responsibilities.
We value...

... the uniqueness of each student.
... instructional practices based on evidence-based research.
... a well planned, articulated curriculum that is implemented throughout the K-12 setting and meets the individual needs of students.
... collaborative relationships between community members, businesses, and leaders for the benefit of our students and public education.
... facilities that are safe and well-maintained to provide a quality learning, working, and social environment.
... the integration of technology as a tool which enhances student learning, reduces expenses, and improves efficiencies.
... facilities that are safe and well-maintained to provide a quality learning, working, and social environment; and,
... the integration of technology as a tool which enhances student learning, reduces expenses, and improves efficiencies.
**Description of IN-TASS Training/Process**

Tipton Community School Corporation (TCSC) embarked on developing this teacher appraisal plan in the fall of 2011. In response to the Indiana’s General Assembly of Senate Enrolled Act 1 (SEA 1) (IC 20-28-11.5), a number of staff members began to learn about the RISE Model of Evaluating Teacher Performance coming from the Indiana Department of Education. Some TSCS staff members attended a presentation by Dr. Hardy Murphy where he outlined the evaluation model used in his school district in Evanston, Illinois. Sharing this information with the administrative team and the leadership of the Tipton Education Association, TCSC decided to join the coalition that was being developed by a group from Indiana University. By joining this coalition, TCSC would be in a network of neighboring school corporations that included Kokomo Center School Corporation, Taylor School Corporation, and Northwestern in Howard County, as well as Southeastern in Cass County, working on this process together.

The Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) at Indiana University designed a model for evaluating teacher effectiveness in compliance with the new state law, based on Dr. Hardy’s model used in Evanston. CELL began working with an initial group of 12 Indiana school districts, including TCSC, to implement the model. Called the Indiana Teacher Appraisal and Support System (IN-TASS), the model was developed in collaboration with Dr. Hardy Murphy, superintendent of Evanston/Skokie, Ill., School District 65, and the School of Education at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. The Evanston/District 65 Professional Appraisal System was used as the framework in the development of the IN-TASS.

The Evanston/District 65 Professional Appraisal Model is one of five teacher evaluation models compared in a recent policy brief from the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy (CEEP) at Indiana University. The brief, “Revamping the Teacher Evaluation Process,” offers information on SEA 1 and its implications for teacher evaluation. “Strengths of the District 65 model are its clear and simple synthesis of inputs and outputs, and its automatic due process procedures,” the authors of the CEEP report write. “...these elements are absent from many of the other models included in this brief.”

The focus of the IN-TASS was to facilitate the growth of all education professionals, enhance the quality of classroom instruction and school system supports, and improve student achievement. TCSC, along with the other eleven school corporations, committed to implementing IN-TASS and received training and support to develop their appraisal plans.

IN-TASS has been approved by the Indiana Department of Education to support Indiana school corporations as they develop local plans for teacher appraisal. IN-TASS enabled school corporations to comply with SEA 1, which was approved by the Indiana General Assembly in the spring of 2012 year and requires Indiana schools to implement teacher evaluation systems that make significant use of measures of student performance and growth, starting in 2012-13.

While participating in IN-TASS, TCSC continued to follow the progress of the RISE Model being developed by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) and to take advantage of various meetings held throughout the state on the new appraisal system. This included training provided by Wabash Valley Education Center (WVEC) on Student Learning Objectives (SLO) and using the RISE Rubric. This also included the
implementation of the use of classroom walk-throughs. Classroom walk-throughs were conducted during the 2011-2012 school year to 1) help administrators develop time management skills that enabled them to visit classrooms often, and 2) have teachers (and students) become accustomed to having an administrator stop in the classroom often. Observers used a template identifying certain aspects of the classroom, procedures used, and the behaviors of the teacher and the students. This data was collected and used by the school corporation and the staff in analyzing what was taking place in the classrooms of TCSC.

The final plan contained herein is a blend of the Evanston model and the IDOE’s RISE Model.

**Gathering Feedback and Communication Plan**

TCSC used their email system to distribute information to the TCSC staff. This provided a means for staff members to communicate their ideas and concerns back to the committee. While the effectiveness of this method was questionable, each building did have a teacher and administrator representative working on the Teacher Evaluation Committee. This allowed for progress reports to be made at individual building’s staff meetings and in discussions with the Tipton Education Association (TEA) on a regular basis.

Ongoing communication and feedback is done through staff meetings and regular professional development. Teachers new to the corporation are assigned a mentor who assists in communicating the Teacher Appraisal Plan with those individuals. Copies of the Certified Personnel Appraisal Plan are made available to all staff members. An Executive Summary of the plan is posted on the corporation website and reviewed at beginning of the year staff and board meetings.

**Introduction and Purpose of Teacher Evaluation**

**Guiding Principles and Beliefs**

IN-TASS has as their guiding principles:

1. A system that strives for accurate judgments about the teaching and learning process.
2. A system that enables valid judgments/assessment of student growth.
3. A system that includes multiple measures of student achievement.
4. A system that facilitates a productive professional dialogue among all involved.
5. A system that creates confidence and support for all stakeholders.
6. A system that has procedures incorporated to address anomalies and variance/inconsistencies in implementation and judgments.
7. A system that incorporates collegial decision-making.

The purpose of the teacher appraisal program in Tipton Community School Corporation is to create a climate to ensure quality instruction and enhance professional growth. The goal of the program is to link instruction, supervision, and evaluation to professional development. The ultimate outcome should be to
enhance quality instruction, encourage professional growth for the participants, and to improve student achievement.

We believe that all children can learn. We believe that teaching and teachers are the heart of the educational process and that teacher performance makes a difference in the achievement of students as well as the students’ sense of fulfillment and feeling of well-being. What teachers do and how they do it play key roles in achieving this goal; therefore, teaching is the most important aspect of our purpose to educate students to their maximum potential. We recognize that teachers are also learners and need a collegial and supportive atmosphere in order to thrive. The establishment of a dynamic and productive environment will result in successful and positive students.

We also believe that an effective appraisal plan should be positive, must be clearly defined, and is an ongoing process that strives for accurate judgments about the teaching and learning process. An effective plan must also be a collaborative effort between teachers and administrators, resulting in confidence and support for all stakeholders. Enough time, the right tools, and adequate funding are necessary for an evaluation process to result in effective instruction. Professional development must also be a part of the plan and is the responsibility of both teacher and administrator. Professional growth, a personal responsibility, is achieved best in an environment characterized by trust, support, and mutual respect among administrators and staff. Teacher appraisal requires: clearly stated criteria, data drawn from available and appropriate sources which assess student growth, observations in different situations over time, and procedures to address inconsistencies in implementation and judgment.

The principal, as the instructional leader in the school is responsible for providing feedback and positive support to staff members. Appraisal of staff members is constant. Staff members have different professional needs at different times in their careers. New staff members may require more support and advice; they may benefit from specific observational data and analysis. Experienced professionals can benefit more from support and encouragement about research and new methodology. This support may come from administrators and/or colleagues and may take forms other than observational data. Finally, some staff members may require more intensive intervention. When intervention is necessary, staff members will have positive support as they work toward improvement.

Performance expectations of certified personnel were developed with the understanding that:

- Growth and development are best achieved in an environment marked by mutual respect and trust.
- Teachers are professionals and will make responsible decisions about their growth and development.
- Teachers will provide a caring classroom environment for all students in an atmosphere that facilitates learning.
- Reflection and analysis are essential for the professional growth of teachers and the successful practice of teaching.
Among the goals for the Certified Personnel Appraisal Plan are to:

1) Improve the quality of instruction and performance of staff to enhance student learning as defined in the professional competencies;
2) Provide training and support for staff, including staff new to teacher or new to TCSC;
3) Create positive attitudes toward the purposes and value of appraisal and professional development; and
4) Collect reliable and varied data for making employment decisions.

All of these characteristics will be found in the TCSC’s Certified Personnel Professional Appraisal System. Through the domains, components, and elements of the RISE Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER) and by incorporating student academic growth, all of the characteristics of an effective appraisal system focus upon teacher development, improvement of instruction, and student learning. The domains of the RISE Teacher Effectiveness Rubric of professional appraisal used as a framework for TCSC’s Certified Personnel Appraisal System are 1) purposeful planning, 2) effective instruction, 3) teacher leadership, and 4) core professionalism.

In the TCSC’s Certified Personnel Appraisal Plan, each teacher will receive a rating at the end of the school year in one of four performance levels:

**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 Necessary:** A teacher who is rated as *improvement necessary* requires a change in performance before he/she meets expectations. This is a teacher whom 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.

Components Required by Law

The Teacher Appraisal Program, by state law (I.C. 20-28-11.5) evaluations must:

- **Be annual:** Every teacher, regardless of experience, deserves meaningful feedback on their performance on an annual basis.
- **Include Student Growth Data:** Evaluations should be student-focused. First and foremost, an effective teacher helps students make academic progress. A thorough evaluation system includes multiple measures of teacher performance, and growth data must be one of the key measures.
- **Include Four Rating Categories:** To retain our best teachers, we need a process that can truly differentiate our best educators and give them the recognition they deserve. If we want all teachers to perform at the highest level, we need to know which individuals are achieving the greatest success and give support to those who are new or struggling.

More specifically, the appraisal plans must have the components outlined below:

**Components of the Plan:**

- Plans must include performance evaluations for all certified employees conducted at least annually.
- Plans must include objective measures of student achievement and growth to significantly inform the evaluation:
  - Results from ISTEP
  - Methods for assessing student growth in non-tested (ISTEP) areas
  - Student assessment results from locally developed assessments and other test measures for certified employees who may or may not be involved in instruction
- Plans must include "rigorous" measures of effectiveness including observations and other performance indicators
- Plans must include an annual designation of each certified employee as either a) highly effective, b) effective, c) improvement necessary or d) ineffective.
- Plans must include an explanation of the evaluators' recommendations for improvement and the time by which improvement is expected.
- Plans must include a provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective.
- Plan must include a provision that a teacher who negatively impacts student growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective.
- Interlocals, Special Education cooperatives, Joint Career and Technical schools, charters and virtual charters are included as school corporations requiring plans.
- Each school corporation must submit a plan which will be published on the IDOE website.
- Legislation is not clear as to whether districts need 75% vote from teachers so it is recommended.

Evaluations:
- All certified employees, conducted at least annually
- An explanation of the evaluator’s recommendations for improvement, and the time in which improvement is expected.
- A teacher may conduct staff evaluations if they have a record of effective teaching over several years, is approved by the principal, and conducts staff evaluations as a significant part of their job.
- The evaluator must discuss the evaluation with the employee and employee must receive a copy of evaluation no later than 7 school days after the evaluation.
- Individuals can only conduct evaluations if they have received training and support in evaluation skills.
- If teacher is rated "ineffective" or "needs improvement", the evaluator and teacher shall develop a remediation plan of not more than 90 school days in length to correct deficiencies.
- Remediation plans must require the use of license renewal credits in professional development activities intended to help the teacher achieve an effective rating on the next evaluation.
- A teacher who receives a rating of "ineffective" may file a request for a private conference with Superintendent/designee no later than 5 days after receiving notice.
- A student may not be instructed for 2 consecutive years by 2 consecutive teachers, each of whom was rated as "ineffective" before the school year in which the student is placed in the respective teacher’s class.
- If a teacher did not instruct students in the school year immediately before the school year in which students are placed in the teacher’s class, the teacher’s rating for the most recent year in which the teacher instructed students will be used.
- If a school corporation cannot comply with the above they must notify parents of each applicable student indicating the student will be in a classroom with a teacher rated "ineffective". The parent must be notified before the start of the second consecutive year.
- By August 1 of each year, school corporations must submit the results of the staff performance evaluations, including the number of certified employees place in each performance category to the IDOE. Before Sept. 1 of each year, IDOE will report the results to the state board and the public.
- At the beginning of each school the Teacher Evaluation Communication plan will be effectively communicated to all stakeholders.
**Student Growth Component:**

- Measures of student growth must include:
  - ISTEP used as a measure for teachers 4-8.
  - Methods to assess student growth for certified employees who do not teach in areas measured by ISTEP.
  - Locally developed assessments and other test measures for certified employees who may or may not teach in areas measured by ISTEP.

Related to the appraisal system, Indiana has identified three categories of teachers: probationary, professional, and established. These categories are determined based upon the number of and the evaluation summary received as indicated in the following chart:

**Figure 1: Probationary, Professional, and Established Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Summary</th>
<th>Any new teacher after July 1, 2012</th>
<th>All current teachers as of July 1, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Probationary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Professional</strong></td>
<td><strong>Established</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
<td>When rated <em>highly effective</em> or <em>effective</em> for three of five years, teacher will move to <em>professional</em>.</td>
<td>Remains at the <em>professional</em> level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>When rated <em>highly effective</em> or <em>effective</em> for three of five years, teacher will move to <em>professional</em>.</td>
<td>Remains at the <em>professional</em> level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Necessary</td>
<td>Two consecutive may lead to dismissal.</td>
<td>Remains at the professional level. Any combination of three <em>improvement necessary</em> or <em>ineffective</em> ratings within five years may lead to dismissal for incompetence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>May be dismissed.</td>
<td>Moves back to <em>probationary</em> after one ineffective rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Overview of Evaluations

All certified staff members will be included in the appraisal process. These individuals will be divided into two groups, with the weights established as listed:

**Group 1**: Teachers who have individual growth model data for at least one subject.
Teacher Effectiveness Rubric 70%, School-wide Learning 5%, Individual Growth Model 15%, Student Learning Objectives 10%

**Group 2**: Teachers who do not teach any classes with growth model data.
Teacher Effectiveness Rubric 70%, School-wide Learning 5%, Student Learning Objectives 25%

Indiana code requires that certified personnel receive one formal evaluation per year. TCSC’s local appraisal system provides for a minimum of four classroom walkthroughs (one per grading period) of 3-5 minutes each for all individuals being evaluated plus one extended announced observation. If a teacher has been classified as in the lower categories – ineffective or needs improvement, or is classified as a probationary teacher, they will receive a second extended observation as part of their evaluation. Additional, supplemental walk-throughs may be conducted for additional documentation.

**Figure 2: Teacher Categories and Observations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly effective/effective and/or professional/established</th>
<th>Ineffective/improvement necessary and/or probationary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Walkthrough</td>
<td>Minimum four per year with written feedback within 2 days</td>
<td>Minimum four per year with written feedback within 2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Observations</td>
<td>Minimum one per year with written feedback within five school days and a post conference within seven school days.</td>
<td>Minimum two per year with written feedback within five working days and a post conference within seven school days.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All evaluation-based observations are to be completed by December 1 of each year. This will provide time for those teachers receiving a rating of ineffective or needs improvement to implement an improvement plan that has been agreed upon during the post-observation conference with the evaluator. For those teachers falling into one of these categories, a second evaluation, including at least one extended observation will be conducted and is to be completed by March 15. Additional short observations will be included in the final observation and prior to the evaluation conference.

Final evaluations will be provided to teachers no later than two weeks after the last student day of the school year. The final summative evaluation conference with the teacher will be held when all data has been collected.
**Components of Evaluation System**

**Overview of Components**

All certified employees will receive an annual evaluation. This will consist of a minimum of one extended observation and two short observations. The extended observation will be at least forty (40) minutes in duration and will be pre-scheduled with the teacher. This observation will be followed with written feedback within five (5) school days and a post-conference within seven (7) school days. A minimum of four classroom walkthroughs of at least three to five minutes in duration will also be conducted during the school year (one per grading period). The classroom walkthrough may be unannounced and can be done by any trained evaluator, but written feedback will be provided within two (2) school days following the observation. For those teachers requiring a second evaluation, the evaluation-based observations are to be completed by March 15.

Every teacher is unique, and the classroom is a complex place. TCSC’s Certified Personnel Appraisal Plan relies on multiple sources of information to paint a fair, accurate, and comprehensive picture of a teacher’s performance. All teachers will be evaluated on two major components:

1. **Professional Practice** – Assessment of instructional knowledge and skills that influence student learning, as measured by competencies set forth in the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric. All teachers will be evaluated in the domains of Planning, Instruction, Leadership, and Core Professionalism.

2. **Student Learning** – Teacher’s contribution to student academic progress, assessed through multiple measures of student academic achievement and growth, including Indiana Growth Model data as well as progress towards specific Student Learning Objectives using state-, corporation-, or school-wide assessments.

**Component 1: Professional Practice**

TCSC has chosen to use the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER) developed for the state’s model, RISE. TER is relatively simple to use while providing the domains and indicators that would encompass those qualities we wish to evaluate. Rubrics for counselors, media specialist, and other certified staff have been developed by their respective professional organizations in partnership with the IDOE. These are also incorporated in the TCSC’s Certified Personnel Appraisal System.

It was determined that with their administrative training and evaluation experience, the licensed building principals would be the best qualified individuals to continue to serve in this capacity. IDOE certified trainers provided by the Wabash Valley Education Center (WVEC) trained all building principals and central office administrators in the summer of 2012 on using the RISE evaluation model. In addition, teacher members of the Teacher Evaluation Committee participated in the training. This peer training would provide additional support and understanding to teachers as the new appraisal system is implemented.
Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric: Background and Context

The Teacher Effectiveness Rubric was developed for three key purposes:

1. **To shine a spotlight on great teaching:** The rubric is designed to assist principals in their efforts to increase teacher effectiveness, recognize teaching quality, and ensure that all students have access to great teachers.

2. **To provide clear expectations for teachers:** The rubric defines and prioritizes the actions that effective teachers use to make gains in student achievement.

3. **To support a fair and transparent evaluation of effectiveness:** The rubric provides the foundation for accurately assessing teacher effectiveness along four discrete ratings.

The primary portion of the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric consists of three domains and nineteen competencies, as shown in Figure 3 on the following page. In addition to these three primary domains, the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric contains a fourth domain, referred to as Core Professionalism, which reflects the non-negotiable aspects of a teacher’s job. The Core Professionalism domain has four criteria:

- [ ] Attendance
- [ ] On-Time Arrival
- [ ] Policies and Procedures
- [ ] Respect

All supporting teacher observation and conference documents and forms can be found in Appendix G. Supplemental documents have been prepared for each of the following areas of certified personnel: In Teacher Effectiveness Rubric, Media Specialist Effectiveness Rubric, Counselors Effectiveness Rubric, Special Educator Effectiveness Rubric, Principals Effectiveness Rubric, and Superintendent Effectiveness Rubric.
**Figure 3: Domains 1-3 and Competencies**

**Domain 1: Planning**

1.1 Utilize Assessment Data to Plan
1.2 Set Ambitious and Measurable Achievement Goals
1.3 Develop Standards-Based Unit Plans and Assessments
1.4 Create Objective-Driven Lesson Plans and Assessments
1.5 Track Student Data and Analyze Progress

**Domain 2: Instruction**

2.1 Develop Student Understanding and Mastery of Lesson Objectives
2.2 Demonstrate and Clearly Communicate Content Knowledge to Students
2.3 Engage Students in Academic Content
2.4 Check for Understanding
2.5 Modify Instruction as Needed
2.6 Develop Higher Level of Understanding Through Rigorous Instruction and Work
2.7 Maximize Instructional Time
2.8 Create Classroom Culture of Respect and Collaboration
2.9 Set High Expectations for Academic Success

**Domain 3: Leadership**

3.1 Contribute to School Culture
3.2 Collaborate with Peers
3.3 Seek Professional Skills and Knowledge
3.4 Advocate for Student Success
3.5 Engage Families in Student Learning

**Teacher Effectiveness Rubric: Scoring**

Evaluators are not required to score teachers after any given observation. However, it is essential that during the observation the evaluator take evidence-based notes, writing specific instances of what the teacher and students said and did in the classroom. The evidence that evaluators record during the observation should be non-judgmental, but instead reflect a clear and concise account of what occurred in the classroom. The difference between evidence and judgment is highlighted in the examples below.
### Figure 4: Evidence vs. Judgment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9:32 am) Teacher asks: Does everyone understand?</td>
<td>The teacher doesn’t do a good job of making sure students understand concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 Students nod yes, no response from others)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher says: Great, let’s move on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9:41 am) Teacher asks: How do we determine an element?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No student responds after 2 seconds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher says: By protons, right?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher to Student 1: “Tori, will you explain your work on this problem?” (Student explains work.)</td>
<td>The teacher asks students a lot of engaging questions and stimulates good classroom discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher to Student 2: “Nick, do you agree or disagree with Tori’s method?” (Student agrees) “Why do you agree?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the observation, the evaluator should take these notes and match them to the appropriate indicators on the rubric in order to provide the teacher with rubric-aligned feedback during the post conference. Although evaluators are not required to provide teachers interim ratings on specific competencies after observations, the process of mapping specific evidence to indicators provides teachers a good idea their performance on competencies prior to the end-of-year summative scoring conference. Below is an example of a portion of the evidence an evaluator documented, and how he/she mapped it to the appropriate indicators.

### Figure 5: Mapping Evidence to Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9:32 am) Teacher asks: Does everyone understand?</td>
<td>Competency 2.4: Check for Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 Students nod yes, no response from others)</td>
<td>Teacher frequently moves on with content before students have a chance to respond to questions or frequently gives students the answer rather than helping them think through the answer. (Ineffective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher says: Great, let’s move on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9:41 am) Teacher asks: How do we determine an element?</td>
<td>Competency 2.6: Develop Higher Level of Understanding through Rigorous Instruction and Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No student responds after 2 seconds)</td>
<td>Teacher frequently develops higher-level understanding through effective questioning. (Effective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher to Student 1: “Tori, will you explain your work on this problem?” (Student explains work.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher to Student 2: “Nick, do you agree or disagree with Tori’s method?” (Student agrees) “Why do you agree?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the end of the year, primary evaluators must determine a final, teacher effectiveness rubric rating and discuss this rating with teachers during a summative evaluation conference. The final teacher effectiveness rating will be calculated by the evaluator in a four-step process:

1. **Compile ratings and notes from observations, conferences, and other sources of information.**

At the end of the school year, primary evaluators should have collected a body of information representing teacher practice from throughout the year. Not all of this information will necessarily come from the same evaluator, but it is the responsibility of the assigned primary evaluator to gather information from every person that observed the teacher during that year. In addition to notes from observations and conferences, evaluators may also have access to materials provided by the teacher, such as lesson plans, student work, parent/teacher conference notes, etc. To aid in the collection of this information, schools should consider having files for teachers containing evaluation information such as observation notes and conference forms, and when possible, maintain this information electronically.

Because of the volume of information that may exist for each teacher, some evaluators may choose to assess information mid-way through the year and then again at the end of the year. A mid-year conference allows evaluators to assess the information they have collected so far and gives teachers an idea of where they stand.

2. **Use professional judgment to establish three, final ratings in Planning, Instruction, and Leadership.**

After collecting information, the primary evaluator must assess where the teacher falls within each competency. Using all notes, the evaluator should assign each teacher a rating in every competency on the rubric. Next, the evaluator uses professional judgment to assign a teacher a rating in each of the first three domains. It is not recommended that the evaluator average competency scores to obtain the final
domain score, but rather use good judgment to decide which competencies matter the most for teachers in different contexts and how teachers have evolved over the course of the year. The final, three domain ratings should reflect the body of information available to the evaluator. In the summative conference, the evaluator should discuss the ratings with the teacher, using the information collected to support the final decision. The figure below provides an example of this process for Domain 1.

**Figure 6: Example of competency ratings for domain 1 and the final domain rating.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Rating</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use Professional Judgment

Final Domain 1 Rating: 3

Competency ratings based on notes from observations, conferences and other sources of evidence.

At this point, each evaluator should have ratings in the first three domains that range from 1 (Ineffective) to 4 (Highly Effective).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D1: Planning</th>
<th>D2: Instruction</th>
<th>D3: Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Ratings</td>
<td>3 (E)</td>
<td>2 (IN)</td>
<td>3 (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scoring Requirement:** Planning and instruction go hand-in-hand. Therefore, if a teacher scores a 1 (I) or 2 (IN) in Instruction, he or she cannot receive a rating of 4 (HE) in Planning.

**Use established weights to roll-up three domain ratings into one rating for domains 1-3**

At this point, each of the three final domain ratings is weighted according to importance and summed to form one rating for domains 1-3. As described earlier, the creation and design of the rubric stresses the importance of observable teacher and student actions. These are reflected in Domain 2: Instruction. Good instruction and classroom environment matters more than anything else a teacher can do to improve student outcomes. Therefore, the Instruction Domain is weighted significantly more than the others, at 75%. Planning and Leadership are weighted 10% and 15% respectively.
Figure 7: Ratings and Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Rating (1-4)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain 1: Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 2: Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 3: Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The calculation here is as follows:

1) Rating x Weight = Weighted Rating
2) Sum of Weighted Ratings = Final Score

**Incorporate Core Professionalism**

At this point, the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric rating is close to completion. Evaluators now look at the fourth domain: Core Professionalism. As described earlier, this domain represents non-negotiable aspects of the teaching profession, such as on-time arrival to school and respect for colleagues. This domain only has two rating levels: Does Not Meet Standard and 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. If a teacher has met standards in each of the four indicators, the score does not change from the result of step 3 above. The teacher must not meet standards in all four indicators otherwise he or she automatically has a 1 point deduction from the final score in step 3.

**Outcome 1:** Teacher meets all Core Professionalism standards. Final Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Score = 2.25

**Outcome 2:** Teacher does not meet all Core Professionalism standards. Final Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Score (2.25-1) = 1.25

**Scoring Requirement:** 1 is the lowest score a teacher can receive in the TCSC appraisal system. If, after deducting a point from the teacher’s final Teacher Effectiveness Rubric score, the outcome is a number less than 1, then the evaluator should replace this score with a 1. For example, if a teacher has a final rubric score of 1.75, but then loses a point because not all of the core professionalism standards were met, the final rubric score should be 1 instead of 0.75.

The final Teacher Effectiveness Rubric score is then combined with the scores from the teacher’s student learning measures in order to calculate a final rating. Details of this scoring process are provided in the Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring section.
The Role of Professional Judgment

Assessing a teacher’s professional practice requires evaluators to constantly use their professional judgment. No observation rubric, however detailed, can capture all of the nuances in how teachers interact with students, and synthesizing multiple sources of information into a final rating on a particular professional competency is inherently more complex than checklists or numerical averages. Accordingly, the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric provides a comprehensive framework for observing teachers’ instructional practice that helps evaluators synthesize what they see in the classroom, while simultaneously encouraging evaluators to consider all information collected holistically.

Evaluators must use professional judgment when assigning a teacher a rating for each competency as well as when combining all competency ratings into a single, overall domain score. Using professional judgment, evaluators should consider the ways and extent to which teachers’ practice grew over the year, teachers’ responses to feedback, how teachers adapted their practice to the their current students, and the many other appropriate factors that cannot be directly accounted for in the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric before settling on a final rating. In short, evaluators’ professional judgment bridges the best practices codified in the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric and the specific context of a teacher’s school and students.

Evaluators

All evaluators are required by law to receive training in evaluation skills. Evaluators have been identified as the corporation’s administrators. During the summer of 2012, the current administrators received extensive training through IDOE certified trainers in using the RISE Rubric for Teachers. This training was conducted through the WVEC. In addition, a teacher leader in each building received this same training not to be evaluators but to assist their peers in understanding this new evaluation tool.

Evaluators are in two categories: Primary Evaluator and Secondary Evaluator. Only administrators, building and corporation, will serve as evaluators. The Primary Evaluator is that person chiefly responsible for evaluating a teacher. This evaluator approves Professional Development Plans (when applicable) in the fall and assigns the summative rating in the spring. Each teacher has only one primary evaluator. This will be either the building principal or the assistant building principal. The primary evaluator must perform a minimum of one extended and two short observations.

The Secondary Evaluator is the administrator whose observations, feedback, and information gathering informs the work of a primary evaluator. This could be any administrator in the corporation that has received training in the evaluation process, including the superintendent and assistant superintendent. A secondary evaluator mainly is involved with performing the additional short observations that may assist the primary evaluator.
Observations

All certified employees will receive an annual evaluation. This will consist of a minimum of one extended observation and four classroom walkthroughs, with one being done each grading period. The extended observation will be at least forty (40) minutes in duration and will be pre-scheduled with the teacher. An optional pre-observation conference may be scheduled by request of the teacher or the evaluator. This observation will be followed with written feedback within five (5) school days and a post-observation conference. The post-observation conference shall occur within seven (7) working days between administrator and the teacher following the observation. The teacher will indicate receipt of copy of the written summary. The teacher may file in his/her personnel file any comment with respect to such evaluation, provided such shall be submitted within twenty (20) work days of receipt of the written summary.

A minimum of four classroom walkthroughs of at least three to five minutes in duration will also be conducted during the school year with one being done each grading period. The classroom walkthrough may be unannounced and can be done by any trained evaluator, primary or secondary, but written feedback will be provided within two (2) school days following the observation. Additional, supplemental walk-throughs and observations may be conducted for additional documentation.

For those teachers requiring a second evaluation, the evaluation-based observations are to be completed by March 15. Additional observations will be included in the final observation and prior to the evaluation conference.

The observations are only one component of the total evaluation process. Evaluators will gather evidence of a teacher’s effectiveness and record that evidence in the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric. Much of this evidence will be gathered through classroom observations. Additional evidence collected that could be included in the overall evaluation may include: conversations, binders, portfolios, classroom invitation, etc. to prove or document performance at a certain level for a certain competency. Teachers are invited to collect and share information and evidence that would support their efforts in any of the domains of the evaluation process. This may include teachers using the evaluation tool for self-evaluation, rating themselves, and engaging in reflective dialogue with their evaluator(s). This may become more important when there is a difference of opinion between the evaluator and the teacher, where supporting evidence would help to document a position. Teachers who receive a rating of “ineffective or improvement necessary” would strongly be encouraged to collect evidence to help document their professional growth and improvements. Any artifacts required as part of the evaluation process and due dates will be mutually agreed upon by the teacher and administrator. A list of suggested artifacts that could be used can be found in Appendix B.

Component 2: Student Learning

Student Learning: Overview

Many parents’ main question over the course of a school year is: “How much is my child learning?” Student learning is the ultimate measure of the success of a teacher, instructional leader, school, or
district. To meaningfully assess the performance of an educator or a school, one must examine the growth and achievement of their students, using multiple measures.

**Available Measures of Student Learning**

There are multiple ways of assessing both growth and achievement. When looking at available data sources to measure student learning, we must use measurements that:

- Are **accurate** in assessing student learning and teacher impact on student learning
- Provide **valuable and timely data** to drive instruction in classrooms
- Are **fair** to teachers in different grades and subjects
- Are as **consistent** as possible across grades and subjects
- Allow **flexibility** for districts, schools, and teachers to make key decisions surrounding the best assessments for their students

The Indiana Growth Model is the most common method of measuring growth. This model will be used to measure the student learning for all math and ELA teachers in grades in 4-8. To complement the Growth Model, and to account for those teachers who do not have such data available, TCSC’s Certified Personnel Appraisal Plan also includes measures of students’ progress toward specific learning goals, known as Student Learning Objectives.

Student Learning Objectives involve setting rigorous learning goals for students around common assessments. All teachers will have Student Learning Objectives. For teachers who have a Growth Model rating, these Objectives will serve as additional measures of student achievement. For teachers who do not have a Growth Model rating, the Student Learning Objectives will form the basis for the student learning measures portion of their evaluation. More details on how each type of student learning measure affects a teacher’s final rating can be found in the Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring section.
Indiana Growth Model

The Indiana Growth Model indicates a student’s academic progress over the course of a year. It takes a student’s ISTEP+ scores in the previous year or years and finds all other students in the state who received the same score(s), for example, in math. Then it looks at all of the current year math scores for the same group of students to see how the student scored compared to the other students in the group. Student growth is reported in percentiles, and therefore represents how a student’s current year ISTEP + scores compare to students who had scored similarly in previous ISTEP+ tests.

Indiana teachers are accustomed to looking at growth scores for their students, but these scores will now also be calculated at the classroom level and across classes for use in teacher evaluation. Individual growth model measures are only available for students and teachers in ELA/Math in grades 4-8. For these teachers, students’ growth scores will be used to situate teachers in one of the four rating categories. This process of translating growth scores into summative ratings is currently being modeled with a sample of Indiana schools. Once refined, the finalized method will be released before the 2012-2013 academic year.

School-wide Learning

Because it is important for teachers to have a common mission of improving student achievement, all teachers will also have a component of their evaluation score tied to school-wide student learning by aligning with Indiana’s new A – F accountability model. The new A – F accountability model will be based on several metrics of school performance, including the percent of students passing the math and ELA ISTEP+, and ISTAR for elementary and middle schools, and ISTEP English and Math (Algebra I and English 10 ECA scores through completion of their use) as well as graduation rates and college and career readiness for high schools. Additionally, school accountability grades may be raised or lowered based on participation rates and student growth (for elementary and middle schools) and improvement in scores (for high schools).

All teachers in the same school will receive the same rating for this measure. Teachers in schools earning an A will earn a 4 on this measure; teachers in a B school will earn a 3; teachers in a C school receive a 2; and teachers who work in either a D or F school earn a 1 on this measure.

Effective teachers have learning goals for their students and use assessments to measure their progress toward these goals. They review state and national standards, account for students’ starting points, give assessments aligned to those standards, and measure how their students grow during the school year. For those who teach 4th through 8th grade math or ELA, information on the extent to which students grow academically is provided annually in the form of growth model data. Teachers of other grades and subjects do not have such information available. The TCSC’s system helps account for these information gaps by requiring Student Learning Objectives.
A Student Learning Objective is a long-term academic goal that teachers and evaluators set for groups of students. It must be:

- Specific and measurable using the most rigorous assessment available
- Based on available prior student learning data
- Aligned to state standards
- Based on student progress and achievement

For subjects without growth model data, student learning objectives provide teachers standards-aligned goals to measure student progress that allow for planning backward to ensure that every minute of instruction is pushing teachers and schools toward a common vision of achievement. By implementing Student Learning Objectives, the appraisal system seeks to make these best practices a part of every teacher’s planning.

Steps in Developing SLOs

**Step 1:** An initial conference occurs no later than September 30 between the teacher and evaluator. The teacher and evaluator meet to review the characteristics of students in the teacher’s classroom, establish goals and review the components of the appraisal process including timelines and the extended and classroom walkthrough processes. Student characteristics include achievement data as well as any extenuating circumstances known at this time, or to determine if a student may need growth measured by supplementary guidelines. (If circumstances for a child should change during the year, the teacher and principal should discuss the special needs of that child and determine whether or not an extenuating circumstance may have developed or been eliminated.) At this time the teacher will have established and will seek approval of their Student Learning Objectives (SLO). Teachers may choose to use the form provided by PIVOT or the local SLO Report (Appendix C).

**Step 2:** Ongoing communications occur throughout the school year between the teacher and evaluator. They should discuss progress being made relative to student growth and toward teacher goal attainment on a continuing basis throughout the year. The conversations should ensure that there are no surprises, focus a data-based collaborative relationship between the principal and teacher, and augment the short and extended observational process.

**Step 3:** The observation process is integral to the implementation of an effective performance appraisal system and should represent an open and collaborative process between the teacher and the principal and should be a part of the goal setting process as described below.

**Step 4:** The teacher rating shall be determined at the summative conference. It should never be a surprise when a teacher receives a highly effective, effective, improvement needed or ineffective summative rating. If a teacher is not performing up to standards, the principal has a responsibility to provide interventions to
help that individual move to effective. If concerns arise related to a teacher’s performance in any rating area or domain the procedures related to developing and implementing a professional assistance plan will be followed.

Appendix D provides a summary of a timeline and checklist for completing SLOs. More detailed information on the Student Learning Objectives process along with examples can be found in the Student Learning Objectives Handbook, available at www.riseindiana.org

Negative Student Growth

For classes measured by statewide assessments with growth model data, negative impact on student learning is defined by the cut scores as determined by the Indiana Department of Education. These cut scores are determined and revised at regular intervals the cut levels in growth results that would determine negative impact on growth and achievement. Cut levels are to be published by August 1. (511 IAC 10-6-4 (c) (1).

Negative impact on student learning, as measured by student performance on statewide assessments, is characterized by a significant decrease in student achievement and notably low levels of student growth. The IDOE will calculate negative impact for all teachers with Indiana Growth Model data. The determination of negative impact is based on two key variables:

1. Mean ISTEP+ scale score – ISTEP+ scale scores for all students assigned to a teacher will be averaged and then compared to the same variable from the previous year. In order for a teacher to be identified as negatively impacting student learning, the mean ISTEP+ scale score must drop by 15 or more scale points from one year to the next.

2. Median student growth percentile - The median student growth percentile of all students assigned to a teacher will be measured. In order for a teacher to be identified as negatively impacting student learning, the median student growth percentile must be 15 or less.

The criteria for both variables must be met in order for a teacher to be identified as negatively impacting student learning. This rigorous requirement supports an accurate identification of negative impact and protects against statistical anomalies.

For classes that are not measured by statewide assessments, negative impact on student growth is determined by pre-identified data (test results) that shows a significant number of students across a teacher’s classes fails to demonstrate student learning or mastery of standards established by the state. (511 IAC 10-6-4-(c) (2). The data used in making this determination is based on:

1. Academic standards – the subject or content standards teachers are responsible for teaching.

2. Demonstration of mastery– the degree to which students will master the standards, and the method by which this mastery will be demonstrated and measured.
3. Significant number of students – the number of students assigned to a specific teacher who must fail to demonstrate mastery of the academic standards for a teacher to be identified as negatively impacting student learning.

The negative impact on student learning will be based on the objective measures of student achievement and growth selected for use in teachers’ performance. Criteria for these three key areas mentioned above will be defined as teachers and administrators collaborate to set expectations for student learning and teacher performance.

Teachers and administrators should have an understanding of the definitions of negative impact on student learning at the beginning of the evaluation cycle, as well as the procedures by which a teacher’s rating will be adjusted if he or she is identified as negatively impacting student learning. A teacher identified as having a negative impact on student learning cannot receive a final evaluation result of effective or highly effective. The final evaluation rating will either be improvement necessary or ineffective and will depend on the combination of all measures included in the performance evaluation.

**Data Collection, Storage Analysis**

**Collection of Teacher Data**

Five-STAR Technologies, PIVOT, is being used at TCSC to collect teacher data. This tool allows for electronic recording of observations by evaluators, development and submissions of SLOs by teachers, and teacher access. PIVOT also serves as a tracking document for feedback.

**Collection of Student Data**

The summative scoring matrix for teachers provide that 15% of the total score will be based on Indiana’s Student Growth Model (SGM), for these teachers who teach ISTEP subjects and grades. All teachers will have 5% of their total score based on School Wide Learning (SWL) as determined by the school’s result on the ISTEP.

Two provisions of Indiana statutes provides that the evaluation plan must use rigorous measures of teacher effectiveness, and teachers who negatively affect student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective. In addition, teachers must identify Student Learning Objectives (SLO) that will constitute 10-25% of the total score on the summative scoring matrix. Collection, storing, and analyzing this data in terms of teacher evaluation becomes imperative.

In addition to the data from state mandated ISTEP, other data is collected. IREAD became a new state assessment in the spring of 2012. This measures the reading proficiency of third grade students to determine if they can be advanced to the fourth grade. IREAD is also given in grade K-2 to help monitor the
students’ progress towards this proficiency. Through a state grant, mClass/DIBELS is also given, at designated intervals throughout the school year, to students in grade K-2. This same grant provides students assessment with Performance Series in grades 2 through 8. This assessment is given twice a year to monitor students’ progress and growth. All of these state assessments are computer-based, providing for quick scoring and accessibility of the results/data for the students’ respective teacher.

At the high school level, the state’s End of Course Assessment (ECA) in Algebra I, and English 10 will be used until replaced by ISTEP. These are a combination of computer-based and paper-pencil assessment. Online student data will be accessible to the respective teacher. In the case of paper-pencil assessment, hard copies of the data will be provided to the teacher. Teachers with assessments on PIVOT (developed through the Testing Consortium) use the readiness and ECA tests available.

Additional assessments are developed locally. These assessments would be in the non-ISTEP, non-Consortium areas. Guidance from WVEC, the Assessment Consortium, and IN-TASS continues to help guide the schools in the development of these assessments.

A number of multi-faceted data points are available for use in helping to determine a teacher’s effectiveness and determining student growth, in addition to that provided by the IDOE. This data can be used by the teacher in helping to identify and develop their SLO for the year. It can also be used to help the teacher identify their strengths and areas they may wish to work upon through professional development.

**Professional Development/Assistance Plans**

**Training of Evaluators**

All evaluators are required by law to receive training in evaluation skills. Evaluators have been identified as the corporation’s administrators. The current administrators received extensive training through IDOE certified trainers in using the RISE Rubric for Teachers. This training was conducted through the WVEC. In addition, a teacher leader in each building received this same training not to be evaluators but to assist their peers in understanding this new evaluation tool. Administrators receive on-going local training through group practice observations. Administrators take advantage of other training opportunities as they become available.

**Professional Goals**

The teacher appraisal process should support continuous professional growth to benefit the students of TCSC. The evaluation process is used to help identify and implement the needs of the school corporation and the individual teacher. Professional goals are established to help teachers meet their individual professional goals as well as the corporation and school’s goals to improve student learning. Continuing throughout the staff member’s professional career, the staff member and administrator work collaboratively to ensure strengthening of professional competencies. The three major components to this process are: 1) continued appraisal of the professional competencies (domains), 2) planning for continued professional growth, and 3) monitoring student growth.
All teachers are encouraged to establish professional goals for themselves. A professional goal should be achievable and reflect both long term, i.e., two-year, and/or short-term one-year goals. These goals should reflect the teacher’s desire for professional growth as well as a commitment to corporation goals. The goals should also include and reflect a determination of the academic achievement and student growth profile of the classroom and individual students. At the beginning of the school year, staff members should identify their goals and the strategies to be used to achieve those goals.

Additionally, the principal and teacher should discuss the teacher’s strengths and weaknesses. With this information the principal and teacher collaboratively set the teacher’s professional goals that reflect district and building goals and result in the continuous improvement of student learning.

The teacher appraisal system is designed to provide a clear picture of the teacher’s performance. It is used to help reinforce and recognize those areas in which the teacher excels and supports student learning. But it also used to help identify those areas where a teacher can improve in their performance. The teacher appraisal software used by the evaluators can be of assistance as the overall data is analyzed. It will help to identify strengths and weaknesses – not just of individual teachers, but of the staff as a whole. This data can be used to 1) identify professional development needs of groups of teachers, or the staff as a whole as they continue to embark on continuous improvement, 2) help to identify and match teachers who could serve as mentors or coaches in specific areas. These coaches can be especially helpful in guiding new teachers and/or those teachers struggling in a given area.

**Professional Assistance Plan**

When a teacher receives a rating of “improvement necessary” or “ineffective” they will be placed on a Professional Assistance Plan. When receiving such a rating the evaluator will provide the teacher recommendations for improvement and the time by which improvement is expected. The evaluator and teacher will develop a remediation plan of not more than 90 school days in length to correct deficiencies. Remediation plans must require the use of professional growth points in professional development activities intended to help the teacher achieve an effective rating on next evaluation. The purpose of the Assistance Plan is twofold:

1. to enable an administrator to assist a teacher needing assistance
2. to enable a teacher the opportunity to seek assistance

The Professional Assistance Plan is completed where the teacher is given assistance and opportunities to remediate any deficiencies in performance. The Professional Assistance Plan will include:

1. A statement identifying the concern(s) relative to a teacher’s evaluation;
2. An identification of individuals involved in the plan;
3. A listing of activities/procedures to be initiated and utilized;
4. A listing of resources to be allocated for plan implementation and completion including but not limited to materials, professional development, and budgetary considerations; a time line indicating implementation dates, final review dates, and meeting dates to review progress of the plan.
5. Meeting minutes and discussions within this plan will be filed at the building be made available to the corporation office upon request.
6. A review of progress at the conclusion of the designated time period will result in one of three recommendations:
   a. Concern resolved, removal from Professional Assistance Plan
   b. Progress noted, continue with the Professional Assistance Plan.
   c. Concerns unresolved, revise the Professional Assistance Plan, or move for dismissal.

The purpose of the Professional Assistance Plan is to bring individuals together to identify and discuss areas of concern related to the teacher’s performance. Procedures, resources, and timelines relative to resolving the concerns will be mutually agreed upon. This concern will be discussed within five (5) working days. The principal and teacher will complete classroom observations (both short and extended), discuss area of concerns, and provide suggestions for improvements. The Professional Assistance Plan should be:
   • Based upon specific need
   • Directed toward improvement of professional competencies
   • Initiated by teacher or administrator
   • Collaboratively developed
   • Collaboratively implemented

The Professional Assistance Plan should reach completion within a mutually agreed upon time frame. A review of progress by the administrator will result in one of three recommendations:
   • concerns resolved, no further action necessary;
   • progress noted, continuation of agreed procedures and mutually agreed upon extended timeline and/or;
   • concerns remain unresolved, revise the Professional Assistance Plan, or move for dismissal.

The Professional Assistance Plan should reach completion within a mutually agreed upon time frame. A review of progress by the administrator will be included in the summative evaluation conference.

Depending on whether a teacher is classified as Probationary or Professional (see page 13) when placed on the Professional Assistance Plan because of his/her evaluative rating, such placement could lead to the teacher’s dismissal if improvements are not noted.

Ineffective Teachers

An ineffective teacher 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. While TCSC will provide professional assistance for that teacher, the corporation will also ensure that students do not receive instruction from an ineffective teacher two years in a row. When this is unavoidable, parents will be notified in writing of this status at the beginning of the student’s assignment to that class.
Review of Components

Each teacher’s summative evaluation score will be based on the following components and measures:

1) Professional Practice – Assessment of instructional knowledge and skills
   Measure: Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER)

2) Student Learning – Contribution to student academic progress
   Measure: Individual Growth Model (IGM)*
   Measure: School-wide Learning Measure (SWL)
   Measure: Student Learning Objectives (SLO)

* This measure only applies to teachers of grades 4 through 8 who teach ELA or math.

The method for scoring each measure individually has been explained in the sections above. This section will detail the process for combining all measures into a final, summative score.

Weighting of Measures

The primary goal of the weighting method is to treat teachers as fairly and as equally as possible. This particular weighting method does this in a few ways:

- Wherever possible, it aims to take a teacher’s mix of grades and subjects into account
- It gives the most weight to the measures that are standardized across teachers
- It includes the same measures (whenever possible) for each teacher

At this point, the evaluator should have calculated or received individual scores for the following measures: Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER), Individual Growth Model (IGM) (if available), School-Wide Learning Measure (SWL), and Student Learning Objectives (SLO). How these measures are weighted depends on a teacher’s mix of classes and the availability of growth data. Teachers fall into one of two groups (further definitions of these groups can be found in the Glossary).

Group 1: Teachers who have individual growth model data for at least one subject.
   Teacher Effectiveness Rubric 70%, School-wide Learning 5%, Individual Growth Model 15%, Student Learning Objectives 10%

Group 2: Teachers who do not teach any classes with growth model data.
   Teacher Effectiveness Rubric 70%, School-wide Learning 5%, Student Learning Objectives 25%

Each group of teachers has a separate weighting scheme. Each is summarized in the charts below.
Growth model and rubric data are given more weight because educators have more experience with these measures. Student Learning Objectives are a new and difficult process for many. This percentage may increase over time, once teachers and principals are given sufficient practice and training on writing rigorous Student Learning Objectives.

Compared across groups, the weighting looks as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>G1: At least one GM classes</th>
<th>G2: Non-GM classes only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Effectiveness Rubric</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Growth Model Data</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Objectives</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-wide Learning Measure</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the weights are applied appropriately, an evaluator will have a final decimal number. Below is an example from a Group 1 teacher:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Effectiveness Rubric</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>X 70%</td>
<td>= 2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Growth Model Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X 15%</td>
<td>= 0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X 10%</td>
<td>= 0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-wide Learning Measure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X 5%</td>
<td>= 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of the Weighted Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= 3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To get the final weighted score, simply sum the weighted scores from each component.
This final weighted score is then translated into a rating on the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Improvement Necessary</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Points</td>
<td>1.75 Points</td>
<td>2.5 Points</td>
<td>3.5 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Borderline points always round up.

The score of 3.23 maps to a rating of “Effective”. Primary evaluators should meet with teachers in a summative conference to discuss all the information collected in addition to the final rating derived electronically from PIVOT.

Teachers and administrators should have an understanding of the definitions of negative impact on student learning at the beginning of the evaluation cycle, as well as the procedures by which a teacher’s rating will be adjusted if he or she is identified as negatively impacting student learning. A teacher identified as having a negative impact on student learning cannot receive a final evaluation result of effective or highly effective. The final evaluation rating will either be improvement necessary or ineffective and will depend on the combination of all measures included in the performance evaluation. The final summative rating may be modified by the evaluator to reflect this. A teacher who has received a rating of ineffective may request a private conference with the superintendent. This request must be made in writing and within five (5) working days of the conference held between the teacher and the evaluator.

Evaluators will gather evidence of a teacher’s effectiveness and record that evidence in the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric. Much of this evidence will be gathered through extended and short classroom observations. Teachers are invited to collect and share information and evidence that would support their efforts in any of the domains of the evaluation process. This may become more important when there is a difference of opinion between the evaluator and the teacher, where supporting evidence would help to document a position. Teachers who receive a rating of “ineffective or improvement necessary” would strongly be encouraged to collect evidence to help document their professional growth and improvements.

**Performance Pay**

The performance pay package has been developed and is distributed in two phases. The first phase is the performance pay that is negotiated with the TEA and is based on the teacher evaluation and experience. (See Appendix I) The second phase is based on the Performance Award Grant distributed by the IDOE in December. This award is distributed to those teachers rated highly effective or effective and the amount of the awarded stipend is calculated based on the factors of attendance, leadership, and professional growth. (See Appendix J)
**Oversight Process**

The Certified Personnel Appraisal Plan will be reviewed annually by the Teacher Evaluation Committee of teachers and administrators for the purpose of making changes to reflect best practices in teacher evaluation and as a result of feedback from teachers and principals in the school corporation. The Teacher Evaluation Committee will continue to monitor progress and to review issue and concerns. Each corporation- and school-wide program anomaly will be reviewed by the Teacher Evaluation Committee and if a problem exists, corrective action will be taken by the committee. When appropriate, summative ratings that were affected by the identified problem will be modified in keeping with the corrective action.

The teacher appraisal rubric software used by the evaluators will provide data on how teachers are scored using this appraisal system. Through an analysis of the data gathered, it will show the final ratings and how many teachers were scored in each area. The data can help to show if there are discrepancies in how teachers are being scored. It will also provide information on the strengths and areas of concerns of the teaching staff within a building or within the corporation.

As we look at the evaluation process, we will use this data to assess the evaluation plan itself. The committee will collect informal and formal feedback from teachers as they complete evaluations in December and again in March. The committee will meet annually to review the evaluation plan and examine the data collected on the evaluations for analysis. TCSC incorporates the IN-TASS Teacher Evaluation Plan Rubric to help evaluate the TCSC Certified Personnel Appraisal Plan.
**Glossary of Terms**

**Achievement:** Defined as meeting a uniform and pre-determined level of mastery on subject or grade level standards. Achievement is a set point or “bar” that is the same for all students, regardless of where they begin.

**Artifacts:** Any evidence, in a variety of formats that could be used to support, document, or give evidence of task or performance being met.

**Beginning-of-Year Conference:** A conference in the fall during which a teacher and primary evaluator discuss the teacher’s prior year performance and Professional Development Plan (if applicable).

**Certified Employee:** Those employees who are required to hold a licensed issued by the Indiana Department of Education. This would include all classroom teachers, counselors, media specialist, and administrators.

**Classified Employee:** Those employees who work for the school but are not required to hold a license issued by the Indiana Department of Education. These would include those employed as clerical, custodial, and food service staff to name a few.

**Classroom Walk-Through:** An unannounced observation lasting a minimum of 3 to 5 minutes. There are no conferencing requirements for classroom walk-throughs. Feedback in writing must be delivered within two school days.

**Classroom Student Learning Objective:** A mastery goal based on students’ starting point for a class or classes of students covering all of the Indiana content standards for the course. This is sometimes referred to as a Primary Objective.

**Competency:** There are nineteen competencies, or skills of an effective teacher, in the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric. These competencies are split between the four domains. Each competency has a list of observable indicators for evaluators to look for during an observation.

**Corporation-Wide Assessment:** A common assessment given to all schools in the corporation. This assessment may have either been created by teachers within the corporation or purchased from an assessment vendor. This may also be an optional state assessment that the corporation chooses to administer corporation-wide (ex. Acuity, mClass, etc.).

**Documentation:** Any evidence or artifact, in a variety of formats that could be used to support, document, or give evidence of task or performance being met.

**Domain:** There are four domains, or broad areas of instructional focus, included in the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric: Planning, Instruction, Leadership, and Core Professionalism. Under each domain, competencies describe the essential skills of effective instruction.
End-of-Course Assessment: An assessment given at the end of the school year to measure mastery in a given content area. The state currently offers end-of-course assessments in Algebra I, English 10, and Biology I. However, many districts and schools have end-of-course assessments that they have created on their own.

Extended Observation: An announced observation lasting a minimum of 40 minutes. Extended observations are accompanied by optional pre-conferences and mandatory post-conferences including written feedback within five school days of the observation.

Group 1 Teacher: For the purpose of summative weighting, a group 1 teacher is a teacher who has at least one subject or one of their “classes” that has growth model data. More specifically, this includes any teacher in grades 4-8 that teaches either ELA or Math OR any teacher in grades 4-8 that teaches either ELA or Math for at least one class. Their weighted evaluation would be based on: Teacher Effectiveness Rubric 70%, School-wide Learning 5%, Individual Growth Model 15%, and Student Learning Objectives 10%.

Group 2 Teacher: For the purpose of summative weighting, a group 2 teacher is a teacher for whom none of his/her classes have growth model data. This currently represents all PK-3rd teachers and all high school teachers. It also may represent any teachers in grades 4-8 that teach neither math nor ELA. Their weighted evaluation would be based on: Teacher Effectiveness Rubric 70%, School-wide Learning 5%, and Student Learning Objectives 25%.

Growth: Improving skills required to achieve mastery on a subject or grade-level standard over a period of time. Growth differentiates mastery expectations based on baseline performance.

Indiana Growth Model: The IN Growth Model rating is calculated by measuring the progress of students in a teacher’s class to students throughout the state who have the same score history (their academic peers). All teachers will have a small component of their evaluation based on school-wide growth model data. Individual growth model data currently only exists for teachers in grades 4-8 ELA/Math.

Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric: The Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric was written by an evaluation committee of education stakeholders from around the state. The rubric includes nineteen competencies and three primary domains: Planning, Instruction, and Leadership. It also includes a fourth domain: Core Professionalism, used to measure the fundamental aspects of teaching, such as attendance.

Indicator: These are observable pieces of information for evaluators to look for during an observation. Indicators are listed under each competency in the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric.

ISTEP+: A statewide assessment measuring proficiency in Math and English Language Arts in grades 3-8, Social Studies in grades 5 and 7, and Science in grades 4 and 6. The Indiana Growth model uses ISTEP+ scores in Math and ELA to report student growth for these two subjects in grades 4-8.
Mid-Year Conference: An optional conference in the middle of the year in which the primary evaluator and teacher meet to discuss performance thus far.

Negative Impact: This occurs when a teacher is unable to have students show performance growth during time they are assigned to them. Negative impact on student learning shall be defined as follows: (1) For classes measured by statewide assessments with growth model data, the department shall determine and revise at regular intervals the cut levels in growth results that would determine negative impact on growth and achievement. Cut levels shall be published by August 1. (2) For classes that are not measured by statewide assessments, negative impact on student growth shall be defined locally 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. (511 IAC 10-6-4)

Post-Conference: A mandatory conference that takes place after an extended observation during which the evaluator provides feedback verbally and in writing to the teacher.

Pre-Conference: An optional conference that may be requested by the teacher or the evaluator and that takes place before an extended observation during which the evaluator and teacher discuss important elements of the lesson or class that might be relevant to the observation.

Primary Evaluator: The person chiefly responsible for evaluating a teacher. This evaluator approves Professional Development Plans (when applicable) in the fall and assigns the summative rating in the spring. Each teacher has only one primary evaluator. The primary evaluator must perform a minimum of one extended and two short observations. A secondary evaluator may perform the additional short observation(s).

Professional Assistance Plan: The individualized plan for educator professional development based on prior performance. Each plan consists of goals and clear action steps for how each goal will be met. The only teachers in the appraisal process who must have a Professional Assistance Plan are those who received a rating of Improvement Necessary or Ineffective the previous evaluation.

Professional Development Goals: These goals identified through self-assessment and reviewing prior evaluation data, are the focus of the teacher’s Professional Development Plan over the course of the year. Each goal will be specific and measurable, with clear benchmarks for success.

Professional Judgment: A primary evaluator’s ability to look at information gathered and make an informed decision on a teacher’s performance without a set calculation in place. Primary evaluators will be trained on using professional judgment to make decisions.

Professional Practice: Professional Practice is the first of two major components of the summative evaluation score (the other is Student Learning). This component consists of information gathered through observations using the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric and conferences during which evaluators and teachers may review additional materials.
**School-Wide Assessment:** A school-wide assessment is common to one school, but not given across schools. It is usually created by a team of teachers within the school, but may have been purchased from an outside vendor. It is administered to all students in a given grade or subject. For an assessment to be considered school-wide, it must be given by more than one teacher.

**School-Wide Growth Model:** All teachers will have a small component of their evaluation based on school-wide growth model data.

**School-Wide Learning (SWL):** School-wide student learning is a score aligned with Indiana’s A – F accountability model. The new A – F accountability model is based on several metrics of school performance, including the percent of students passing the math and ELA ISTEP+, IMAST, and ISTAR for elementary and middle schools, and Algebra I and English 10 ECA scores as well as graduation rates and college and career readiness for high schools.

**Secondary Evaluator:** An evaluator whose observations, feedback, and information gathering informs the work of a primary evaluator.

**Statewide Assessment:** A statewide assessment refers to any mandatory assessment offered by the state. Examples of this in Indiana include: ISTEP, ECAs, LAS Links, mClass, etc.

**Student Learning Objective:** A long-term academic goal that teachers and evaluators set for groups of students. It must be specific and measureable using the most rigorous assessment available, based on available prior student learning data, aligned to state standards, and based on student progress and achievement.

**Student Learning:** Student learning is the second major component of the summative evaluation score (the first is Professional Practice). Student learning is measured by a teacher’s individual Indiana Growth Model data (when available), school-wide Indiana Growth Model data, and Student Learning Objectives. These elements of student learning are weighted differently depending on the mix of classes a teacher teaches.

**Summative Conference:** A conference held when all data is available where the primary evaluator and teacher discuss performance from throughout the year leading to a summative rating.

**Summative Rating:** The final summative rating is a combination of a teacher’s Professional Practice rating and the measures of Student Learning. These elements of the summative rating are weighted differently depending on the mix of classes a teacher teaches. The final score is mapped on to a point scale. The points correspond to the four summative ratings: Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Ineffective.

**Targeted Student Learning Objective:** This objective is a growth and/or achievement goal that may cover either all or a sub-set of Indiana content standards targeted at students beginning the class at a low level of preparedness. This is sometimes referred to as a Secondary Objective.
**Teacher-Created Assessment:** A teacher-created assessment is an individual exam developed and administered by an individual teacher. Please note that a teacher-created assessment does not refer to an assessment created by and administered by *groups* of teachers (see school-wide assessment).

**Years' Growth:** Depending on the assessment tool used, a year’s growth is defined as maintaining the percentile or NCE score from the beginning of the year to the end of the year, or raising a grade equivalent score by 1.0 point. If a student begins at the 85th percentile in August and ends the year at the 85th percentile, he has shown a year’s growth. Likewise, if a student begins the year at 5.9 and ends the year with a grade equivalent score of 6.9, he is showing a year’s growth.
Performance Level Ratings

Each teacher will receive a rating at the end of the school year in one of four performance levels:

**Highly Effective Teacher:** A teacher receiving a performance level rating of highly effective is a teacher that 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 Teacher:** A teacher receiving a performance level rating of effective is a teacher that 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 Necessary Teacher:** A teacher receiving a performance level rating of improvement necessary is a teacher that 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 earning 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 Teacher:** A teacher receiving a performance level rating of ineffective is a teacher that 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.
Appendix A: Indiana Code 20-28-11.5

IC 20-28-11.5
Chapter 11.5. Staff Performance Evaluations

IC 20-28-11.5-0.5 "Certificated employee"
Sec. 0.5. As used in this chapter, "certificated employee" includes the following:
   (1) A certificated employee (as defined in IC 20-29-2-4).
   (2) For purposes of annual performance evaluations conducted for a school year beginning after June 30, 2014, a teacher (as defined in IC 20-18-2-22), regardless of whether the individual is a certificated employee (as defined in IC 20-29-2-4).

As added by P.L.239-2015, SEC.6.

IC 20-28-11.5-1 "Evaluator"
Sec. 1. As used in this chapter, "evaluator" means an individual who conducts a staff performance evaluation. The term includes a teacher who:
   (1) has clearly demonstrated a record of effective teaching over several years;
   (2) is approved by the principal as qualified to evaluate under the plan; and
   (3) conducts staff performance evaluations as a significant part of teacher's responsibilities.

As added by P.L.90-2011, SEC.39.

IC 20-28-11.5-2 "Plan"
Sec. 2. As used in the chapter, "plan" refers to a staff performance evaluation plan developed under this chapter.

As added by P.L.90-2011, SEC.39.

IC 20-28-11.5-3 "School corporation"
Sec. 3. As used in this chapter, "school corporation" includes:
   (1) a school corporation;
   (2) a school created by an interlocal agreement under IC 36-1-7;
   (3) a special education cooperative under IC 20-35-5; and
   (4) a joint career and technical education program created under IC 20-37-1.

However, for purposes of section 4(a) and 4(b) of this chapter, "school corporation" includes a charter school, a virtual charter school, an eligible school (as defined in IC 20-51-1-4.7).


IC 20-28-11.5-4 School corporation plan; plan components
Sec. 4. (a) Each school corporation shall develop a plan for annual performance evaluations for each certificated employee. A school corporation shall implement the plan beginning with the 2012-2013 school year.
(b) Instead of developing its own staff performance evaluation plan under subsection (a), a school corporation may adopt a staff performance evaluation plan that meets the requirements set forth in this chapter or any of the following models:

1. A plan using master teachers or contracting with an outside vendor to provide master teachers.
2. The System for Teacher and Student Advancement (TAP).
3. The Peer Assistance and Review Teacher Evaluation System (PAR).

(c) A plan must include the following components:

1. Performance evaluations for all certificated employees, conducted at least annually.
2. Objective measures of student achievement and growth to significantly inform the evaluation. The objective measures must include:
   (A) student assessment results from statewide assessments for certificated employees whose responsibilities include instruction in subjects measured in statewide assessments;
   (B) methods for assessing student growth for certificated employees who do not teach in areas measured by statewide assessments; and
   (C) student assessment results from locally developed assessments and other test measures for certificated employees whose responsibilities may or may not include instruction in subjects and areas measured by statewide assessments.
3. Rigorous measures of effectiveness, including observations and other performance indicators.
4. An annual designation of each certificated employee in one (1) of the following rating categories:
   (A) Highly effective.
   (B) Effective.
   (C) Improvement necessary. (D) Ineffective.
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.
7. For annual performance evaluations for school years beginning after June 30, 2015, provide for a pre-evaluation planning session conducted by the superintendent or equivalent authority for the school corporation with the principals in the school corporation.

(d) In developing a performance evaluation model, a school corporation may consider the following:

1. Test scores of students (both formative and summative).
2. Classroom presentation observations.
3. Observation of student-teacher interaction.
5. Dedication and effectiveness of the teacher through time and effort on task.
(6) Contributions of teachers through group teacher interactivity in fulfilling the school improvement plan.
(7) Cooperation of the teacher with supervisors and peers.
(8) Extracurricular contributions of the teacher.
(9) Outside performance evaluations.
(10) Compliance with school corporation rules and procedures.
(11) Other items considered important by the school corporation in developing each student to the student's maximum intellectual potential and performance.

The state board and the department may recommend additional factors, but may not require additional factors unless directed to do so by the general assembly.

(e) This subsection applies to plans applicable to annual performance evaluations for school years beginning after June 30, 2015. The plan must:
(1) be in writing; and
(2) be explained to the governing body in a public meeting; before the evaluations are conducted. Before explaining the plan to the governing body, the superintendent of the school corporation shall discuss the plan with teachers or the teachers' representative, if there is one. This discussion is not subject to the open door law (IC 5-14-1.5). The plan is not subject to bargaining, but a discussion of the plan must be held.

(f) The evaluator shall discuss the evaluation with the certificated employee.


IC 20-28-11.5-5 Conduct of evaluations
Sec. 5. (a) The superintendent or equivalent authority, for a school corporation that does not have a superintendent, may provide for evaluations to be conducted by an external provider.
(b) An individual may evaluate a certificated employee only if the individual has received training and support in evaluation skills.

As added by P.L.90-2011, SEC.39.

IC 20-28-11.5-6 Completed evaluation; remediation plan; conference with superintendent
Sec. 6. (a) A copy of the completed evaluation, including any documentation related to the evaluation, must be provided to a certificated employee not later than seven (7) days after the evaluation is conducted.
(b) 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 (90) 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. If the principal did not conduct the performance evaluation, the principal may direct the use of the certificated employee's license renewal credits under this subsection.
(c) A teacher 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 fifty (5) days after
receiving notice that the teacher received a rating of ineffective. The teacher is entitled to a private conference with the superintendent or superintendent's designee.

As added by P.L.90-2011, SEC.39.

IC 20-28-11.5-7  Student instructed by teachers rated ineffective; notice to parents required
Sec. 7. (a) This section applies to any teacher instructing students in a content area and grade subject to IC 20-32-4-1(a)(1) and IC 20-32-5-2.

(b) A student may not be instructed for two (2) consecutive years by two (2) consecutive teachers, each of whom was rated as ineffective under this chapter in the school year immediately before the school year in which the student is placed in the respective teacher's class.

(c) If a teacher did not instruct students in the school year immediately before the school year in which students are placed in the teacher's class, the teacher's rating under this chapter for the most recent year in which the teacher instructed students, instead of for the school year immediately before the school year in which students are placed in the teacher's class, shall be used in determining whether subsection (b) applies to the teacher.

(d) If it is not possible for a school corporation to comply with this section, the school corporation must notify the parents of each applicable student indicating the student will be placed in a classroom of a teacher who has been rated ineffective under this chapter. The parent must be notified before the start of the second consecutive school year.

As added by P.L.90-2011, SEC.39.

IC 20-28-11.5-8  State board actions; model plan; approval of plan by teachers
Sec. 8. (a) To implement this chapter, the state board shall do the following:

(1) Before January 31, 2012, adopt rules under IC 4-22-2 that establish:

(A) the criteria that define each of the four categories of teacher ratings under section 4(c)(4) of this chapter;
(B) the measures to be used to determine student academic achievement and growth under section 4(c)(2) of this chapter;
(C) standards that define actions that constitute a negative impact on student achievement; and
(D) an acceptable standard for training evaluators.

(2) Before January 31, 2012, work with the department to develop a model plan and release it to school corporations. Subsequent versions of the model plan that contain substantive changes must be provided to school corporations.

(3) Work with the department to ensure the availability of ongoing training on the use of the performance evaluation to ensure that all evaluators and certificated employees have access to information on the plan, the plan's implementation, and this chapter.

(b) A school corporation may adopt the department's model plan, or any other model plan approved by the department, without the state board's approval.

(c) A school corporation may substantially modify the model plan or develop the school corporation's own plan, if the substantially modified or developed plan meets the criteria established under this chapter. If a school corporation substantially modifies the model
plan or develops its own plan, the department may request that the school corporation submit the plan to the department to ensure the plan meets the criteria developed under this chapter. If the department makes such a request, before submitting a substantially modified or new staff performance evaluation plan to the department, the governing body shall submit the staff performance evaluation plan to the teachers employed by the school corporation for a vote. If at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the voting teachers vote in favor of adopting the staff performance evaluation plan, the governing body may submit the staff performance evaluation plan to the department. (d) Each school corporation shall submit its staff performance evaluation plan to the department. The department shall publish the staff performance evaluation plans on the department's Internet web site. A school corporation must submit its staff performance evaluation plan to the department for approval in order to qualify for any grant funding related to this chapter.


IC 20-28-11.5-8.5 Plan for performance evaluations not subject to bargaining; review of plans by the department and the Indiana employment relations board; requirement to present plans selected to the state board of education

Sec. 8.5. A plan for performance evaluations under this chapter may be discussed, but is not subject to bargaining. Selection of a performance evaluation model is at the discretion of the school corporation, but the developed plan must be reported to the department and the Indiana education employment relations board in a timely manner, as established by the department. The department may review the plan for efficacy and the Indiana education employment relations board may review the plan for legality, and both may comment to the school corporation. The department shall annually present to the state board of education plans selected by the school corporations. The state board may recommend model plans to school corporations, but shall not mandate any plan.

As added by P.L.213-2015, SEC.184.

IC 20-28-11.5-9 Department report of evaluation results

Sec. 9. (a) The principal of a school in a school corporation shall report in the aggregate the results of staff performance evaluations for the school for the previous school year to the superintendent and the governing body for the school corporation before August 15 of each year on the schedule determined by the governing body. The report must be presented in a public meeting of the governing body. Before presentation to the governing body, the superintendent of the school corporation shall discuss the report of completed evaluations with the teachers. This discussion is not subject to the open door law (IC 5-14-1.5). The report of completed evaluations is not subject to bargaining, but a discussion of the report must be held.

(b) A school corporation annually shall provide the disaggregated results of staff performance evaluations by teacher identification numbers to the department:

(1) after completing the presentations required under subsection (a) for all schools for the school corporation; and

(2) before November 15 of that year.
Before November 15 of each year, each charter school (including a virtual charter school) shall provide the disaggregated results of staff performance evaluations by teacher identification numbers to the department.

(c) Before August 1 of each year, each charter school and school corporation shall provide to the department:
   
   (1) the name of the teacher preparation program that recommended the initial license for each teacher employed by the school; and
   
   (2) the annual retention rate for teachers employed by the school.

(d) Not before the beginning of the second semester (or the equivalent) of the school year and not later than August 1 of each year, the principal at each school described in subsection (b) shall complete a survey that provides information regarding the principal's assessment of the quality of instruction by each particular teacher preparation program located in Indiana for teachers employed at the school who initially received their teaching license in Indiana in the previous two (2) years. The survey shall be adopted by the state board and prescribed on a form developed not later than July 30, 2016, by the department that is aligned with the matrix system established under IC 20-28-3-1(i). The school shall provide the surveys to the department along with the information provided in subsection (c). The department shall compile the information contained in the surveys, broken down by each teacher preparation program located in Indiana. The department shall include information relevant to a particular teacher preparation program located in Indiana in the department's report under subsection (g).

(e) During the second semester (or the equivalent) of the school year and not later than August 1 of each year, each teacher employed by a school described in subsection (b) in Indiana who initially received a teacher's license in Indiana in the previous three (3) years shall complete a form after the teacher completes the teacher's initial year teaching at a particular school. The information reported on the form must:
   
   (1) provide the year in which the teacher was hired by the school;
   
   (2) include the name of the teacher preparation program that recommended the teacher for an initial license;
   
   (3) describe subjects taught by the teacher;
   
   (4) provide the location of different teaching positions held by the teacher since the teacher initially obtained an Indiana teaching license;
   
   (5) provide a description of any mentoring the teacher has received while teaching in the teacher's current teaching position;
   
   (6) describe the teacher's current licensure status; and
   
   (7) include an assessment by the teacher of the quality of instruction of the teacher preparation program in which the teacher participated.

The form shall be prescribed by the department. The forms shall be submitted to the department with the information provided in subsection (c). Upon receipt of the information provided in this subsection, the department shall compile the information contained in the forms and include an aggregated summary of the report on the department's Internet web site.
Before December 15 of each year, the department shall report the results of staff performance evaluations in the aggregate to the state board, and to the public via the department's Internet web site for:

1. the aggregate of certificated employees of each school and school corporation;
2. the aggregate of graduates of each teacher preparation program in Indiana;
3. for each school described in subsection (b), the annual rate of retention for certificated employees for each school within the charter school or school corporation; and
4. the aggregate results of staff performance evaluations for each category described in section 4(c)(4) of this chapter. In addition to the aggregate results, the results must be broken down:
   A) by the content area of the initial teacher license received by teachers upon completion of a particular teacher preparation program; or
   B) as otherwise requested by a teacher preparation program, as approved by the state board.

Beginning November 1, 2016, and before September 1 of each year thereafter, the department shall report to each teacher preparation program in Indiana for teachers with three (3) or fewer years of teaching experience:

1. information from the surveys relevant to that particular teacher education program provided to the department under subsection (d);
2. information from the forms relevant to that particular teacher preparation program compiled by the department under subsection (e); and
3. the results from the most recent school year for which data are available of staff performance evaluations for each category described in section 4(c)(4) of this chapter with three (3) or fewer years of teaching experience for that particular teacher preparation program. The report to the teacher preparation program under this subdivision shall be in the aggregate form and shall be broken down by the teacher preparation program that recommended an initial teaching license for the teacher.

Appendix B: Suggested List of Artifacts

I. Planning and Preparation:
   - Lesson Plans
   - Long Range Plans
   - Assessment Plan
   - Grading Plan/Grade Book
   - Discipline Plan
   - Substitute Plans

II. Classroom Environment:
   - Affective domain (self-esteem, incentives, rewards, projects, etc.)
   - Physical Layout (rationale)
   - Seating Arrangement (rationale)
   - Group Building Strategies
   - Cooperative Learning
   - Classroom Rules/Routine
   - Management Forms
   - Bulletin Boards (interactive, instructional, affective)
   - Homework Plan

III. Instruction:
   - Units of Study/Thematic Units
   - Extension/Enrichment Activities
   - Review/Reinforcement Activities
   - Modifications/Differentiations for Special Needs
   - Flexible Grouping Plans
   - Instructional Sequence (samples from whole lesson sequence-planning through culmination)
   - Completed Student Work Samples (with evidence of individually specific teacher feedback)
   - Homework Assignments and Guides
   - Technology Links (multi-media, laser disc, internet, etc.)
   - Curriculum Integration Efforts
   - Video-taping of Instruction/Photo Chronology of Unit Sequence

IV. Personal and Professional Responsibilities:
   - Professional Involvement (District Committees, School Committees, Professional Organizations, Community Projects)
   - Research to Practice (Professional Reading, Journals)
   - Team/Grade Level (Group Planning Notes)
   - Parent Communication (notes, letters, phone calls, surveys, forms, etc.)
   - Coursework. Conferences, Workshops, Presentations, Meetings
   - Collegiality

*Use of technology resources is encouraged in developing artifacts.
Appendix C: Student Learning Objective (SLO) Reports

Form provided through PIVOT
Tipton Community School Corporation
Teacher Evaluation Plan
Student Learning Objective (SLO) Report

Name
Assignment/Grade
Other Participants
Date Submitted ______________ Date Approved ______________

Purpose
A Student Learning Objective Plan provides an opportunity for instructors to focus on certain goals that will allow them to use (collective) talents, research, and best practices to improve the quality of instruction for students. These goals should be measurable (and/or observable) to ensure the goal is adequately met.

Procedure
Teachers shall submit plans by September 30 and the administrator shall approve the plan by October 15. The plan shall be assessed before the end of the school year with results reported to the approving administrator.

Format
Options include working independently, with another person (teacher, aide, university professor, administrator, business person, etc.) or with a team (grade level, interdisciplinary, etc.).

Goal Setting
The foundation of a Student Learning Objective Plan is the selection of a worthy goal that is closely tied to overarching district goals, standards, and student achievement. The assessment shall be completed in one (1) school year; however, teachers are encouraged to target important areas for growth that will have a lasting impact two (2), three (3) or more years later.

To set the Student Learning Objective, a teacher must only decide the appropriate proportion of students who will achieve mastery for each performance level. These proportions are based on students’ starting points. Although teachers and evaluators must use professional judgment when determining the appropriate proportions, the following guidelines are suggested:

- To be considered **Highly Effective**, all students in the high and medium levels of preparedness and most of the students in the low level achieve content mastery. (80% of the class reaching mastery)
- To be considered **Effective**, all students in the high level, almost all students in the medium level and many of the students in the low level achieve content mastery. (70% of the class reaching mastery)
- To be considered **Improvement Necessary**, most students in the high and medium levels of preparedness, and few students in the low level achieve content mastery. (50% of the class reaching mastery)
- To be considered **Ineffective**, few or no students achieve content mastery. (below 50% of the class reaching mastery)

The number of students selected from each level of preparedness is not strictly defined. Instead, it is expected that teachers — who know the students the best — use their professional judgment to determine how many students from each category most appropriately represent “most”, “many”, or “few”. Only a teacher knows the variation of levels of students within any given level of preparedness (e.g. a student who is medium high vs. medium low). The teacher should use this knowledge to help write the objective and discuss this with his or her evaluator.
Student Learning Objective (SLO)

1. Describe an area (district goal, standard, or area of student achievement) you feel your students need to master and show growth. Include the data you will use to show achievement and growth in your goals for your classroom that reflects the needs of your high, middle, and low students.

2. Describe how this is important to student learning in your subject area/classroom.

3. Describe the strategies and activities, such as those listed below, that you plan to use to help students successfully reach your goal. Describe your vision of how to use those and any other strategies in your instruction.

- Flipped classroom
- Using technology
- Project based learning
- Differentiated Instruction
- My Big Campus
- Utilize a new computer application
- Peer coaching
- Inquiry based learning

4. Describe the indicators, such as those listed below, that will measure progress toward attainment of the goal. Include in a time line these indicators and others you foresee observing.

- Pre/Post Tests
- Sample Student Work
- Student Portfolios
- Test Data

Date of Conference

Goal Description

Anticipated Ending Date

Teacher Signature

Administrator Signature
Post-Assessment Conference:

Date:________________________________

To be filled out by the teacher:

1. What was the result of the assessment?

2. Describe the student learning you observed while working to achieve this goal.

Comments:

Teacher Signature______________________________________

Administrator Signature___

_____________________________________________
Appendix D:  

**SLO Timeline and Checklist**

**Timeline and Checklist**

Below is a general overview of the timeline of the Student Learning Objective process and checklists of each major section of the timeline with more details.

---

**Student Learning Objectives in RISE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparing Assessments</th>
<th>Initial Conference</th>
<th>Mid-Course Check-In</th>
<th>End-of-Year Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Corporations pre-approve any assessments they themselves created</td>
<td>• Teachers collect evidence to define students’ starting points, and uses it to set Primary Objective</td>
<td>• Teacher and evaluator discuss formative evidence of student learning and progress towards Objectives</td>
<td>• Teacher and evaluator review evidence and score Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers and evaluators review and approve assessments created at the school or classroom level and establish content mastery scores</td>
<td>• Teachers Assess needs of target population, and choose appropriate content and assessment for Secondary Objective</td>
<td>• Evaluator establishes ways to support teacher’s efforts to promote student learning</td>
<td>• Evaluator incorporates final Student Learning Objectives score into RISE summative rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ongoing feedback based on formative assessments and interim student achievement data.
### Approving Assessments and Creating Content Mastery Scores

#### Prior to the beginning of the school year – typically in the spring of the previous school year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher should:</th>
<th>The evaluator should:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Decide what is the best assessment available for a Primary Objective as determined by assessment hierarchy.</td>
<td>□ Create an assessment matrix indicating the available assessments for all teachers. Share with faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Meet with other teachers of the same course or grade level (if applicable) to review common assessments for alignment and stretch, rigor and complexity and format by completing the Assessment Pre-Approval form. If no common assessment exists, when feasible, teachers and curriculum leaders should work to create one.</td>
<td>□ If possible, meet with teacher teams as they review their assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ For each assessment reviewed above, set a content mastery score and record on the Assessment Pre-Approval form.</td>
<td>□ Review Pre-Approval forms, and approve or provide feedback for revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Provide copies of the Pre-Approval form to the evaluator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### After the school year:

| □ Review the common assessments used for Primary Student Learning Objectives and make revisions when necessary. Assessments do not need to be reapproved unless significant changes were made. | |

### Beginning-of-year Student Learning Objective approval conference:
Review and approve each teacher’s Student Learning Objectives.

#### Prior to the beginning-of-year Student Learning Objective approval conference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The teacher should:</th>
<th>The evaluator should:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Determine the course which will be targeted by the Student Learning Objectives. When appropriate, this course should not be covered by Growth Model data.</td>
<td>☐ If possible, meet with teachers as they plan their Student Learning Objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Collect evidence on students’ starting points and classify each student’s level of preparedness</td>
<td>☐ If possible, review each teacher’s evaluation of their students starting points and his/her Student Learning Objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Use students’ starting points and the <em>Primary Objective Setting Form</em> to determine the proportion of students who must achieve mastery in order to attain each performance level.</td>
<td>☐ If a teacher-created or teacher-obtained assessment is being used, review the assessment and scoring tool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Use students’ starting points and the <em>Secondary Objective Setting form</em>, specify the target population, content standard(s), and assessment, and write the Secondary Learning Objective.</td>
<td>☐ Schedule the beginning-of-year conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Provide copies of the above forms to the evaluator at least 48 hours in advance of any discussion (2 school days).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### During beginning-of-year Student Learning Objective approval conference:

1. Review and discuss the evidence of student starting points and the drafted Student Learning Objectives.
   a. If necessary, make any adjustments to the Student Learning Objectives.
2. If changes do not need to be made to the Student Learning Objectives, the evaluator may approve both by signing the *Evaluator Approval of Student Learning Objectives* form.
3. Establish clear next steps for the evaluator and teacher after the approval.

#### After the beginning-of-year Student Learning Objective approval conference:

☐ The teacher collects formative assessment data in order to monitor students’ progress towards Student Learning Objectives and adjusts instruction as necessary
### Mid-year conference:
Review student learning data supplied by the teacher, revise Student Learning Objectives if necessary.

#### Prior to the mid-year check-in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The <strong>teacher</strong> should:</th>
<th>The <strong>evaluator</strong> should:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☐ Collect important interim student learning data related to the Student Learning Objectives and complete the *Mid-Year Check-in Form*. Both should be submitted to the evaluator 48 hours before the review (2 school days). | ☐ Schedule the mid-year check-in  
☐ Review the *Mid-Year Check-in Form* and examine all available formative student learning outcomes that relate to the Primary or Secondary Learning Objective. |

#### During the mid-year check-in:

Review the *Mid-Year Check-In* form and available formative student learning data. The evaluator should ask questions that will help him/her gauge the current level of student learning, as well discuss the ways in which he/she can support the teacher’s efforts to promote academic achievement.

#### After the mid-year check-in:

The teacher should continue to monitor progress towards Learning Objectives, and the evaluator should follow through with the support strategies discussed in the mid-year check-in.
### End-of-year Scoring:
Review student learning data, including the results of summative assessments, and determine scores for Student Learning Objectives.

#### Prior to end-of-year review conference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The <strong>teacher</strong> should:</th>
<th>The <strong>evaluator</strong> should:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Collect all end-of-course assessment data used for the Primary and Secondary Student Learning Objectives and record this data on the <em>End-of-Course Review Form</em>.</td>
<td>☐ Schedule the end-of-year review conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Submit any additional information to help evaluators judge the Secondary Objective. This might consist of additional graded student assessments, classwork, or student work products.</td>
<td>☐ Review the teacher’s <em>End-of-Course Review Form</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Submit the <em>End-of-Course Review Form</em> 48 hours before the end-of-year review conference (2 school days).</td>
<td>☐ Determine the overall Secondary Student Learning Objective score that best describes the learning of the teacher’s students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### During end-of-year review conference:

1. Review and discuss the student learning data and attainment of objectives.
2. Evaluator has a chance to ask any outstanding questions about student learning data.
3. Evaluator finalizes overall Student Learning Objective score and shares with teacher, along with any rationale and summative feedback

#### After end-of-year review conference:

- ☐ Evaluator incorporates Final Student Learning Objective score into the overall all RISE score. (See the RISE Handbook for more information on how to incorporate the Student Learning Objectives score into a final teacher rating.)
Appendix E: Observation of Teacher Practice Questions and Answers for Teachers

How will my proficiency on the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric be assessed?

Your proficiency will be assessed by a primary evaluator, taking into account information collected throughout the year during extended observations, short observations, and conferences performed by both your primary evaluator as well as secondary evaluators.

What is the role of the primary evaluator?

Your primary evaluator is responsible for tracking your evaluation results and helping you to set goals for your development. The primary evaluator must perform at least one of your short and at least one of your extended observations during the year. At the end of the year, the primary evaluator will look at information collected by all evaluators throughout the year and determine your summative rating. He or she will meet with you to discuss this final rating in an end-of-year conference.

What is a secondary evaluator?

A secondary evaluator may perform extended or short observations as well as work with teachers to set Student Learning Objectives. The data this person collects is passed on to the primary evaluator responsible for assigning a summative rating.

Do all teachers need to have both a primary and secondary evaluator?

No. It is possible, based on the capacity of a school or corporation, that a teacher would only have a primary evaluator. However, it is recommended that, if possible, more than one evaluator contribute to a teacher’s evaluation. This provides multiple perspectives on a teacher’s performance and is beneficial to both the evaluator and teacher.

What is an extended observation?

An extended observation lasts a minimum of 40 minutes. It may be announced or unannounced. It may take place over one class or span two consecutive class periods.

Are there mandatory conferences that accompany an extended observation?

a. Pre-Conferences: Pre-Conferences are not mandatory, but are scheduled by request of teacher or evaluator. Any pieces of information that the evaluator would like to see during the observation (lesson plans, grade book, etc.), may be requested of the teacher prior to the extended observation.

b. Post-Conferences: Post-Conferences are mandatory and must occur within five school days of the extended observation. During this time, the teacher must be presented with written and oral feedback from the evaluator.
**How many extended observations will I have in a year?**

All teachers must have a minimum of one extended observations per year. Probationary teachers, or those teachers identified as needing improvement will have a second extended observation.

**Who is qualified to perform extended observations?**

Any trained primary or secondary evaluator may perform an extended observation. The primary evaluator assigning the final, summative rating must perform a minimum of one of the extended observations.

**What is a Classroom Walk-Through?**

A classroom walk-through is short observation lasting 3 to 5 minutes and is usually not announced. There are no conferencing requirements around classroom walk-through, but a post-observation conference should be scheduled if there are areas of concern. A teacher must receive written feedback following a classroom walk-through within two school days.

**How many short observations will I have in a year?**

All teachers will have a minimum of one classroom walk-through per grading period. However, many evaluators may choose to visit classrooms much more frequently than the minimum requirement specified here.

**Who is qualified to perform short observations?**

Any primary evaluator or secondary evaluator may perform a classroom walk-through. The primary evaluator assigning the final, summative rating must perform a minimum of one of the classroom walk-through.

**Is there any additional support for struggling teachers?**

It is expected that a struggling teacher will receive observations above and beyond the minimum number required by this plan. This may be any combination of extended or short observations and conferences that the primary evaluator deems appropriate. It is recommended that primary evaluators place struggling teachers on a Professional Assistance Plan.

**Will my formal and informal observations be scored?**

Both extended and short observations are times for evaluators to collect information. There will be no summative rating assigned until all information is collected and analyzed at the end of the year. However, all evaluators are expected to provide specific and meaningful feedback on performance following all observations. For more information about scoring using the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric, please see the scoring section of this handbook.
**Domain 1: Planning and Domain 3: Leadership is difficult to assess through classroom observations. How will I be assessed in these Domains?**

Evaluators should collect material outside of the classroom to assess these domains. Teachers should also be proactive in demonstrating their proficiency in these areas. Examples of material for these domains may include (but are not limited to):

a. Domain 1: Planning - lesson and unit plans, planned instructional materials and activities, assessments, and systems for record keeping

b. Domain 3: Leadership - documents from team planning and collaboration, call-logs or notes from parent-teacher meetings, and attendance records from professional development or school-based activities/events

**What is a professional development plan?**

An important part of developing professionally is the ability to self-reflect on performance. The professional development plan is a tool for teachers to assess their own performance and set development goals. In this sense, a professional development plan supports teachers who strive to improve performance, and can be particularly helpful for new teachers. Although every teacher is encouraged to set goals around his/her performance, only teachers who score an “Ineffective” or “Improvement Necessary” on their summative evaluation the previous year are required to have a professional development plan monitored by an evaluator.

**If I have a professional assistance plan, what is the process for setting goals and assessing my progress?**

Teachers needing a professional assistance plan work with an administrator to set goals at the beginning of the academic year. These goals are monitored and revised as necessary. Progress towards goals is formally discussed during the mid-year conference, at which point the evaluator and teacher discuss the teacher’s performance thus far and adjust individual goals as necessary. Professional development goals should be directly tied to areas of improvement within the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric. Teachers with professional assistance plans are required to use professional growth points for professional development activities.

**Is there extra support in this system for new teachers?**

Teachers in their first few years are encouraged to complete a professional development plan with the support of their primary evaluator. These teachers will benefit from early and frequent feedback on their performance. Evaluators should adjust timing of observations and conferences to ensure these teachers receive the support they need. This helps to support growth and also to set clear expectations on the instructional culture of the building and school leadership.
What are some examples of negative impact for teachers without growth model data?

Please see the following options for establishing language for negative impact. This list is not exhaustive and should serve only as a starting point:

Option A
If a teacher satisfies the following two variables, he or she will not be eligible to receive a summative rating in the Effective or Highly Effective range.

1. Fewer than 50% of the minimum number of students required to receive a rating as improvement necessary on the teacher’s class SLO achieve content mastery and few to no students achieve the targeted goal, and
2. Fewer than 60% of their students pass the end of course assessment.

The criteria for both variables must be met in order for a teacher to be identified as negatively impacting student learning. This rigorous requirement supports an accurate identification of negative impact and protects against anomalies.

Option B
If a teacher satisfies the following two variables, he or she will not be eligible to receive a summative rating in the Effective or Highly Effective range.

1. The teacher receives an ineffective rating in both SLOs (class and targeted, or both targeted), and
2. Fewer than 60% of their students pass the end of course assessment.

The criteria for both variables must be met in order for a teacher to be identified as negatively impacting student learning. This rigorous requirement supports an accurate identification of negative impact and protects against anomalies.

Option C
If a teacher scores a 1 (Ineffective) on BOTH his/her SLO (class SLO and targeted SLO) measures in the first year of implementation, then the primary evaluator should review student learning data available for all of the teacher’s students. If 90% or more of students failed to show achievement of standards (achievement is defined as 70% or higher on the SLO assessments or pass rate on other major student assessments such as STAR Reading/ECA), then the teacher shall be determined to be having a negative impact on student learning. If the teacher’s other summative data (rubric and school-wide learning) together with the SLO summative data should yield a summative rating score in the Effective or Highly Effective range, the summative score would then be reduced to Needs Improvement.

The highlighted percentages are arbitrarily set as an example. It is suggested to discuss the percentages with teachers and other administrators.
### Appendix F: Timeline for Annual Observations and Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August - September</td>
<td>Teachers establish SLOs and have them approved by their evaluator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September – December</td>
<td>Classroom observations take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>At least one extended observation and an appropriate number of classroom walkthroughs have been conducted for each teacher followed by a post-observation conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January – March</td>
<td>Additional extended observations conducted for probationary teachers and those teachers rated as “Improvement Necessary” or “Ineffective” in the first observation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional classroom walkthroughs conducted on all teachers. Data and evidence in all areas collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April – June</td>
<td>Final evaluation ratings determined and shared with teachers. All information will be included except IGM data and SLOs related to ISTEP results. This information will be added when available (approximately August).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Tools & Forms from PIVOT’s Staff Assessment Tool

**SLOs.** If you are teaching a class and need to create an SLO for the school year, click on the "Set My SLO" button. You'll then fill out the SLO form and submit for approval from your evaluators.

**Growth Plan.** As a Teacher you can create your Growth Plan by clicking on the "Set My Growth Plan" button below. You'll then fill out the Growth Plan form and submit for approval from your evaluators.

**Professional Development.** If you have PD's assigned they will appear in the 'My Professional Development' section below. In each PD you can view the assigned options and leave reflections.

**Documents.** Evaluation Documents can be used to attach a Document to an entire Rubric or individual Competencies. This will present the Observer/Evaluator with the Document during an Observation and an Evaluation. Click "Add Document" to add Documents or click any Document listed to edit its details.

**Your Rubric.** This lists the various rubrics that you can see the layout of the domains. Teachers will use the rubrics RISE Teacher 2.0 and Classroom Walkthrough. The RISE Teacher 2.0 is also available through Google Drive. The Classroom Walkthrough Rubric is list here for your information.

**Classroom Walkthrough.** Evaluators will complete this form for brief unannounced visits of 3 to 5 minutes in length. This information is used for additional documentation but provides no direct scoring in conjunction with the rubric.
Setting Up the Student Learning Objective

### Your SLO Class Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year:</td>
<td>2013-2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Mastery Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High - Medium - Low -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Level of Student Preparedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly Effective (Score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective (Score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement Necessary (Score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ineffective (Score)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Class Learning Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly Effective (Score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective (Score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement Necessary (Score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ineffective (Score)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Performance Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This section will be filled in by the Teacher after the SLO has been approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Buttons

- Add another Class Objective
- Add another Targeted Objective
- Cancel
- Save & Finish Later
- Save & Request Approval
Setting up a Teacher Growth Plan

![Growth Plan Information Form]

**Growth Plan Name:**

**Teacher:** Alan Darnell

**School Year:** 2013-2014

**Growth Plan General Comments:**

**Start Date:**

**End Date:**

**Goal**

**Start Date:**

**End Date:**

**Goal:**

**Action 1:**

**Action 2:**

**Evidence of Achievement:**

This section will be filled in by the Teacher after Growth Plan has been Approved.

**Buttons:** Cancel, Save & Finish Later, Save & Request Approval
Developing and Tracking Professional Development

If you have PDs assigned they will appear in the 'My Professional Development' section below. In each PD you can view the assigned options and leave reflections.

You haven't been assigned any Professional Development for this school year (2013-2014).
Uploading Documents

Evaluation Documents can be used to attach a Document to an entire Rubric or individual Competencies. This will present the Observer/Evaluator with the Document during an Observation and an Evaluation. Click “Add Document” to add Documents or click any Document listed to edit its details.

**Filters**

- **Document Name**: Search or Clear
- **Type of Document**:
  - Upload your Document
  - Web Link
- **Upload Document**: Choose File (No file chosen)
- **Document Description**:

**Your Documents**

No Documents!

**System Documents: Shared with You**

No Documents!
Classroom Walkthrough

1. Student Engagement

   Number of Competencies: 5

   Domain Description:

   1.1. Competency Engagement of Students

   (1) Observed
       • Active Teaching/Active Learning
       • Active Teaching/Passive Learning
       • Passive Teaching/Passive Learning

   (0) Not Observed
       • Not Observed

   1.2. Competency Activities

   (1) Observed
       • Student Seatwork/Teacher Engaged
       • Student Group Work/Teacher Engaged
       • Student Group Work/Teacher Disengaged

   (0) Not Observed
       • Not observed

   1.3. Competency Learning Objectives

   (1) Observed
       • Posted in room
       • Stated orally
       • On syllabus or assignment sheet
       • Not Posted

   (0) Not Observed
       • Not observed

   1.4. Competency Connections to Standards

   (1) Observed
       • Clear and stated
       • Implied
       • No connection

   (0) Not Observed
       • Not observed

   1.5. Competency Instructional Calendar

   (1) Observed
       • On desk
       • Inaccessible
       • Non-existent

   (0) Not Observed
       • Not observed
## 2. Content, Curriculum

### Domain Description:
Number of Competencies: 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Competency Lesson Content</td>
<td>(1) Observed</td>
<td>Appropriately arranged, Inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Competency Lesson Activities</td>
<td>(1) Observed</td>
<td>Appropriately arranged, Inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Competency Pacing/Timing of Instruction</td>
<td>(1) Observed</td>
<td>Appropriately arranged, Inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. Competency Cognitive Level</td>
<td>(1) Observed</td>
<td>Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis, Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Competency Application of Instruction</td>
<td>(1) Observed</td>
<td>Knowledge in one, Apply in discipline, Apply across disciplines, Apply to real world predictable, Apply to real world unpredictable situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. Competency Modality of Instruction</td>
<td>(1) Observed</td>
<td>Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic, Technological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7. Competency Assessment of Instruction</td>
<td>(1) Observed</td>
<td>Informal discussion, Objective quiz or test, Essay/Short answer quiz or test, Performance assessment, None evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8. Competency Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>(1) Observed</td>
<td>Identifying Similarities and Differences, Summarizing and Note Taking, Reinforcing Effort and Providing Recognition, Homework and Practice, Nonlinguistic Representation, Cooperative Learning, Setting Objectives and Providing Feedback, Generating and Testing Hypotheses, Questions, Cues, and Advanced Organizers, Other Non-High Yield Instructional Strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(0) Not Observed Not observed
### 3. Classroom Management

**Domain Description:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Number of Competencies: 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Competency Use of Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Observed</td>
<td>• Appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) Not Observed</td>
<td>• Inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Competency Climate/Room Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Observed</td>
<td>• Appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) Not Observed</td>
<td>• Inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. Competency Room Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Observed</td>
<td>• Appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0) Not Observed</td>
<td>• Inappropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Principals
FROM: Kevin Emsweller, Superintendent
DATE: 10/15/13
RE: Long Term Absences & Evaluations

In cases of any long term leave of absence, certified employees must work 120 days to receive a complete, final summative evaluation and thus be eligible for any performance pay. Understanding that extenuating circumstances may exist in any given situation, this application may be appealed by either the employee or the supervisor. This appeal will be considered by a committee composed of three teachers and three administrators, with the superintendent serving as the chairperson and tie breaking vote.
Appendix I: Professional Compensation (as found in TEA Contract)

Article IX

PROFESSIONAL COMPENSATION

A. Teacher compensation will be based upon performance with teachers earning units for specific performance in the following three defined factors:
   1. Evaluation (added to base)
   2. Experience (added to base)

B. Teachers who are evaluated as Needs Improvement or Ineffective (bottom two (2) categories of the evaluation model) are not eligible to receive salary or stipend increases, except for those that are eligible per IC 20-28-9-1.5(d).

C. Teachers may earn four units in factor 1 and one unit in factor 2 for a maximum of 5 units per year.

D. The teacher must be under contract the following year to be eligible for unit/performance pay. When notice of retirement is given by June 15 of the year of retirement, those teachers who retire at the end of the school year will be eligible to receive up to eight (8) units, if earned, and this pay will be payable in the form of a stipend.

E. A salary range with a minimum salary of $31,521 and a maximum salary of $62,541 is established. No teacher will experience a decrease from the per diem she/he earned under the 2016-2017 master contract.

F. In accordance with Indiana Code 20-28-9-1.5, upon completion of a Master’s Degree from an accredited postsecondary educational institution in a content area directly related to the subject matter of a dual credit course or another course taught by the teacher, a middle school or high school teacher’s base salary will increase by $2,000 the next contract year. In addition, for an elementary teacher who earns a Master’s Degree in math or reading and literacy that a teacher’s base salary will increase by $2,000 the next contract year. This amount was discussed, not bargained.

G. Teachers who earn units that would result in a compensation being above the maximum salary will have all remaining earned units paid in the form of a stipend.

H. FACTORS added to salary base - 5 Units Possible
   1. Teacher Evaluation - 4 Units
      Teachers who score in the top two categories (Highly Effective or Effective) on the teacher evaluation earn 4 units.
   2. Experience - 1 Unit
      A unit is given for a year of experience with TCSC. A year experience is a minimum of 120 paid days as defined by the Indiana Public Retirement System.
APPENDIX J: Performance Award: State Grant (January Distribution)

PERFORMANCE AWARD DISTRIBUTION
(January Distribution)

For years in which the Performance Pay Award is granted from the State of Indiana, it will be distributed to eligible teachers in the following manner:

1. All teachers in the corporation who scored a 3 or 4 on the Teacher Evaluation Plan are eligible to be granted this money.
2. For each 4 earned on Teacher Evaluation, $1 from the total award will be subtracted.
3. Eligible teachers will earn three points for an equivalent portion of this money by:
   a. Attendance
   b. Professional Development
   c. Leadership
4. Total money received (plus what the corporation is willing to subsidize) less $1 per 4 earned on the Teacher Evaluation Rubric divided by the total points earned (above) corporation-wide will equal the “per point” stipend.
5. Multiply each teacher’s earned points x “per point stipend amount” Add $1 for all teachers who scored a 4.

For years in which Performance Award Money is granted from the State, it will be distributed to teachers who were employed in the previous year in the Tipton Community School Corporation, in the form of a stipend, based on the following criteria.

A. Teacher Performance Award Stipends will be based upon teachers earning units in the following three categories:
   a. Attendance
   b. Professional Development/Growth
   c. Leadership
B. Teachers who are evaluated as Needs Improvement or Ineffective (bottom two (2) categories of the evaluation model) are not eligible to receive salary or stipend increases. (IC 20-28-9-1(c))
C. Teachers who score a 4 on their Teacher Evaluation Plan will receive $1 more than those teachers who score a 3 on their Teacher Evaluation Plan. (IC 20-43-10-3)
D. When notice of retirement is given by June 15 of the year of retirement, those teachers who retire at the end of the school year will be eligible to receive up to three (3) units of the Performance Award, if earned, in the following January Distribution.
E. Teachers may earn three units, one unit in each category of Attendance, Professional Development/Growth, and Leadership.
F. FACTORS added as a Performance Award Stipend - 3 Unit Possible

a. Attendance - 1 Unit
   i. The teacher maintains a minimum of 97% attendance (6 days absence or less within a 183-day contractual year). This requirement excludes the following: FMLA approved leave, bereavement leave, personal days, military leave, professional leave, jury duty.

b. Professional Development/Growth Opportunities - 1 Unit
   i. Teacher earns a minimum of fifteen (15) professional growth points (PGP) within the contractual year.
   ii. Professional growth will be defined as those activities that could be applied toward license renewal, such as conferences, workshops, publications, and local activities. PGP’s must be approved by the appropriate administrator.
   iii. All documentation for professional development units must be submitted to the evaluator no later than the last teacher work day of the school year.

c. Leadership - 1 Unit
   i. The teacher may choose to do four different items from the following list to earn one unit:
      1. Serve on a committee (corporation or building). Serving on two committees will count for two of the four points.
      2. Write and receive a grant.
      3. Teach a dual credit course.
      4. Supervise a student teacher.
      5. Sponsor a student club.
      6. Actively participate in a local civic organization in Tipton.
      7. Volunteer tutoring provided on a consistent and significant basis during non-instructional time.
      8. Assume an additional teaching assignment for which the majority of other teachers in the building are not assigned as part of the teacher’s regular assignment.
      9. Mentor a teacher according to the guidelines established by the Tipton Community School Corporation. Mentorship must be preapproved by the administration.
     10. Present a total of 3 different educational-based workshops at Wednesday morning PD’s or before/after school (minimum 30 minutes). Workshops must have an attendance of at least 5 people. These workshops must be pre-approved by the building administration.
     11. Attend 3 different before/after school educational-based workshops given by peers.
     12. Actively participate in a professional organization directly related to your discipline.
     13. Have an article published in a professional journal (print or online).
     14. Present a workshop at a state or regional conference.
15. Hold a state office or serve on the state board for your professional organization.

16. Submit to the superintendent articles for the possibility of publishing in the newspaper or the corporation newsletter.

17. Give a presentation highlighting a school program, activity, or issue to the school board or to a local organization.

18. Work to attain National Board Certification and then continue to use knowledge to enhance education in subsequent years.

19. Work to attain the Gifted & Talented Certification on your teaching license and then continue to use knowledge to enhance education in subsequent years.

20. Work to attain the K-12 Computer Endorsement on your teaching license and then continue to use knowledge to enhance education in subsequent years.

ii. If a person has been serving in a leadership position, they will be allowed to remain in that position.

iii. If there is already a stipend paid for a leadership role (i.e. Club Sponsor, Department Chair, etc.), this position will not be included in the Performance Award Money Stipend.

iv. All documentation for leadership units must be submitted to the evaluator no later than the last teacher work day of the school year.

**Definition of Teacher Leadership:**

“Teacher leadership is the process by which teachers, individually or collectively, influence their colleagues, principals, and other members of the school community to improve teaching and learning practices with the aim of increased student learning and achievement.”