

Metropolitan School District of Wabash County

Teacher Evaluation and Development Plan

July 2021



Metropolitan School District of Wabash County Teacher Evaluation and Development Plan

The purpose of this handbook is to outline and explain the Metropolitan School District of Wabash County(MSDWC) Teacher Evaluation and Development Plan. The model is a modification of the IDOE's RISE Teacher Evaluation model.

The following handbook represents a collaborative effort that ensures the MSDWC Teacher Evaluation and Development plan is in compliance with state law (Senate Enrolled Act 1).

House Enrolled Act (HEA) 1002 (July 1, 2020) amends existing I.C. 20-28-11.5-4 by removing the requirement that student assessment results from statewide standardized assessments be used as part of a certified employee's annual evaluation performance plan.

Guiding Principles

1. Nothing MSDWC can do for our students matters more than giving them effective teachers. Teachers are the most important school factor in how much children learn.
2. Teachers deserve to be treated like professionals. MSDWC is committed to creating evaluations that are fair, accurate and consistent, based on multiple factors that paint a complete picture of each teacher's success in helping students learn.

Legislative Context

- In the spring of 2011, the Indiana legislature passed IC 20-28-11.5, a new law relating to the evaluation of all certified teaching staff.
- House Enrolled Act (HEA) 1002 (July 1, 2020) amends existing I.C. 20-28-11.5-4 by removing the requirement that student assessment results from statewide standardized assessments be used as part of a certified employee's annual evaluation performance plan.
- The law includes the following main requirements:
 - Every certified employee must receive an evaluation annually;
 - Every evaluation system must include four performance categories: Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Ineffective; and
 - Rigorous measures of effectiveness, including observations and other performance indicators.
 - An explanation of the evaluator's recommendations for improvement and the time in which improvement is expected.
 - A provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective.

Performance Level Ratings

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.
- **Effective: An *effective* teacher consistently meets expectations.** This is a teacher who has consistently met expectations, as determined by a trained evaluator
- **Improvement Necessary: A teacher who is rated as *improvement necessary* requires a change in performance before he/she meets expectations.** This is a teacher who a trained evaluator has determined to require improvement
- **Ineffective: An *ineffective* teacher consistently fails to meet expectations.** This is a teacher who has failed to meet expectations.

Overview of Components

Every teacher is unique, and the classroom is a complex place. This evaluation relies on multiple sources of information to paint a fair, accurate, and comprehensive picture of a teacher's performance. 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 Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TRE). All teachers will be evaluated in the domains of Planning, Instruction, Leadership, and Core Professionalism.

2. **Student Learning** – Teachers’ contribution to student academic progress, assessed through multiple measures of student academic achievement and growth.

Length of Service:

Every teacher must work 120 days or more to receive a summative evaluation rating as outlined in the Teacher Evaluation and Development Plan. If a teacher works less than 120 days throughout the school year, the teacher will be observed and evaluated as time permits, but will not receive a summative evaluation rating.

Timeline

August – September

- Teacher(s) and evaluator(s) meet for the Beginning-of-the Year Conference

August – December

- Evaluator makes classroom observations and provides feedback

November – February

- Teacher and evaluator meet for the Mid-Year Conference at teacher’s request or evaluator’s discretion

January – May

- Evaluator continues to make classroom observations and provide feedback

May – June

- Evaluator completes observations and scores Teacher Effectiveness Rubric

Upon Collection of Data

- Evaluator completes Summative Evaluation
- Teacher and evaluator meet for the End-of-Year Conference
- Evaluator gives the teacher a copy of the Summative Evaluation within 7 days of the End-of-Year Conference

Evaluation Steps

Step 1 – Beginning-of-Year Conference – all certified employees will be evaluated annually. The evaluator will meet with all staff (August or September). The purpose of the meeting is to:

- review the evaluation process and
- highlight priority competencies and indicators from the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric

Teachers on an improvement plan will write a professional development plan with the primary evaluator near the beginning of the school year.

Step 2 – Classroom Observations – During the school year, evaluators (both primary and secondary) will collect evidence through a series of observations and conferences.

The following table indicates minimum requirements for observations.

Beginning Teacher (First year at MSDWC) OR Any teacher who was rated <i>Improvement Necessary</i> or <i>Ineffective</i> within the past 3 years.						
Observation Type	Length (minutes)	Frequency	Pre-Conference	Post-Conference	Written Feedback	Announced
Extended	30-40 minutes	2/year (1/semester)	Evaluator’s discretion	Yes	Within 5 days	Evaluator’s discretion (1 st year MSDWC – Yes, 1 st one announced.)
Short	10 – 15 minutes	3/year (min. 1/semester)	No	No	Within 3 days	No

Veteran Teachers (2 or more years at MSDWC)						
Observation Type	Length (minutes)	Frequency	Pre-Conference	Post-Conference	Written Feedback	Announced
Extended	30-40 minutes	1/year (1/semester)	No	Yes	Within 5 days	No
Short	10 – 15 minutes	2/year (1/semester)	No	No	Within 3 days	No

Optional Forms

Pre-Observation Form (SFS)

Post-Observation Form (SFS)

If a teacher is on an improvement plan, that plan will determine the number of observations and feedback.

Step 3 – Mid-Year Conference (by teacher’s request or evaluator’s discretion)

– This conference is to be held in November, December, January, or February where the primary evaluator and teacher meet to discuss performance thus far.

This conference will be **mandatory** if a teacher is in jeopardy of being rated as *ineffective* or *improvement necessary* based on prior observations, or has been rated *ineffective* or *needs improvement* on an evaluation within the past 5 years. This conference is also mandatory for any teacher new to MSDWC.

Step 4 – Teacher Effectiveness Rubric: Scoring

1. **The primary evaluator compiles ratings and notes from observations, conferences, and other sources of information.** At the end of the school year, the primary evaluator should have collected a body of information representing teacher practice from throughout the year. In addition to notes from observations and conferences, teachers shall provide evidence of planning and leadership. See Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Domains 1 and 3.
2. **The primary evaluator uses professional judgment to establish a final rating.** In the summative conference, the evaluator should discuss the rating with the teacher, using the information collected to support the final decision.

At this point, each evaluator should have a rating that ranges from 1 (*Ineffective*) to 4 (*Highly Effective*).

3. **The primary evaluator uses established weights to calculate one rating for domains 1-3.** 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 1: Planning (10%), Domain 2: Instruction (75%), and Domain 3: Leadership (15%). Effective instruction and classroom environment matter more than anything else a teacher can do to improve student outcomes.
4. **Core Professionalism is incorporated.** This domain represents non-negotiable aspects of the teaching profession; attendance, on-time arrival, policies and procedures, and respect. This domain only has two rating levels: *Does Not Meet Standards* and *Meets Standard*. The evaluator uses available information and professional judgment to decide if a teacher has not met standards in each of the four indicators. If a teacher has met standards in each of the four indicators, the score does not change. If the teacher did not meet standards in one or more of the four indicators, he or she automatically has a 1-point deduction. A faculty member will not meet the standard if they are written up for any of

the above core professional categories or for non-continuance reasons of immorality, incompetence, and/or insubordination.

Step 5: Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring

Domain	Rating (1-4)	Weight	Weighted Rating
Domain 1 - Planning		10 %	
Domain 2 - Instruction		75 %	
Domain 3 - Leadership		15 %	
Final Score for Domains 1-3			

Use the following formula to calculate by hand:

1. Rating * % Weight = Weighted Rating
2. Sum of Weighted Ratings = Final Score for Domains 1-3

Final Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Score, Domains 1-3: _____

Review of Components – Each teacher’s summative evaluation score will be based on the following component:

Professional Practice – Assessment of instructional knowledge and skills

Measure: Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER)

Negative impact on student learning shall be defined as follows:

- 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.
- A teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective. A teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth will be determined locally by the primary evaluator.

All certified evaluations will be comprised using Group 3.

GROUP 3: 100% Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER) will be the Summative Teacher Evaluation Score

Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
1.0 Points	1.75 Points	2.5 Points	3.5 Points
	→	→	→
			4.0 Points

Note: Borderline points always round up.

Step 6: End-of-year summative evaluation conference – The primary evaluator meets with the teacher in a summative conference to discuss all the information collected in addition to the final rating. A copy of the completed evaluation, including any documentation related to the evaluation, must be provided to the teacher within seven days of the end-of-year summative evaluation conference.

Teacher Remediation Plan – If a teacher received a rating of *ineffective* or *improvement necessary*, the evaluator and the teacher shall develop a remediation plan of not more than 90 school days in length to correct the deficiencies noted in the evaluation. The remediation plan must require the use of the teacher’s license PGP’s in professional development activities intended to help the teacher improve.

The MSDWC Teacher Evaluation Process will be reviewed by teacher and administrative representatives on an annual basis. All evaluation procedures will be discussed and modifications may occur if deemed necessary to improve the MSDWC Teacher Evaluation Process.

Appendix A

Appeal – A teacher who received a rating of *ineffective* may file a request for a private conference with the superintendent not later than 5 days after receiving notice that the teacher received a rating of *ineffective*. The teacher is entitled to a private conference with the superintendent.

Parent Notice – A student may not be instructed for two consecutive years by teachers rated as *ineffective*. If it is not possible, the school corporation must notify the parents by letter of each applicable student before the start of the second consecutive year indicating the student will be placed in a classroom of a teacher who has been rated *ineffective*.

IDOE Reports – Before August 1, 2013 (and each year following), the school corporation shall provide the results of the teacher performance evaluations including the number of teachers placed in each performance category to the IDOE. The results may not include the names of teachers.

Compensation – A teacher rated *ineffective* or *improvement necessary* may not receive any raise or increment for the following year if the teacher’s employment contract is continued.

Tenure Categories – New Teacher Tenure Categories begin July 1, 2012

- A. Probationary Teacher (IC 20-28-6-7.5) – A teacher who has not received a rating (newly hired) or an established/professional teacher who receives a rating of *ineffective* or an established/professional teacher who receives two consecutive ratings of *improvement necessary*.

- B. Established Teacher (IC 20-28-6-8) – A teacher who serves under contract before July 1, 2012 and enters into another contract before July 1, 2012. All current teachers become established teachers on July 1, 2012.
- C. Professional Teacher (IC 20-28-6-7.5) – A teacher who receives a rating of *effective* or *highly effective* for at least 3 years in a 5-year (or shorter) period. A professional teacher becomes probationary if he/she receives a rating of *ineffective* or 2 consecutive ratings of *improvement necessary*.

Contract Cancellation Grounds (IC 20-28-7.5-1)

- A. Probationary Teacher
 - 1. One (1) *ineffective* rating
 - 2. Two (2) consecutive years of *improvement necessary*
 - 3. Justifiable decrease in teaching positions – After June 20, 2012, RIF's in positions must be based on performance and not seniority
 - 4. Any reason considered relevant to the school's interest
- B. Established/Professional Teacher
 - 1. Justifiable decrease in positions – After June 30, 2012, RIF's in positions must be based on performance and not seniority
 - 2. Immorality
 - 3. Insubordination
 - 4. Incompetence
 - a. Two (2) consecutive years of *ineffective* ratings; or
 - b. *Ineffective* or *improvement necessary* in three (3) years of any 5-year period
 - 5. Neglect of duty
 - 6. Certain felony convictions
 - 7. Other good and just cause