



Indiana Department of Education

Dr. Katie Jenner, Secretary of Education

Staff Performance Evaluation Plan Submission Cover Sheet

SY 2022-2023

Context: Indiana Code (IC) 20-28-11.5-8(d) requires each school corporation to submit its entire staff performance evaluation plan to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) and requires IDOE to publish the plans on its website. This cover sheet is meant to provide a reference for IDOE staff and key stakeholders to view the statutory- and regulatory-required components of staff performance evaluation plans for each school corporation. Furthermore, in accordance with IC 20-28-11.5-8(d), a school corporation must submit its staff performance evaluation plan to IDOE for approval in order to qualify for any grant funding related to this chapter. Thus, it is essential that the reference page numbers included below clearly demonstrate fulfillment of the statutory (IC 20-28-11.5) and regulatory (511 IAC 10-6) requirements.

School Corporation Name	Southwest Dubois County School Corporation
School Corporation Number	2110
Evaluation Plan Website Link	

For the 2022-2023 School Year, we have adopted the following Evaluation Model:

- The System for Teacher and Student Advancement (TAP)
- The Peer Assistance and Review Teacher Evaluation System (PAR)

x RISE 3.0 State Model

Locally Developed Plan

Other _____

Instructions:

In the chart below, please type the page numbers in your staff performance evaluation document which clearly display compliance with the requirements. Please note, your plan may include many other sections not listed below.

Submission:

Once completed, please **upload this cover sheet via the following [Jotform](#) by Friday, September 16, 2022**. If you cannot provide a direct website link (above) to your evaluation plan, you must upload the entire plan and this cover sheet as a single PDF. Please make sure the link provided will lead directly to your evaluation plan, and that a login and password will not be required for access. Contact [Dr. Rebecca Estes](#), Senior Director of Educator Talent, with any questions.

Evaluation Plan Discussion			
Requirement	Statutory/Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
Evaluation plan must be in writing and explained before the evaluations are conducted	IC 20-28-11.5-4(f)(1) IC 20-28-11.5-4(f)(2)	Process for ensuring the evaluation plan is in writing and will 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	1-3

Annual Evaluations			
Requirement	Statutory/Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
Annual performance evaluations for each certificated employee	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(1)	Plan and metrics to evaluate all certificated employees, including teachers, administrators, counselors, principals and superintendents	4-10
Annual performance evaluations include a minimum of two (2) observations	511 IAC 10-6-5	A minimum of two (2) observations as part of formative evaluations that shall take place at reasonable intervals to ensure that teachers have the opportunity to demonstrate growth prior to a summative evaluation	4-10

Evaluators

Requirement	Statutory/Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Page Number(s)
Only individuals who have received training and support in evaluation skills may evaluate certificated employees	IC 20-28-11.5-1 IC 20-28-11.5-5(b) IC 20-28-11.5-8(a)(1)(D)	Description of ongoing evaluator training Description of who will serve as evaluators Process for determining evaluators	1
Teachers acting as evaluators (<i>optional</i>) clearly demonstrate a record of effective teaching over several years, are approved by the principal as qualified to evaluate under the evaluation plan, and conduct staff evaluations as a significant part of their responsibilities	IC 20-28-11.5-1(2) IC 20-28-11.5-1(3) 511 IAC 10-6-3	Description of who will serve as evaluators Process for determining evaluators	1
All evaluators receive training and support in evaluation skills	IC 20-28-11.5-5(b) 511 IAC 10-6-3	Description of ongoing evaluator training	1

Rigorous Measures of Effectiveness

Requirement	Statutory/Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Page Number(s)
Rigorous measures of effectiveness, including observations and other performance indicators	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(2)	Observation rubrics - for all certificated staff - with detailed descriptions of each level of performance for each domain and/or indicator Other measures used for evaluations (<i>e.g.</i> , surveys)	4-10

Evaluation Feedback

Requirement	Statutory/Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Page Number(s)
An explanation of evaluator's recommendations for improvement and the time in which improvement is expected	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(4) 511 IAC 10-6-5	Process and timeline for delivering feedback on evaluations Process for linking evaluation results with professional development	1-3

Designation in Rating Category

Requirement	Statutory/Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Page Number(s)
A summative rating as one of the following: highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, or ineffective	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(5) 511 IAC 10-6-4(c)	Summative scoring process that yields placement into each performance category Weighting (broken down by percentage) of all evaluation components	3
A definition of negative impact for certificated staff A final summative rating modification if and when a teacher negatively affects student growth	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(3)	Definition of negative impact on student growth for all certificated staff Description of the process for modifying a final summative rating for negative growth	3-10

Feedback and Remediation Plans

Requirement	Statutory/Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Page Number(s)
All evaluated employees receive completed evaluation and documented feedback within seven business days from the completion of the evaluation.	IC 20-28-11.5-6(a)	System for delivering summative evaluation results to employees	23-24
Remediation plans assigned to teachers rated as ineffective or improvement necessary	IC 20-28-11.5-6(b)	Remediation plan creation and timeframe Process for linking evaluation results with professional development	4
Remediation plans include the use of employee's license renewal credits	IC 20-28-11.5-6(b)	Description of how employee license renewal credits and/or Professional Growth Points will be incorporated into remediation	12
Means by which teachers rated as ineffective can request a private conference with the superintendent	IC 20-28-11.5-6(c)	Process for teachers rated as ineffective to request conference with superintendent	12-24

Instruction Delivered by Teachers Rated Ineffective

Requirement	Statutory/Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Page Number(s)
The procedures established for avoiding situations in which a student would be instructed for two consecutive years by two consecutive teachers rated as ineffective	IC 20-28-11.5-7(c)	Process for ensuring students do not receive instruction from ineffective teachers two years in a row	3
The procedures established to communicate to parents when student assignment to consecutive teachers rated as ineffective is unavoidable	IC 20-28-11.5-7(d)	Description of how parents will be informed of the situation	3

SOUTHWEST DUBOIS COUNTY SCHOOL CORPORATION

**TEACHER EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT
PLAN**



2022-2023

SOUTHWEST DUBOIS COUNTY SCHOOL CORPORATION Teacher Evaluation and Development Plan

The purpose of this handbook is to outline and explain the Southwest Dubois County School Corporation Teacher Evaluation and Development Plan. The model is a modification of the IDOE's RISE Teacher Evaluation model and draws on elements of Bluffton-Harrison and Milan community Schools' plan. During the summer of 2012 and the fall of 2014, a group of administrators were trained in the RISE model. Changes have been made to the original plan to reflect the requirements as set forth by the IDOE after the evaluation plan audit during the 2-17-2018 school year. Administrators along with the CTA president looked at the requirements and set forth changes to the evaluation plan.

Tim LaGrange, Superintendent

Jeremy Marshall, Holland Elementary Principal

Megan Anselment, Huntingburg Elementary Principal

Chad Whitehead, Southridge Middle School Principal

Greg Gogel, Southridge High School Principal

The following handbook represents a collaborative effort that ensures the Southwest Dubois County School Corporation Evaluation and Development Plan is in compliance with state law (Senate Enrolled Act 1)

Guiding Principles

1. Nothing the Southwest Dubois County School Corporation 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. SWDCSC 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.
- The new law introduced 3 main requirements:
 - Every teacher must receive an evaluation annually;
 - Every evaluation system must include four performance categories: Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Ineffective; and
 - Every evaluation system must incorporate measures of student growth
- **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, which are 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, which are 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 who a trained evaluator has determined to require improvement in locally selected competencies, which are 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, which are 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.

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 Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric. 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.

Timeline

August – September

- Teacher and evaluator meet for the Beginning-of-the Year Conference at teacher's request or evaluator's discretion

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 seven days of the End-of-Year Conference

Step 1 – Beginning-of-Year Conference (teacher’s request or evaluator’s discretion)

The teacher meets with the primary evaluator near the beginning of the school year (August or September). The purpose of the meeting is to:

- Sign off on summative evaluation tool from previous year
- Develop a 90 day improvement plan for any teacher rated *improvement necessary or ineffective* from the previous 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 indicates minimum requirements for observations.

1. **Teachers at steps 0-5** = 2 short observations and 1 long observation
2. **Teachers at steps 6 and above** = 1 short observations and 1 long observation

NOTE: Written feedback will be given in a timely manner.

NOTE: Any teacher that has received a rating of *improvement necessary or ineffective* within the previous three years will receive 2 short observations and 2 long observations until an effective rating is achieved for three consecutive years.

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

NOTE: All pre-conferences for long and short observations will be at the evaluator’s discretion. Post-conferences will be required for all long observations but optional for short observations.

NOTE: Announcement of long and short observations will be at the discretion of the evaluator.

Optional Forms

Pre-Observation Form (Form 1)

Post-Observation form (Forms 2 and 3)

Step 3 – Mid-Year Conference (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 3 years.

Optional Forms

Mid-Year Professional Practice Check-In Form (Form 4)

Step 4 – Teacher Effectiveness Rubric: Scoring (Appendix C)

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 three final ratings in Planning, Instruction, and Leadership. After collecting evidence, the primary evaluator must use professional judgment to assess the teacher and assign a rating in each competency within the first three domains. The final three domain ratings should reflect the body of evidence available to the evaluator. In the summative conference, the evaluator should discuss the ratings with the teacher, using the evidence collected to support the final decision.

*It is recommended that the evaluator not average competency scores to obtain the final domain score, but rather use professional judgment to decide which competencies are more important to teachers in different contexts and how teachers have evolved over the course of the year.

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

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.

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 (15%), Domain 2: Instruction (75%), and Domain 3: Leadership (10%). 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 Standards*. 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.

Scoring Requirement: 1 is the lowest score a teacher can receive. 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.

Step 5: Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring – 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.

Domains 1-3 Weighted Scores

DOMAIN	RATING 1-4	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED RATING
Domain 1 - Planning		15%	
Domain 2 – Instruction		75%	
Domain 3 - Leadership		10%	
			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 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: School-wide Learning Measure (SWL) – IDOE’s A-F Ratings

Measure: Individual Growth Model (IGM) – IDOE’s 1-4 Ratings

Measure: Pre-post tests, NWEA, I-ready to determine negative impact for teachers that are teaching a non-tested subject.

The School-wide Learning Measure is determined based upon the school's current grade as defined by the IDOE. If a teacher teaches at more than one building, the school's score that the teacher spends the majority of his/her day shall be used. If a teacher spends equal time in more than one building, the school's scores will be averaged. The following scale shall determine the amount of points awarded:

- A = 4 pts
- B = 3 pts
- C = 2 pts
- D = 1 pt.
- F = 0 pts.

All teacher evaluations will be comprised using one of the following two percentage groups:

I. Group I


80% Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER) – Observations

11% Individual Growth Model Data (IGM) – DOE Data

9% School Wide Learning Measure – ISTEP E/LA and Math Scores for Grades 4-8

100% Summative Teacher Evaluation Score

GROUP I



II. GROUP II


80% Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER) – Observations

11 % - Locally developed assessments for growth and negative impact (**Pre-post tests, NWEA, I-Ready**)

9 % School Wide Learning Measure – All HS Teachers , Grade 3 and K-2

100% Summative Teacher Evaluation Score

GROUP II



Once the weights are applied appropriately, an evaluator will have a final decimal number.

COMPONENT	RAW SCORE	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED SCORE
Teacher Effectiveness Rubric			
Individual Growth Model/Locally Developed assessments (if applicable)			
School wide Learning Measure			
Sum of the weighted scores			

*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.

INEFFECTIVE	IMPROVEMENT NECESSARY	EFFECTIVE	HIGHLY EFFECTIVE
1.0 pts.	→ 1.75 pts.	→ 2.5 pts.	→ 3.5 pts. → 4.0 pts.

NOTE: Borderline Scores always round up.

Step 6: End-of-year summative evaluation conference – The primary evaluator and/or secondary 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.

The SWDCSC Teacher Evaluation Process will be reviewed by teacher and administrative representatives at the conclusion of the 2014-2015 school year and periodically thereafter. All evaluation procedures will be discussed and modifications may occur if deemed necessary to improve the SWDCSC Teacher Evaluation Process.

**Appendix A –
Notes from
Senate Enrolled Act 1
(IC-20-28-11.5)**

Appendix A – Notes from Senate Enrolled Act 1 (IC 20-28-11.5)

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 renewal credits in professional development activities intended to help the teacher improve. The *Professional Development Plan* form (Form 5) is an optional form that can be used.

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 2 consecutive years by teachers rated as *ineffective*. If it is not possible, the school corporation must notify the parents 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, 2015 (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.

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

A. Probationary Teacher

1. One *ineffective* rating
2. Two 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

Appendix B – Forms

Form 1

Pre-Observation Form - Teacher

Note: This form may be used in conjunction with a pre-conference, but can also be exchanged without a pre-conference prior to the observation.

School: _____ Observer: _____

Teacher: _____ Grade/Subject: _____

Date and Period of Scheduled Observation: _____

Dear Teacher:

In preparation for your formal observation, please answer the questions below and attach any requested material.

1. What learning objectives or standards will you target during this class?
2. How will you know if students are mastering/have mastered the objective?
3. Is there anything you would like me to know about this class in particular?
4. Are there any skills or new practices you have been working on that I should look for?

Please attach the following items for review prior to your scheduled observation:

Form 2

Post-Observation Form - Evaluator

Instructions: The primary post-observation document should simply be a copy of the observation notes taken in the classroom. This form is designed to summarize and supplement the notes.

School: _____ Observer: _____

Teacher: _____ Grade/Subject: _____

Date of Observation: _____

Domain 2: Areas of Strength Observed in the Classroom (identify specific competencies):

Domain 2: Areas of Improvement Observed in the Classroom (identify specific competencies):

Domain 1: Analysis of Information (including strengths and weaknesses) in Planning:

Domain 3: Analysis of Information (including strengths and weaknesses) in Leadership:

Action Steps for Teacher Areas of Improvement:

This section should be written by the teacher and evaluator during the post conference.

Form 3

Post-Observation Form - Teacher

School: _____ Observer: _____

Teacher: _____ Grade/Subject: _____

Date of Observation: _____

Dear Teacher:

In preparation for our post-conference, please complete this questionnaire and bring it with you when we meet. Your honesty is appreciated and will help us to have a productive conversation about your performance and areas for improvement.

1. How do you think the lesson went? What went well and what didn't go well?

2. Did you accomplish all that you wanted to in terms of students mastering the objectives of the lesson? How do you know? If not, why do you think it did not go as planned?

3. If you were to teach this lesson again, what would you do differently?

4. Did the results of this lesson influence or change your planning for future lessons?

Form 4

Mid-Year Check-In Form

School: _____ Summative Evaluator: _____

Teacher: _____ Grade/Subject: _____

Date: _____

Note: Mid-year check-in conferences are optional for any teacher without a professional practice plan, but can be helpful for evaluators to assess what evidence still needs to be collected, and for teachers to understand how they are performing thus far. It should be understood that the mid-year rating is only an assessment of the first part of the year and does not necessarily correspond to the end-of-year rating. If there has not yet been enough evidence to give a mid-year rating, circle N/A.

Number of Formal Observations Prior to Mid-Year Check-in: _____

Number of Informal Observations Prior to Mid-Year Check-in: _____

DOMAIN 1: Planning	MID-YEAR ASSESSMENT OF DOMAIN 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	
MID-YEAR RATING (Circle One)	4- Highly Effective 3 – Effective 2 – Improvement Necessary 1 – Ineffective N/A

DOMAIN 2: Instruction	MID-YEAR ASSESSMENT OF DOMAIN 2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	
MID-YEAR RATING (Circle One)	4- Highly Effective 3 – Effective 2 – Improvement Necessary 1 – Ineffective N/A

DOMAIN 3: Leadership	MID-YEAR ASSESSMENT OF DOMAIN 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	
MID-YEAR RATING (Circle One)	4- Highly Effective 3 – Effective 2 – Improvement Necessary 1 – Ineffective N/A

DOMAIN 4: Professionalism	MID-YEAR ASSESSMENT OF DOMAIN 4
4.1 Attendance 4.2 On-Time Arrival 4.3 Policies and Procedures 4.4 Respect	
MID-YEAR RATING (Circle One)	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Standards <input type="checkbox"/> Does Not Meet Standards

Form 5

Professional Development Plan

Using relevant student learning data, evaluation feedback and targeted professional development, establish at least 3 areas of professional growth below. Each of your goals is important but you should rank your goals in order of priority. On the following pages, complete the growth plan form for each goal.

Professional Growth Goal #1						
Overall Goal: <i>Using your most recent evaluation, identify a professional growth goal below. Identify alignment to rubric (domain and competency).</i>	Action Steps: <i>Include specific and measurable steps you will take to improve.</i>	Benchmarks and Data: <i>Set benchmarks to check your progress throughout the improvement timeline (no more than 90 school days for remediation plans). Also, include data you will use to ensure your progress is adequate at each benchmark.</i>			Evidence of Achievement: <i>How do you know that your goal has been met?</i>	
	Action Step 1	__/__/__	__/__/__	__/__/__	__/__/__	
		Data:	Data:	Data:	Data:	
	Action Step 2	__/__/__	__/__/__	__/__/__	__/__/__	
		Data:	Data:	Data:	Data:	

Professional Growth Goal #2						
Overall Goal: <i>Using your most recent evaluation, identify a professional growth goal below. Identify alignment to rubric (domain and competency).</i>	Action Steps: <i>Include specific and measurable steps you will take to improve.</i>	Benchmarks and Data: <i>Set benchmarks to check your progress throughout the improvement timeline (no more than 90 school days for remediation plans). Also, include data you will use to ensure your progress is adequate at each benchmark.</i>				Evidence of Achievement: <i>How do you know that your goal has been met?</i>
	Action Step 1	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> __/__/__ __/__/__ __/__/__ __/__/__ </div>				
		Data:				
	Action Step 2	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> __/__/__ __/__/__ __/__/__ __/__/__ </div>				
		Data:				

Professional Growth Goal #3

Overall Goal: <i>Using your most recent evaluation, identify a professional growth goal below. Identify alignment to rubric (domain and competency).</i>	Action Steps: <i>Include specific and measurable steps you will take to improve.</i>	Benchmarks and Data: <i>Set benchmarks to check your progress throughout the improvement timeline (no more than 90 school days for remediation plans). Also, include data you will use to ensure your progress is adequate at each benchmark.</i>				Evidence of Achievement: <i>How do you know that your goal has been met?</i>
	Action Step 1	__/__/__	__/__/__	__/__/__	__/__/__	
		Data:	Data:	Data:	Data:	
	Action Step 2	__/__/__	__/__/__	__/__/__	__/__/__	
		Data:	Data:	Data:	Data:	

Form 6

Final Summative Rating

School: _____ Summative Evaluator: _____

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Grade/Subject: _____

Note: This form should be completed based on information collected and assessed throughout the year. Evaluators should complete this form and make a copy for the teacher to discuss results during the end-of-year summative conference.

Number of Formal Observations: _____

Number of Informal Observations: _____

Domains 1-3 Weighted Scores

DOMAIN	RATING 1-4	WEIGHT	WEIGHTED RATING
Domain 1		15%	
Domain 2		75%	
Domain 3		10%	
Domain 4	Meets Standard/ Does Not Meet Standard		
	WEIGHTED	100%	Final Score for Domains 1-3

1. Rating * % Weight = Weighted Rating
2. Sum of Weighted Ratings = Weighted Score
3. Rounded Weighted Score (.5 or above round up, .49 or below round down) = Final Teacher Practice Rating

If the teacher "Meets Standards" in Domain 4 (Professionalism), deduct 0 points. The final teacher score remains the same as in the previous step. If the teacher "Does Not Meet Standards," deduct 1 point from the score calculated in the previous step.

Final Teacher Practice Score, Domains 1-4: _____

Circle the group to which the teacher belongs. Then use the appropriate weights to calculate the final rating:

Group 1

Group 2

Choose only one set of weights

Measure	Rating 1-4	Group 1 weights	Group 2 Weights	Final Summative Score
Teacher Practice Score		80%	80%	
Indiana Growth model Score OR Locally developed Assessments		11%	11%	
School wide learning measure		9%	9%	


*All teachers in the same school should have the same rating on this measure

Follow the following formula to calculate by hand:

1. Rating * % Weight = Weighted Rating
2. Sum of Weighted Ratings = Final Summative Score

Final Summative Evaluation Score: _____

Use the chart below and the Final Summative Evaluation Score to determine the teacher's final rating.



Note: Borderline points always round up.

Final Summative Rating:

Ineffective Improvement Necessary Effective Highly Effective

Teacher Signature

I have met with my evaluator to discuss the information on this form and have received a copy.
Signature: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator Signature

I have met with this teacher to discuss the information on this form and provided a copy.
Signature: _____ Date: _____