



Performance Evaluation Plan 2023-2024

Making a Difference...Realizing Potential

Hanover Community School Corporation Performance Evaluation Plan

	Table of Contents Introduction	4
Background and System Overview		4
Evaluation Plan Discussion		5
Annual Evaluations		5-7
Negative Impact IDOE Definition		8
Negative Impact HCSC Definition		8
Negative Impact for Administrators		8
Negative Impact Designations and Summative Ratings		7-8
Effectiveness Rating Determinations		9
Teacher Instructional Effectiveness Scoring Matrix		9
Final Teacher Instructional Effectiveness Rating		10
Teacher Evaluation Process		11-13
Pre-Observation Form		14
Explanation of Evaluation Plan		15
Avoiding Ineffective Instruction		15
HCSC Instructional Effectiveness Observation Instrument		16-20
Design Team Members		21
Appendix A – Teacher/Administrator Development Plan		23
Appendix B – Superintendent Evaluation and Summary		24-25

Appendix C- Assistant Superintendent Evaluation and Summary	26
Appendix D – Director of Grants and Assessment Evaluation and Summary	27
Appendix E – Technology Coach Evaluation and Summary	28
Appendix F – Principals Specialist Evaluation and Summary	29
Appendix G – Asst. Principals Evaluation and Summary	30
Appendix H – Dean of Students Evaluation and Summary	31
Appendix I – Athletic Director Evaluation and Summary	32
Appendix J –Media Specialist Evaluation and Summary	33
Appendix K – Elementary/ Middle Counselor Evaluation and Summary	34
Appendix L –High School Counselor Evaluation and Summary	35
Appendix M – School Social Worker Evaluation and Summary	36
Appendix N – Teacher Appreciation Grant Distribution	37
Appendix O – Written Request for Private Conference	38

Introduction

The primary purpose of the Performance Evaluation Plan is to promote continuous improvement in instructional practices that advance student achievement. This evaluation plan will identify both strengths and/or needs of professional staff, recognize high-quality teaching performance, inform instructional practice and relevant professional development, and inform recommendations relative to the Hanover Community School Corporation's current and future job status. *Recognition for consideration and use of components of this plan are given to TriCreek School Corporation.*

Background and System Overview

The Hanover Community Schools' teacher evaluation design team was formed to research and develop a teacher evaluation system based on the research that defines effective teaching and that met the requirements of I.C. 20-28-9 and I.C. 20-28-11-5. The design team consisted of eighteen (16) teachers representing a cross-section of grade levels, school locations, and curriculum areas, as well as four principals, the Assistant Superintendent, and the Superintendent. A listing of the design team members and their assignments appears on page 27.

The Hanover Community Schools' performance-based evaluation components include the following:

Section 1: The Teacher Observation/Evaluation Process contains:

1. The Instructional Effectiveness Rubric
2. The Instructional Effectiveness Instrument
3. The Teacher Instructional Effectiveness Score Matrix
4. The Teacher Instructional Effectiveness Rating
5. The Instructional Effectiveness Observation (Evaluation

Protocol) Section 2: Appendices

1. Teacher/ Administrator Development Plan Form
2. Evaluation Frameworks and Summaries
3. Teacher Appreciation Grant Distribution
4. Written Request for Private Conference Form

Evaluation Plan Discussion

Annually, the evaluation plan will be submitted to the teacher bargaining unit, HOPE, for discussion. The finalized yearly evaluation plan will then be presented at a public board meeting and approved by the Hanover Community School board. IC 20-28-11.5-4 (f)(1) IC 20-28-11.5-4 (f)(2) Building level administrators will review rubrics and evaluations with certified employees at the building level.

Annual Evaluations

Annually, each certified employee (teacher, counselor, administrator, etc.) will receive a rating of Highly Effective (HE), Effective (E), Improvement Necessary (IN), or Ineffective (IE) by the school principal. The Assistant Superintendent and/or Superintendent of Schools will evaluate the lead building administrator. All evaluators have been trained to understand the evaluation rubric and the tool for documenting observations. New administrators to HCSC will be trained, and professional development will be provided.

Effectiveness ratings are based on *Instructional Practice* for the building he/she primarily serves.

Group	Evaluation Instrument	Domains	Instructional Practice / Rubric
Teachers	Locally Developed: Standards for Success	1: Planning 2: Instruction 3: Managing the Learning Climate 4: Professional Responsibilities	10% 50% 30% 10%
Middle School Elementary Counselors	Local: Standards for Success	1: Planning 2: Effective Classroom 3: Counselor Leadership 4: Professional Responsibilities	10% 50% 30% 10%
High School Counselors	Indiana School Counselor Rubric	1: Academic Achievement 2: Student Assistance Services 3: Career Development 4: Professional Leadership	30% 20% 20% 30%
Social Worker	Indiana School Social Worker	1: Planning 2: Social Work Services 3: Leadership 4 Core Professionalism	10% 50% 30% 10%

Media	Indiana School Librarian Rubric	1: Purposeful Planning 2: Effective Instruction 3: Leadership 4: Professional Responsibilities	10 % 50% 30% 10%
Athletic Director	NIAA Rubric	1: Professionalism 2: Administrative Responsibilities 3: Sport Specific Duties 4: Core Professionalism	10 % 40% 40% 10%
Dean of Students	Local: Standards for Success	1: Academic and Behavioral Achievement 2: Student Services and Assistance in the Operation of the School 3: Leadership 4: Core Professionalism	10% 60% 20% 10%
Assistant Principals	RISE	1.1 : Teacher Effectiveness- Mission and Vision 1.2 : Teacher Effectiveness- Capital Management 1.33: Talent Review 2.1 : Leadership Actions- Professional Leadership 2.2: School Leadership	15% 25% 10% 25% 25%
Principals	Local: Standard for Success	1: Instructional Leadership 2: School Climate 3: Human Resources 4: Organizational Management 5: Communication and Community Relations 6: Professionalism	25% 20% 15% 15% 25% 10%
Interventionist	Local: Standards for Success	1: Planning 2: Instruction 3: Managing the Learning Climate	10% 50% 30%

		4: Professional Responsibilities	10%
Technology Coaches	Local: Standards for Success	1: Shared Vision and Leadership 2: Instruction 3: Professional Relationship and Responsibility 4: Core Professionalism	25% 30% 30% 15%
Hanover Grants and Assessment Coordinator	Local: Standards for Success	1: Human Capital Management 2: Instructional Leadership 3: Personal Behavior 4: Building Relationships 5: Culture of Achievement	25% 25% 20% 15% 15%
Assistant Superintendent (Curriculum)	Local: Standards for Success	1: Human Capital Manager 2: Leadership 3: Personal Behavior 3: Building Relationships 4: Organizational Management	20% 20% 20% 20% 20%
Superintendent	ISBA Superintendent Evaluation		100 %

Negative Impact as defined by the Indiana Department of Education

In order to receive a designation that “Negatively Impacts Student Learning,” as defined by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE), the teacher must meet the following **two** criteria based on:

- a. Low student proficiency or achievement on ILEARN (passing percentage)
- b. Low student growth from the previous test administration of the Ilearn (median student growth is ≤ 15).

Negative Impact as defined by HCSC

The designation of Negative Impact at the local level will be determined by criteria consistent with the IDOE.

Negative Impact for Administrators

The designation of Negative Impact for an administrator within HCSC will be defined by the school/district report card. A designation of D or F will be defined as Negative Impact. Additionally, an administrator with a C report card of a school or district report card will not receive a summative rating above Effective. An administrator with a school or district report card of a D will not receive a summative rating above Improvement Necessary.

Negative Impact Designation and Summative Ratings

If a teacher has been determined by the IDOE or local definition to have a Negative Impact on student learning, the teacher or administrator will be placed on a “Teacher/Administrator Development Plan.” See appendix A.

Per Indiana Code 20-28-11.5-4©(6)

Teachers who negatively affect student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective. Those teachers rated HE or E will have their summative rating dropped to “Improvement Necessary.” Teachers rated IN will have their summative rating dropped to “Not Effective.”

Per Indiana Code 20-28-11.5-7,

Administration attempts to ensure a student will NOT be placed with teachers rated ineffective for two consecutive years. Administration will notify parents when student assignments to teachers for two consecutive years are unavoidable.

Effectiveness Rating Determinations and Data Collection

After all informal and formal observations have occurred, scores will be completed for each domain. Hanover Community School Corporation utilizes Standards for Success (SFS) when completing certified evaluations. Teachers will work with the administration to compile and document all student achievement data used in the final calculations for summative ratings.

Teacher Instructional Effectiveness Scoring Matrix

Highly Effective .81-1.00 and No score below the Effectiveness Baseline Score in any Domain

Planning score ____/5 x 10% = ____

Instruction score ____/19 x 50% = ____

Managing score ____/8 x 30% = ____

P.R. score ____/9 x 10% = ____

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Domains	Effectiveness Baseline Score	Maximum Domain Score	Actual Domain Score	% Domain Score (c÷b)	Domain Weight	Weighted Domain Score (d x e = f)
1. Planning	3	5			10%	
2. Instruction	10	19			50%	
3. Managing the Learning Environment	6	8			30%	
4. Professional Responsibilities	6	9			10%	
AGGREGATE	25	41			100%	

Final Teacher Instructional Effectiveness Rating

Category ratings of a teacher's instructional effectiveness

Range of aggregate weighted domain of scores/pts. category of teacher instructional effectiveness

(1) Not effective

< .40

(2) Improvement necessary

.41 to .60 ₍₃₎

(3) Effective

.61 to .80 ₍₁₎

(4) Highly Effective

.81 to 1.00 and NO score below the Effectiveness baseline: SCORE in any DOMAIN₂

1. Aggregate Baseline Effectiveness Score (25) divided by Aggregate Maximum Domain Score (41) = Minimum Weighted Domain Score for Teacher EFFECTIVENESS (.61).
2. The Median of 1.00 (Maximum Weighted Domain Score) and .61 (the Minimum weighted Domain Score for Teacher Effectiveness is .81).
3. (.60) is less than (.61) the Minimum Weighted Domain Score for Teacher Effectiveness and (.41) continues the (.19) range in Category Range Scores.

Hanover Community Schools Teacher Evaluation Process
The Instructional Effectiveness Observation/Evaluation Protocol

I. Formative Observation

- A. The purpose of formative observation is to establish a baseline, determine specific areas of strength and weakness, and target areas of improvement resulting from this observation.
- B. The same administrator shall conduct both formative and summative evaluations. Should there be a personal conflict between the teacher and administrator, the teacher may request another administrator for the observation. Written requests must be made within one (1) week of administrator notification and sent to the central office. Teachers must be prepared to discuss specific concerns and understand that the request may not be granted.
- C. All administrators will meet yearly as a team for ongoing evaluation training and will be initially trained on evaluation from standards for success or a like vendor.
- D. Observations must be scheduled five (5) days in advance or as mutually agreed upon and must be a minimum of twenty-five (25) minutes and a maximum of sixty (60) minutes. If a scheduled observation must be canceled, the observation will be rescheduled using the same protocol as the original observation.
- E. Teachers will submit a completed Pre-Observation Form to the administrator twenty-four (24) hours in advance of the observation.
- F. No formative evaluation shall occur before the fifteenth student day. Teachers whose classes are not scheduled to meet daily shall not have a formative evaluation before October 1. Formative observations shall be completed by November 30.
- G. If a teacher is found less than effective on a rubric item, the teacher may bring documentation to demonstrate rubric expectation has been met. The administration will respond within (7) days indicating receipt of artifacts that may or may not alter the rating. A teacher may invite the administrator in for a short observation for demonstration.
- H. A post-observation conference between the teacher and the observing administrator shall be scheduled within five (5) days of the observation, and the teacher's right to representation shall be observed. Teachers will be notified of the conference at least twenty-four (24) hours before the conference is held.
- I. HOPE members who will be found less than effective will have a twenty-four (24) hour notification to bring a representative to the observation conference.
- J. The administrator and teacher must sign the observation report to acknowledge receipt.

- K. The formative observation conference will identify resources and strategies available in areas identified for improvement:
 - 1. Any less than the effective teacher will be able to request mentoring and access to professional development after the formative assessment;
 - 1. Any less than effective teacher may request placement on an intervention plan immediately.
 - 2. The administration may also recommend an intervention plan to assist the teacher.

II. Short Observations/Walkthroughs

Short observations/walkthroughs are to be a minimum of one, may or may not be scheduled, and are to occur between the formative and summative evaluation.

- A. Short observations/walkthroughs may be done at the teacher's invitation to demonstrate best practices or to engage the administrator in student activities.
- B. Short observations/walkthroughs may be done at the administrator's discretion and are short and general.
- C. Observation reflections may be used to inform the summative evaluation.
- D. These short observations may be done by any building administrator (not necessarily the same person as two formal evaluations).
- E. Short observations/walkthroughs assume a professional relationship between teacher and administrator. Administrators should inform the teacher within 48 hours of any perceived weaknesses resulting from either type of observation.

III. Summative Observation

- A. The purpose of the summative evaluation is to verify growth since formative evaluation.
- B. The summative evaluation must be at least sixty (60) days after the formative observation and prior to May 1.
- C. The summative observation shall be conducted by the same administrator as the formative evaluation.
- D. Observations must be scheduled five (5) days in advance and must be a minimum of twenty-five (25) minutes and a maximum of sixty (60) minutes. Teachers will submit a completed Pre-Observation Form to the administrator twenty-four (24) hours in advance of this observation.

IV. Summative Conference

- A. Summative conferences will be scheduled and held within five (5) days of summative observation. Teachers will receive twenty-four (24) hours' notice of the conference, and HOPE members will have the right to bring a HOPE representative to the conference.

- B. The summative conference will include rubrics from both the formal observations and may include information such as prior observations and artifacts gathered throughout the school year. When the summative conference is scheduled, the teacher shall be informed of artifacts needed to satisfy the observation rubric so those may be provided.
- C. HOPE members who are going to be found less than effective will have twenty-four (24) hour notification to bring a HOPE representative prior to their observation conference.
- D. Teachers may submit artifacts until May 15th. However, the submission of artifacts will not necessarily result in a change on the rubric.
- E. Teachers rated ineffective may request a private conference by the superintendent.

Teacher Development Plan

- A. The purpose of the teacher development plan is to assist teachers in achieving “effective” status as measured on the evaluation rubric.
- B. At the post-observation conference, measurable objectives for improvement will be clearly identified or stated. These objectives will be mutually agreed upon by both the teacher and the administrator.
- C. A plan for development that has been agreed upon by the teacher and administrator will be designed to include a timeline to ensure objectives will be met:
 - 1. Some development plans may include:
 - a. Madeline Hunter’s Peer Coaching Model;
 - b. Mentoring by teachers identified as effective in special areas (such as DI, classroom management, planning, etc.)
 - c. Participation in professional learning circles;
 - d. Attendance at workshops or other opportunities for professional development.
 - 2. Other development plans may be created to meet the specific needs of teachers in the plan.
 - 3. Plan must include a number of PGP points that must be achieved by the teacher during this remediation period.
- D. A pool of effective (and highly effective) teachers will be identified at the building level to assist those who wish to be mentored. Teachers who participate as mentors will receive full-year PGP points for their efforts.
- E. The administrator’s role in the teacher development plan is to provide teachers access to opportunities for professional development.
- F. Once the teacher and administrator agree on the teacher development plan, it will be the teacher’s responsibility to take ownership of and work through the agreed-upon plan. The teacher will be responsible for communicating with the mentor and/or administrator if additional resources are needed or desired.



**Hanover Community School
Corporation Teacher Pre-Observation
Form**

Observing Evaluator: _____

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Course and/or grade level: _____

What day would you like me to visit? (Date and time) _____

- What is the purpose and/or objective of this lesson?
- What standards are you covering during this lesson?
- Before the lesson, I will observe how did you build background knowledge or prepare students for this material?
- Will this lesson include differentiation? If so, how? (Differentiation provides multiple approaches to *content, process, and product*, e.g., *what* students learn, *how* they learn it, and how they *demonstrate what they've learned*. It is a blend of whole class, flexible groups, and/or individual instruction.)
- What will you do after this lesson? How will you remediate, re-teach, or enrich?
- What procedures have you established that students will use in this session?

- What would you really like me to notice during the lesson?

- Please list all of your extra-curricular connections, professional development history, and committees on which you serve or have served within the current year. You may include professional memberships and activities, as well (use back).

Explanation of the Evaluation Plan

The Evaluation Plan will be discussed with the Hanover Organization of Professional Educators (HOPE) and then explained to the Board of School Trustees in a public meeting before evaluations being conducted in accordance with IC 20-28-11.5-4(1) and (2).

Avoiding Ineffective Instruction / Parent Notification

To avoid situations where a student would be instructed for two consecutive years by two ineffective teachers, the principal will review student lists and identify those who were instructed by an ineffective teacher. The identified student(s) will be placed in the classroom of a teacher who has not received an ineffective rating the previous year.

In the event that a student is placed in the classroom of a teacher who has been rated ineffective for the second year in a row, personal notification to parents will occur before the start of the school year.

Hanover Community School Corporation Teacher Instructional Effectiveness Observation Instrument

Teacher _____ Evaluator _____ Date _____

School _____ Assignment/Grade _____ Subject Observed _____

Observation start time _____ End Time _____ Scheduled or Unscheduled _____

Directions: Each indicator must be marked.
 Highly Effective = 2 pts.
 Effective = 1 pt.
 Not Effective = 0 pts.
 Evaluators should provide documentation/comments when rating an indicator as either "Not Effective" or as "Highly Effective".

Planning Domain	Highly Effective (2)	Effective (1)	Not Effective (0)
1.1		The teacher has instructions aligned with the Curriculum Map and indicators.	Not evident or not clearly evident
1.2	Teacher changes group composition over time / (DI) is evident.	The teacher organizes students for tutorial/enrichment/ cooperative learning activities.	Not evident or not clearly evident
1.3	The teacher uses multiple strategies to check for understanding, (i.e., exit cards, white boards, etc.)	Teacher aligns assessment with curriculum and instruction.	Not evident or not clearly evident
Total Planning Score (Minimum effectiveness = 3)			

Instruction Domain	Highly Effective (2)	Effective (1)	Not Effective (0)
2.1		The teacher clearly states the purpose and objective of the learning.	Purpose and/or objective is not clearly established or is ineffective.
2.2	Application of background knowledge across content areas and into the real world.	Teacher elicits student response for background knowledge (i.e., give personal example – “Know, Want to Know, Learn” (KWL))	Building background is not clearly evident or ineffective.
2.3	Teacher demonstrate seamless transition from one teaching tool to another to enhance instruction.	Teacher use graphic organizers, analogies, metaphors or multiple examples to facilitate learning.	Use of instructional tools to facilitate learning is not clearly evident or not effective.
2.4	Teacher differentiate learning activities by higher-order thinking. Teaching reflects levels 2 and above DOK Language. Demonstrates an understanding of different learning styles to determine group composition. Effective student collaboration is evident (2.4.HE).	Teacher asks students to respond to questions and differentiates learning activities (2.4.E)	Students are not provided opportunities to use higher order thinking skills.
2.5	Teacher asks students to respond to higher-order questions, extensions, and seeks responses to open-ended questions.	Teacher uses effective questioning techniques to check for understanding (cues, feedback, beaming, wait time).	Questioning technique is not effective
2.6	Teacher verbally and visually models the expectation, providing opportunities for students to apply to learning (2.6.HE)	Teacher guides the practice of new learning directly and provides corrective feedback as necessary.	Student practice of new learning with direct guidance and feedback from teachers is not evident or ineffective.
2.7	Teacher maintains a routine for distributive practices (i.e., homework, bell ringer, sponge activities, etc.)	Teacher uses spiraling, distributive practice to activate prior learning.	“Spiraling” or Distributive practice of previous learning is not clearly evident.
2.8	Teacher differentiates an extension of learning (enrichment) and scaffolds instruction for struggling learners.	Teacher provides students with tutorial/enrichment tasks as a fundamental Differentiated Instruction (DI) practice.	Differentiated instruction not evident or not effectively deployed.

2.9	Teacher provides student with opportunities to summarize the learning/lesson in their own words	Teacher summarizes/closes the learning lesson.	Summary/closure not deployed or not effectively deployed.
2.10	Teacher provides students with opportunities to utilize available technology in a meaningful manner-meaning the same activity is not one that could be done on paper (It is agreed and understood that technology is not limited to a computer.)	Teacher utilizes available technology in instruction.	Available technology is not evident in instruction.
Total Instruction Score – (Minimum effectiveness=10			

III. Managing the Learning Climate Domain	Highly Effective (2)	Effective (1)	Not Effective (0)
3.1	Teacher refers to critical values in instruction and redirection.	Teacher clearly states or it is evident that student behavior complies with expectations.	Not clearly evident or not being followed.
3.2	Student-to-student interaction is respectful and when it is not teacher, redirects or intervenes effectively.	Teacher fosters mutually respectful interactions with students.	Incidents of negative interaction with students are evident.
3.3		Teachers effectively redirect student inappropriate behavior.	Student misbehavior is not effectively redirected.
3.4		Teacher awareness of what is happening in the classroom is clearly evident (withitness).	Teacher is unaware of student off-task misbehavior in the classroom or does not effectively prevent or redirect it.
3.5		Teacher establishes and clearly communicates classroom/ school procedures and they are followed by students.	Classroom/ School Procedures and routines unclear or not followed by students.
3.6		Teachers create physical space that is safe and conducive to learning.	Physical space has safety issues or is not conducive to learning.
Total Managing the Climate Score (Minimum Effectiveness=6)			

IV. Professional Responsibilities	Highly Effective (2)	Effective (1)	Not Effective (0)
4.1		Teacher attendance, arrival and departure times comply with HCSC standards.	Incidents of non-compliance are of concern.
4.2		Teacher follows school policies and procedures to include: a. maintaining and submitting records; b. monitoring student progress to comply with state, HCSC and/or school expectations.	Incidents of non-compliance are of concern.
4.3	Teacher provide evidence that communication with parents is a regular occurrence and a variety of ways have been done to engage parent involvement (i.e., communicate with parents, phone calls, parent portal, etc.)	Professional educators in HCSC are expected to: a. model the “5 Critical Values”; b. actively work to engage families in the education of their child.	Incidents of non-compliance are of concern.
4.4		Teacher effectively carries out the assigned or expected role of student supervision.	Incidents of non-compliance are of concern.
4.5	Teacher participates in the planning implementation of initiatives/meetings.	Teachers participate effectively in school/corporation initiatives/projects.	Incidents of non-compliance are of concern.
4.6	Teacher shares ideas, teaches others Best Practices (i.e., participation in PGPs, etc.)	Teachers grow professionally by seeking to continually improve the deployment of “Best Practices”.	Incidents of non-compliance are of concern.

Total PR score (minimum effectiveness=6)			
------------------------------------------	--	--	--

Teacher Evaluation Design Team

Hanover Central High School Team

Math	Patrick Joyce
English	Crystal Harrigan-Barry
Social Studies	Larry Govert
Science	Jennifer Kaste
Vocational	Arden Smith

Hanover Central Middle School Team

Math	Sandra Kessler
English	Christine Boland
Science	Robin Dillon
Social Studies	Melissa Reyes
Specials	Jay Lowry

Jane Ball Elementary School Team

Primary	Dawn Kepshire
Intermediate	Caryn Morales
HOPE Co-President	Cynthia Zyzanski

Lincoln Elementary School Team

Primary	Wendy Roberts
Intermediate	Anne Cappas

Elementary Specials

Katie Chambers

Principals

Jane Ball Elementary School – Ryan Eckart
Lincoln Elementary School – Frank Zaremba
Hanover Central Middle School – Deb Snedden
Hanover Central High School – Mary Ann West

Assistant Superintendent

Mary Tracy-MacAulay, Ed.S

Superintendent of Schools

Thomas L. Taylor, Ed.S

Hanover Community School Corporation

Appendices A-I

Teacher Development Plan (TDP) for *Needs Improvement* OR *Ineffective* Performance Levels

Teacher: _____

TDP: Please select performance level: *Needs Improvement* *Ineffective*

If a teacher’s performance level is *Needs Improvement* or *Ineffective*, the evaluator will meet with the teacher to determine a development plan and will include the following:

Plan Components	Action
1: Review the specific performance expectation(s) not being met. The elements, problem, incident(s), or situation requiring improvement should be specifically identified.	
2: Adjust the teacher and student observation/evidence timeline as needed to improve the level of performance.	
3: Working with your administrator and using data from the Informal and Formal Observations, identify a professional growth goal	
4: Develop a plan of action to improve the goal(s) area with specific and measurable steps (describe who must do what, by when, to what extent). Action steps must be identified for each goal.	
5: Determine a system of monitoring the development plan with established benchmarks to assess progress. Include supportive data and evidence that the goal has been met.	
6. Determine the use of a teacher's Professional Growth Points to assist teacher in meeting the goal(s).	
7. Determine date(s) of subsequent meetings.	

- If the evaluator and the teacher cannot agree on the Teacher Development Plan, the assistant superintendent will review the information and decide the matter.
- The evaluator will monitor the teacher’s progress and hold a conference with the teacher. At this conference, the evaluator will:
- If the status is *Needs Improvement* – determine whether the teacher has progressed to a performance level of *Effective* or *Highly Effective* or will be required to have a TDP for either *Needs Improvement* or *Ineffective*.
- If the status is *Ineffective* – determine whether the teacher will be recommended for renewal or non-renewal or be required to have a TDP for either *Needs Improvement* or *Ineffective*.
- Whenever a teacher is required to have a TDP, the building principal will inform the curriculum director and/or Superintendent.

SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Appendix B

LEADERSHIP OUTCOMES (90%):

Effectiveness Rubric (90%): This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the ISBA/IAPSS Superintendent Evaluation Rubric.

Effectiveness Rubric	Category	Points
	Highly Effective (HE)	4
	Effective (E)	3
	Improvement Necessary (I)	2
	Ineffective (IN)	1

SUPERINTENDENT GOALS/OBJECTIVES (10%):

This is an opportunity for superintendents to focus on individual goals/objectives mutually identified by the superintendent and school board that addresses local needs, focus on specific areas of school administration, or that emphasize areas of personal growth and performance. It is weighted at 10% of the superintendent's comprehensive rating.

The guidelines for Superintendent Goals/Objectives are as follows:

1. Must be collaboratively set by the superintendent and school board
2. Must be measurable
3. Must represent a minimum of two goals
4. May be a corporation or school-based
5. Can be reflective of personal growth or achievement

Expectation	Category	Points
Exceeds all goals	Highly Effective (HE)	4
Meets goals, may exceed one	Effective (E)	3
Meets only one goal	Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Meets no goals	Ineffective (IN)	1

SCALE:

		CATEGORIES		
	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
POINTS*	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.5 4.0

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Appendix C

Effectiveness Rubric (100%): This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the Locally created Assistant Superintendent Evaluation Rubric supplied by Standards for Success.

Domains	Indicators	Percent
Human Capital Manager	4	20%
Leadership	7	20%
Personal Behavior	2	20%
Building Relationships	3	20%
Organizational Management	4	20%

Category	Points
Highly Effective (HE)	4
Effective (E)	3
Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Ineffective (IN)	1

SCALE:

	CATEGORIES			
	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
POINTS*	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.5 4.0

HANOVER DIRECTOR OF GRANTS AND ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Effectiveness Rubric (100%): This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the Locally created Evaluation Rubric supplied by Standards for Success.

Domains	Indicators	Percent
Human Capital Management	3	25%
Instructional Leadership	5	25%
Personal Behavior	5	20%
Building Relationships	5	15%
Culture of Achievement	7	15%

Category	Points
Highly Effective (HE)	4
Effective (E)	3
Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Ineffective (IN)	1

SCALE:

	CATEGORIES			
	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
POINTS*	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.5 4.0

HANOVER TECHNOLOGY COACHES EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Effectiveness Rubric (100%): This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the Locally created Evaluation Rubric supplied by Standards for Success.

Domains	Indicators	Percent
Shared vision and leadership	3	25%
Instruction	4	30%
Professional Relationship and Responsibility	4	30%
Core Professionalism	4	15%

Category	Points
Highly Effective (HE)	4
Effective (E)	3
Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Ineffective (IN)	1

SCALE:

	CATEGORIES			
	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
POINTS*	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.5 4.0

PRINCIPALS EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Appendix F

Effectiveness Rubric (100%): This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the Locally created Evaluation Rubric supplied by Standards for Success.

Domains	Indicators	Percent
Instructional Leadership	10	25%
School Climate	10	20%
Human Resources	9	15%
Organizational Management	9	15%
Communication and Community Relations	9	25%
Professionalism	10	10%

Category	Points
Highly Effective (HE)	4
Effective (E)	3
Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Ineffective (IN)	1

SCALE:

	CATEGORIES			
	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
POINTS*	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.5 4.0

ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Appendix G

Effectiveness Rubric (100%): This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the RISE supplied by Standards for Success.

Domains	Indicators	Percent
Teacher Effectiveness	Mission and Vision	15%
Teacher Effectiveness	Capital Managment	25%
Teacher Effectiveness	Talent Review	10%
Leadership Actions	Professional leadership	25%
Leadership Actions	School Leadership	25%

Category	Points
Highly Effective (HE)	4
Effective (E)	3
Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Ineffective (IN)	1

SCALE:

	CATEGORIES			
	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
POINTS*	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.5 4.0

DEAN OF STUDENTS

Appendix H

Effectiveness Rubric (100%): This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the locally created supplied by Standards for Success.

Domains	Indicators	Percent
Academic and Behavioral Achievement	4	10%
Student services and assistance in the operation of the school	14	60%
Leadership	5	20%
Core Professionalism	4	10%

Category	Points
Highly Effective (HE)	4
Effective (E)	3
Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Ineffective (IN)	1

SCALE:

	CATEGORIES			
	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
POINTS*	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.5 4.0

ATHLETIC DIRECTOR EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Appendix

I LEADERSHIP OUTCOMES (100%):

Effectiveness Rubric (100%): This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the NAA Athletic Director Effectiveness Rubric available by Standards for Success (SFS).

Domains	Indicators	Percent
Professionalism	12	10%
Administrative Responsibilities	26	40%
Sport Specific Duties	14	40%
Core Professionalism	4	10%

Expectation	Category	Points
Exceeds all goals	Highly Effective (HE)	4
Meets goals, may exceed one	Effective (E)	3
Meets only one goal	Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Meets no goals	Ineffective (IN)	1

SCALE:

	CATEGORIES			
	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
POINTS*	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.5 4.0

SCHOOL LIBRARIAN EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Appendix J

Effectiveness Rubric (100%): This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the IN School Librarian Evaluation Rubric created by Standards for Success (SFS).

Domains	Indicators	Percent
Purposeful Planning	8	10%
Effective Instruction	9	50%
Leadership	8	30%
Professional Responsibilities	6	10%

Expectation	Category	Points
Exceeds all goals	Highly Effective (HE)	4
Meets goals, may exceed one	Effective (E)	3
Meets only one goal	Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Meets no goals	Ineffective (IN)	1

SCALE:

	CATEGORIES			
	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
POINTS*	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.5 4.0

ELEM/MIDDLE COUNSELOR EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Appendix K

Effectiveness Rubric (100%): This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the Elem./Middle School Counselor Effectiveness Rubric created by Standards for Success (SFS).

Domains	Indicators	Percent
Purposeful Planning	5	10%
Effective Classroom	9	50%
Counselors Leadership	5	30%
Professional Responsibilities	6	10%

Expectation	Category	Points
Exceeds all goals	Highly Effective (HE)	4
Meets goals, may exceed one	Effective (E)	3
Meets only one goal	Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Meets no goals	Ineffective (IN)	1

SCALE:

	CATEGORIES			
	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
POINTS*	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.5 4.0

HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELOR EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Appendix L

Effectiveness Rubric (100%): This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the High School Counselor Effectiveness Rubric created by Standards for Success (SFS).

Domains	Indicators	Percent

Expectation	Category	Points
Exceeds all goals	Highly Effective (HE)	4
Meets goals, may exceed one	Effective (E)	3
Meets only one goal	Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Meets no goals	Ineffective (IN)	1

SCALE:

	CATEGORIES			
	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
POINTS*	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.5 4.0

SOCIAL WORKER EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Appendix M

Domains	Indicators	Percent
Planning	4	10%
School Social Work Services	6	50%
Leadership	5	30%
Core Professionalism	4	10%

Expectation	Category	Points
Exceeds all goals	Highly Effective (HE)	4
Meets goals, may exceed one	Effective (E)	3
Meets only one goal	Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Meets no goals	Ineffective (IN)	1

SCALE:

	CATEGORIES			
	Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
POINTS*	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.5 4.0

Teacher Appreciation Grants

The Hanover Community School Corporation will distribute its Teacher Appreciation Grant monies received from the Indiana Department of Education to the teachers who meet the following criteria:

- 1) Employed in the classroom including in virtual classroom settings.
- 2) Received a Highly Effective or an Effective rating on their most recently completed performance evaluation; and
- 3) Employed on December 1st of the year the Corporation receives the Teacher Appreciation Grant monies.

Hanover Community School Corporation will distribute its Teacher Appreciation Grant monies as follows:

The Corporation shall not allocate a percentage of the Teacher Appreciation Grant funds received to provide a supplemental aware to each teacher with less than five (5) years of service who is rated as highly effective or effective on the most recent performance evaluation.

- A. A cash stipend as determined by the Superintendent shall be distributed to all teachers in the Corporation who are rated as EFFECTIVE; and
- B. A cash stipend in an amount that is twenty-five percent (25%) more than the stipend given the teachers rated as EFFECTIVE shall be distributed to all teachers in the Corporation who are rated as HIGHLY EFFECTIVE.
 - 1) To all EFFECTIVE teachers: A stipend as determined by the Superintendent.
 - 2) To all HIGHLY EFFECTIVE teachers: A stipend in the amount of (25%) more than the stipend given to EFFECTIVE teachers.

Hanover Community School Corporation will distribute the stipends within 20 business days of the distribution date by the Indiana Department of Education of the Teacher Appreciation Grant monies to the School Corporation.

Pursuant to Indiana law, teachers employed by interlocal cooperatives are eligible to receive a stipend under the Teacher Appreciation Grant. For those school districts that are members of an interlocal cooperative, the Indiana Department of Education will distribute the grant award to the school corporation, and then the school corporation is responsible for distributing a portion of the grant to the interlocal cooperative for distribution to the interlocal teachers who are eligible for the grant award.

Hanover School Corporation is a member of the Northwest Indiana Special Education Cooperative (the "NISEC"), and Indiana interlocal cooperative. The School Corporation, through its Superintendent, and the NISEC, through its Executive Director, will mutually determine the manner and amount of the grant that will be distributed from the School Corporation to the NISEC.

LEGAL REFERENCE: I.C. 20-18-2-22
I.C. 20-28-1-7
I.C. 20-43-10-3.5

revised 7/26/2021

Teacher Evaluation Plan – Written Request for a Private Conference

Indiana Code 20-28-11.5-6 (c.) states the following:

*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 **five (5) days** after receiving notice that that teacher received a rating of ineffective. The teacher is entitled to a private conference with the Superintendent or the Superintendent's designee.*

Teacher's name: _____ Date: _____

Building: _____

Date Ineffective rating was received in writing: _____

I am requesting a private conference with the

Superintendent. Teacher's Signature: _____

Superintendent (or designee) Section: (Check one option)

____ Private conference granted

Date of private conference: _____

____ Private conference not granted

Reason:

Superintendent's (or designee) Signature: _____ Date:

