

Greensburg Community School Corporation



Evaluation Plan 2024-2025

Tom Hunter, Superintendent

Greensburg Certified Employee Evaluation Plan

The evaluation procedures for all certified personnel in Greensburg Community Schools will adhere to the expectations stated in Public Law 90. Public Law 90 requires evaluation instruments that are fair, credible, and accurate. The model or system for evaluations must meet the following criteria:

- **Be Annual:** Every certified personnel, 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.

Evaluations to be Completed by:

Certified Employee Group

Superintendent
Building Principals
Assistant Principal/Dean
Counselors
Librarians
General Education Teachers
Special Education Teachers
Athletic Directors
Instructional Specialists
Licenced Professionals

Evaluator

Board of School Trustees
Superintendent
Building Principals
Building Administrators
Building Administrators
Building Administrators
Director of Special Ed (Primary), Building Administrators (secondary)
Building Administrators
Building Administrators
Director of Special Education

**Greensburg Modified RISE
Revised 2024**

Greensburg Schools will use a modified RISE format to evaluate all certified staff on the following schedule:

- **Highly Effective Teachers (Based on Previous Year Rating)**
 - One Long Observation (at least 40 minutes in length)
 - One Short Observation (at least 10 minutes in length)
- **All Other Teachers:**
 - Two Long Observations (at least 40 minutes in length) - one observation per semester
 - Two Short Observations (at least 10 minutes in length) - one observation per semester
- **Note**
 - A face-to face conference following each long observation may occur at teacher or administrator request.
 - A teacher may be evaluated more frequently than outlined above at either teacher or administrator request
 - A teacher on a development plan will be observed as many times as needed to meet requirements outlined in plan
 - Observations will be unannounced by default, but may occasionally be announced at administrator discretion
 - Administrative staff will conduct multiple informal walkthroughs throughout the school year
 - All formal observations will account for the summative scoring of the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER)
 - Feedback will be provided within 2 business days on short observations, and 5 business days for long observations.

Component 1: Professional Practice

The Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER)

The primary portion of the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric consists of three domains containing 19 competencies.

- **Domain 1:** Purposeful Planning
- **Domain 2:** Instruction
- **Domain 3:** Professional Commitment

In addition to these three primary domains, the TER contains a fourth domain referred to as Core Professionalism, which reflects the non-negotiable components of a certified employee's role within the school community. As these components are considered to be basic expectations, certified staff members do not earn points for meeting these expectations. However, failure to meet the expectations can result in a loss of points to the TER as outlined below.

- **Attendance** (-0.25 points) - Individual demonstrates a pattern of unexcused absences
- **Tardiness** (-0.25 points) - Individual demonstrates a pattern of late arrivals to assignment
- **Policies/Procedures** (-0.25 points) - Individual fails to follow recognized state and/or district policies
- **Respect** (-0.25 points) - Individuals treats others in school community with disrespect

Scoring the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric

Collected observational data and other relevant information will be scored against the TER. This will result in a summative rating of 1-4 for each individual domain. These ratings are defined as follows:

- **Ineffective:** 1.00 - 1.74
- **Improvement Necessary:** 1.75 - 2.44
- **Effective:** 2.45 - 3.44
- **Highly Effective** - 3.45 - 4.00

At the conclusion of the evaluation cycle for the school year, each domain score will be applied to the following weighted formula:

| | Weight | Multiplier | Weighted Domain Rating |
|--|--------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Domain 1: Planning | 10% | 0.1 | |
| Domain 2: Instruction | 75% | 0.75 | |
| Domain 3: Professional Commitment | 15% | 0.15 | |
| Core Professionalism | | | (points deducted) |
| | | TER Final Score → | |

The calculation is as follows:

1. Domain Rating x Multiplier = Weighted Rating
2. Sum of Weighted Ratings - any professionalism deductions = Summative TER Score

Component 2: Student Learning

Student Learning

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.

Achievement is defined as meeting a uniform or predetermined 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. Growth is defined as improving skills required to achieve mastery on a subject or grade level standard over a period of time. Growth differentiates mastery expectations based upon baseline performance.

Available Measures of Student Learning

The Primary Learning Measure (PLM) involves setting rigorous learning goals for students around the state and district approved common assessments. All teachers will have a Primary Learning Measure. For teachers who have state assessment data, the resulting achievement and growth data (IGM) will inform the summative PLM rating for the teacher. For teachers who do not have state assessment data, teachers will follow the process outlined in RISE for the development of a locally developed assessment. Once the locally developed assessment has been approved by the administration, the resulting achievement and targeted objective data will inform the summative PLM rating for the teacher.

In light of this, teachers fall into one of two natural categories: those with state assessment data and those without. This produces two separate reporting categories for the summative evaluation as defined below.

Summative Evaluation Category Placement:

- o Group 1 (State Assessment Data)
 - 90% TER, PLM 7% (3% Achievement, 4% IGM), SWL 3%

GCS Evaluation Plan

- o Group 2 (No Growth Model Data) -
 - 90% TER, PLM 7% (3% Achievement, 4% Targeted Objective), SWL 3%

NOTE: Special consideration may be given to teachers servicing concentrated student populations with diverse needs (e.g. special education, inclusion), allowing for two targeted objectives as opposed to one achievement goal and one growth goal.

Abbreviation Key:

TER = Teacher Effectiveness Rubric

PLM = Primary Learning Measure

IGM = Individual Growth Model data

SWL = School Wide Letter grade

TLO = Targeted Learning Objective: Growth and/or achievement goal based on students beginning the class with a low level of preparedness that covers all or a subset of the Indiana content standards.

Final Summative Category Placement:

| Scoring Ranges: | Rating: |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 0-1.4 | Ineffective |
| 1.5 - 2.4 | Improvement Necessary |
| 2.5 - 3.4 | Effective |
| 3.5 - 4.0 | Highly Effective |

Indiana Growth Model:

The Indiana Growth Model indicates a student's academic progress over the course of a year. It takes a student's state assessment 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 state assessment scores compare to students who had scored similarly in previous state assessments.

School Wide Letter Grade:

GCS Evaluation Plan

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 the A – F accountability model. 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 a D will earn a 1; and those in an F school will receive a 0 on this measure.

Rating Tools for Determining Teacher Effectiveness

Teachers with State Assessment Data

| | Highly Effective | Effective | Improvement Necessary | Ineffective |
|------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Objective | The pass/mastery percentage of rostered students exceeded the state average by 10% or greater. | The pass/mastery percentage of rostered students met or exceeded the state average. | The pass/mastery percentage of rostered students was below the state average. | The pass/mastery percentage of rostered students was 10% or more below the state average. |

Teachers without State Assessment Data

| | Highly Effective | Effective | Improvement Necessary | Ineffective |
|------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Objective | 80-100% of students demonstrated the pre-selected proficiency level based on the content learning goal(s) established by the grade-level, content, and or course. | 60-79.9% of students demonstrated the pre-selected proficiency level based on the content learning goal(s) established by the grade-level, content, and or course. | 50-59.9% of students demonstrated the pre-selected proficiency level based on the content learning goal(s) established by the grade-level, content, and or course. | 0-49.9% of students demonstrated the pre-selected proficiency level based on the content learning goal(s) established by the grade-level, content, and or course. |

Teacher Performance Summative Calculations

| Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER) Rating Calculations | Weight | Multiplier | Summative |
|---|---------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Domain 1 (Purposeful Planning) | 10% | 0.10 | |
| Domain 2 (Effective Instruction) | 75% | 0.75 | |
| Domain 3 (Teacher Leadership) | 15% | 0.15 | |
| Domain 4 (Professionalism) | 0% | 0 | (maximum of -1 if not met) |
| TER Total Final Score | | | |
| TER Total Final Score | 90% | X 0.90 | |
| PLM (Achievement 3%, IGM/Targeted 4%) | 7% | X 0.07 | |
| School-wide Accountability Grade (A-F) | 3% | X 0.03 | |
| Summative Evaluation Total Score | | | |

Professional Development Plan Process

If a summative evaluation for a certified employee would result in a rating of “Improvement Necessary” or “Ineffective”, the evaluator will meet with the employee and discuss placement on a *Professional Development Plan*. The evaluator will discuss the following:

1. Review specific areas that are in need of improvement according to the rubric.
2. Specify documentation needed to improve areas defined on the rubric as “improvement necessary”. Teacher may use PGPs/License Renewal credits earned in areas of needed improvement as evidence of remediation.
3. Discuss professional development, strategies, and develop a plan of support for improvement.
 - a. License renewal credits in professional development activities intended to help the certificated employee achieve an effective rating on the next performance evaluation will be part of the remediation plan.
4. Discuss timeline of planned improvement expectations.
5. Visit and provide ongoing feedback through continued observations throughout the plan.

The administrator will inform the superintendent, who will in turn notify the the GTA President (if relevant). At the end of the duration of the Professional Development Plan, the administrator will recommend renewal or non-renewal of the employee’s contract to the superintendent.

If an employee receives a summative rating of “Ineffective”, he or she 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 the employee received a rating of ineffective.

Negative Impact Definition for Teachers

A teacher may not receive a summative rating in the Effective or Highly Effective category if the teacher scores a 1 (ineffective) on both portions of the Primary Learning Measure. If this occurs, the teacher shall be determined to have Negative Impact on student learning.

* We reserve the right to revise these conditions based on an analysis of statewide results on the new state assessments.

Students Instructed by Teachers Rated Ineffective

IC 20-28-11.5-7

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

Greensburg Community Schools will enforce the requirements found in IC 20-28-11.5-7 and ensure that students will not be instructed for two consecutive years by two consecutive teachers each of whom was rated as ineffective in the school year before the school year in which the student was placed into the teacher's class. In the highly unlikely event that it is impossible to prohibit a student from being assigned to consecutive teachers rated as ineffective in two consecutive school years, parents of affected students will be notified in writing by the school administration. This contact will occur prior to the start of the second consecutive school year.

Evaluator Training

All evaluators used by Greensburg Community Schools have received evaluation training through administrative degree work, INALI, IASP, ed service centers, or any combination of opportunities. Additionally, the administrative team annually revisits the rubrics during an administrative PLC to recalibrate and review best practice in the classroom.

Evaluation Software

Greensburg Community Schools uses PIVOT by Five-Star Technology to house its observational and evaluation data. All results are shared through the same platform. Additionally, signed hard copies are presented at annual conferences and stored in each staff member's personnel file. Greensburg administrators and teachers have participated in training sessions with Five-Star Technology Solutions and district technology personnel to learn how to use PIVOT for evaluations.

Evaluation Plan Discussion

The evaluation plan was created and reviewed by a committee consisting of teachers, administrators, and the superintendent. The plan will be reviewed annually. As per Indiana Code, the board must review and approve the plan annually.

Teacher Appreciation Grant

The Greensburg Community Schools Board of Trustees approved board policy 3220.01 in August 2017 in regard to Teacher Appreciation Grants. Under this policy, Highly Effective teachers will receive a stipend award that is 25% more than the amount received by Effective teachers. Stipend amounts will not be differentiated between schools, and no amount of the stipend will become a part of the teacher's base salary.

3220.01 - TEACHER APPRECIATION GRANTS

The School Board shall adopt an annual policy concerning the distribution of teacher appreciation grants. This policy shall be submitted to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) along with the School Corporation's staff performance evaluation plan online as one (1) document by September 15th of each year.

Definitions:

For purposes of this policy, the following definitions apply:

The term "teacher" means a professional person whose position with the Corporation requires a license (as defined in I.C. 20-28-1-7) and whose primary responsibility is the instruction of students.

The term "license" refers to a document issued by the IDOE that grants permission to serve as a particular kind of teacher. The term includes any certificate or permit issued by the IDOE.

Distribution of Annual Teacher Appreciation Grants:

Teacher appreciation grant funds received by the Corporation shall be distributed to licensed teachers who meet the following criteria:

- A. employed in the classroom (including providing instruction in a virtual classroom setting);**
- B. rated as Effective or Highly Effective on their most recent performance evaluation; and**
- C. employed by the Corporation as of December 1st of the year in which the teacher appreciation grant funds are received by the Corporation.**

The Corporation shall distribute the teacher appreciation grant funds it as follows:

The corporation shall not allocate a percentage of the Teacher Appreciation Grant funds received to provide a supplemental award 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.**

If the Corporation is the local educational agency (LEA) or lead school corporation that administers a special education cooperative or joint services program or a career and technical education program, including programs managed under I.C. 20-26-10, 20-35-5, 20-37, or I.C. 36-1-7, then it shall award teacher appreciation grant stipends to and carry out the other responsibilities of an employing school corporation under this section for the teachers in the special education program or career and technical education program with respect to the teacher appreciation grant funds it receives on behalf of those teachers.

A stipend to an individual teacher in a particular year is not subject to collective bargaining but is discussable and is in addition to the minimum salary or increases in the salary set under I.C. 20-28-9-1.5.

The Corporation shall distribute all stipends from a teacher appreciation grant to individual teachers within twenty (20) business days of the date the IDOE distributes the teacher appreciation grant funds to the Corporation.

This policy shall be reviewed annually by the Board and shall be submitted to the IDOE annually by the Superintendent as indicated above.

I.C. 20-18-2-22

I.C. 20-28-1-7

I.C. 20-43-10-3.5

Participants in the Development of the Evaluation Plan

| | |
|--|--|
| Tom Hunter, Superintendent | |
| Tammy Williams, Director of Curriculum | |
| Inga Moore, Director of Special Education | |
| Kara Holdsworth, Primary Principal | |
| Mary Beth Meyer, Intermediate Principal | |
| Matt Clifford, Junior High Principal | |
| Tyler Roell, Junior High Assistant Principal | |
| Liz Fry, Junior High Dean of Students | |
| Mike Myers, High School Principal | |
| Sonja Kolkmeier, High School Assistant Principal | |
| Collin Rigney, High School Dean of Students | |
| Teacher Survey | |