



Staff Performance Evaluation Plan Submission Coversheet

SY 2018-19

CONTEXT: Indiana Code (IC) 20-28-11.5-8(d) requires each school corporation to submit its entire staff performance evaluation plan to the department (IDOE) and requires the IDOE to publish the plans on its website. This coversheet 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 the department 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.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Completion

In the chart below, please type the reference the page numbers in your staff performance evaluation document which clearly display compliance with the requirements. If the plan contains multiple documents with duplicate page numbers, please refer to the documents by A, B, C, D, etc. with the page number following. For example: A-23, B-5, etc. Please note, your plan may include many other sections not listed below.

Submission

Once completed, please attach this coversheet to the staff performance evaluation plan document you will submit. The whole document needs to be combined into one continuous PDF for submission.

School Corporation Name:	Centerville-Abington Community Schools
School Corporation Number:	8360

Annual Evaluations			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> 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	5-8
Objective Measures of Student Achievement and Growth			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Objective measures of student achievement and growth significantly inform all certificated employees evaluations	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please indicate page numbers referencing the inclusion of objective measures of student achievement and growth in all certificated employee evaluations including but not limited to teachers, administrators, and superintendent 	5-8;13-38
<input type="checkbox"/> Student performance results from statewide assessments inform evaluations of employees whose responsibilities include teaching tested subjects	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(2)(A) 511 IAC 10-6-4(b)(1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please note that per 511 IAC 10-6-4(b)(1), Individual Growth Measure (IGM) must be the primary measure for E/LA and math teachers in grades 4-8. • For more information regarding IGM, click here. 	5-8; 13-38
<input type="checkbox"/> Methods of assessing student growth in evaluations of employees who do not teach tested subjects	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(2)(B) 511 IAC 10-6-4(b)(2) 511 IAC 10-6-4(b)(3)	<p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), SMART goals ○ Corporation- or classroom-level student learning measures for non-tested grades and subjects ○ Other student learning measures for non-teaching staff ○ School-wide learning measures (<i>e.g.</i>, A-F accountability grade) 	5-8; 13-38
Rigorous Measures of Effectiveness			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Rigorous measures of effectiveness, including observations and other performance indicators	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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) 	5-8

Designation in Rating Category			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> A summative rating as one of the following: highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, or ineffective	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(4) 511 IAC 10-6-2(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of performance categories • Summative scoring process that yields placement into each performance category 	1-11
<input type="checkbox"/> A definition of negative impact for certificated staff with statewide assessments <input type="checkbox"/> A definition of negative impact for certificated staff without statewide assessments <input type="checkbox"/> A final summative rating modification if and when a teacher negatively affects student growth	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(6) 511 IAC 10-6-4(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of negative impact on student growth for grades and subjects measured <u>and</u> not measured by statewide assessments • Description of the process for modifying a final summative rating for negative growth • For more information regarding Negative Impact, click here. 	6
<input type="checkbox"/> All evaluation components, including but not limited to student performance data and observation results, factored into the final summative rating	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summative scoring process that yields placement into each performance category • Process for scoring student learning measures • Weighting (broken down by percentage) of all evaluation components 	13-38
Evaluation Feedback			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> An explanation of evaluator's recommendations for improvement and the time in which improvement is expected	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(5) 511 IAC 10-6-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process and timeline for delivering feedback on evaluations • Process for linking evaluation results with professional development 	34-38
Evaluation Plan Discussion			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan must be in writing and explained prior to evaluations are conducted.	IC 20-28-11.5-4(e)(1) IC 20-28-11.5-4(e)(2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	5-8

Evaluators			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> 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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of ongoing evaluator training • Description of who will serve as evaluators • Process for determining evaluators 	5-8
<input type="checkbox"/> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of who will serve as evaluators • Process for determining evaluators 	5-8
<input type="checkbox"/> 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	7 And 33-34
Feedback and Remediation Plans			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> 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	5-8
<input type="checkbox"/> Remediation plans assigned to teachers rated as ineffective or improvement necessary	IC 20-28-11.5-6(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remediation plan creation and timeframe • Process for linking evaluation results with professional development 	5-8
<input type="checkbox"/> 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	5-8
<input type="checkbox"/> 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	5-8
Instruction Delivered by Teachers Rated Ineffective			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input type="checkbox"/> 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	8
<input type="checkbox"/> The procedures established to communicate to parents when student assignment to	IC 20-28-11.5-7(d)	Description of how parents will be informed of the situation	8

2018-19

Certified Employees' Evaluation Guidelines and Protocols

Centerville-Abington Community Schools

1. For the purpose of certified employee evaluations and compensation, Centerville-Abington Community Schools defines **Teacher Leadership** as follows. Every teacher is considered a **leader** of students and will not be singled out for purposes determined to destroy cooperation among and between teachers. Our school corporation believes teachers take on very important roles of **leadership** as an embedded part of their daily duties.
2. For the purpose of certified employee evaluations and compensation, Centerville-Abington Community Schools defines **Academic Needs of Students** as follows. Every teacher is considered to be taking into consideration the **academic needs** of all of his/her students. Our school corporation believes all teachers daily address the **academic needs** of all students.
3. At Centerville-Abington Community Schools, we are using the Administrator Assistance (AA) Evaluation Model, which is research-based, practical, integrates all state standards for each certified staff member and is an effective tool to evaluate all certified employees of our school corporation. All certified employees will be evaluated annually using versions of our model for each level of certification. This evaluation system includes rigorous measures of teacher effectiveness, uses a wide-range of objective data, and allows for a designation of Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary and Ineffective as a result of the final summative evaluation concluded annually as soon as all available data is available to the evaluator. The our model include a system of improvement for all teachers rated Ineffective and stipulates that any teacher deemed having a negative impact on student learning cannot receive a rating in the top two categories, nor can he/she receive any type of merit/performance pay for any given year. Our model includes a system of improvement for all teachers rated "Improvement Necessary" or "Ineffective".

4. **NEGATIVE IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING** is teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth as determined by the summative evaluation which includes student growth as determined by the IDOE for statewide assessments and determined locally for non-statewide assessments cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective and not eligible for any increase in compensation.

Centerville-Abington Community Schools defines negative impact on student learning for statewide assessments as defined by 511 IAC 10-6-4 (c) (1) as determined and defined by the Department of Education on a routine basis.

For classes not measured by a statewide assessment, a negative impact on student learning is determined by the following criteria:

- a. (Academic Standards) The use of a grade-level content specific vocabulary exam, aligned to the academic standards, will be taken by the students in their respective courses at the beginning of the semester or year and at the end of the semester or year.
 - b. (Demonstration of Mastery & Significant number of Students) If 59% of the students in a class fail the Local Individualized Vocabulary Assessment post exam, the teacher will be defined as having a negative impact on student learning.
 - c. (Demonstration of Growth & Significant number of Students) If 59% of the students show no growth or show decreases on the exam as determined by the results of a pre-test compared to a post test, the teacher will be defined as having a negative impact on student learning.
5. Our evaluation model includes two basic parts. Part A is the performance evaluation which has general observation rubrics for each of the thirty-three questions. Part B is the student data component which includes a combination of state assessments (ILEARN, IREAD, ISTEP), mClass, NWEA, vocabulary tests, or LIA's. The portion of the summative evaluation that uses numerous objective data points to determine certified staff effectiveness. Part B complies with all state statutes that address this topic. Under Part B, "LIA" stands for Locally Indicated Assessments, which are Indiana standards-based comprehensive exams that are statistically accurate to assess instructional effectiveness but which are NOT a standardized test exam.
6. Once the evaluation is completed for each certified staff member, those deemed to be rated in the either of the bottom two rating categories will work collaboratively with the evaluator to complete an improvement plan that will be implemented at the beginning of the next school year and will be reviewed no later than 90 days after the first day of school to determine if improvements in deficient areas are effectively addressed. At that point, modifications may be necessary to continue the improvement process. The performance improvement/remediation plan must require the use of the license renewal credits in professional development activities intended to help the teacher achieve an effective rating on the next performance evaluation. Any certified employee that has been rated as Ineffective for two consecutive years, may be considered for termination at the end of his/her second evaluation once all components have been received and the employee notified of the final rating by the evaluator. However, there is no mandatory termination.
7. Each year, our evaluation system will be modified as needed to make the evaluation processes the best they can possibly be through discussion with the teacher association. After the discussion, the evaluation process will be approved by the school. This plan will be posted on the website for public and certified staff to review.

8. Each certified staff member will have at least two long observations (one unannounced and one unannounced) and more if deficiencies are noted. The final summative evaluation conference will not take place until all components of the evaluation are completed and each certified staff member has been notified of the final exit evaluation meeting.
9. All tracking and data storage will ultimately be managed and stored securely by the evaluator. Certified staff may report certain data to the evaluator for purposes of compiling the final summative evaluation.
10. A certified staff member, who receives a rating in the bottom two categories, may request a meeting with the superintendent to discuss the evaluation results within five business days from the time of the final summative evaluation conference with the evaluator. There is no obligation to change a summative evaluation by the superintendent but, instead, the superintendent may give good advice to the certified employee so he/she can undertake necessary improvement steps. Our district takes the position that the evaluator is a trained professional, who is capable of making these evaluation decisions. Every certified staff member will be fully trained in the formation and implementation of each of the evaluation systems used in our district.
11. Our district will not use third party evaluators. We will only use trained administrators.
12. For each certified staff member, a primary evaluator will be designated. Other administrators may be given authority to give input, where applicable, to the primary evaluator, who will have the final determination in developing the ratings for each certified staff member.
13. The superintendent will evaluate the assistant to the superintendent and the school psychologist. The assistant principals, the athletic director, and guidance counselors will all be evaluated by the principal to determine the final summative rating in one of the four categories.
14. The superintendent will be evaluated by each board member separately and then a composite average score will be determined for a final summative rating. .
15. All evaluation models may be modified as necessity dictates at any time necessary to make the process more fair and equitable to all concerned.
16. Centerville-Abington Community Schools uses sound research to make final determinations about what will be included in any performance evaluation and/or objective data used to fuel the evaluation. With that as a given, the research is clear that all standardized tests are forms of intelligent quotient tests and thus do not reflect instruction effectiveness nor are they instructionally sensitive. However, the state is requiring their use to determine an effective rating for certified staff despite this research and disclaimers from standardized testing companies, ie. McGraw Hill and North West Education Association. Therefore, our district will minimize the effect of these types of tests on certified staff evaluations while still following the letter and intent of all state statutes.
17. In cases of any long term leave, regardless of the reason, of a certified staff member that makes determining an accurate summative evaluation possible, Centerville-Abington Community Schools adopts the following guidelines. A certified staff member must have worked at least 120 days out of 180 (taking into consideration all leave from actual duty) to qualify for any incentive/merit pay and cannot receive a final summative evaluation. If the

certified staff member and the evaluator believe a fair final summative evaluation can take place, then this provision can be waived by the evaluator in writing to the certified staff member. For the certified staff member that does not remain on active duty for at least 120 or more days, his/her teaching status will be evaluated for job performance regardless of time on actual duty, but any final summative evaluation will not be completed and thus no rating for that year given. This is not to suggest that a teacher could not be retained or terminated for good and just cause as allowed in state statutes or for other reasons outlined in statute, but the summative evaluation cannot be used in making employment determination due to the lack of actual active duty work.

18. In cases of team teaching or shared students, the evaluator and certified staff member will try to reach consensus on what is deemed fair and equitable in regards to whom a particular student is assigned to in terms of accountability. If no agreement can be reached, the evaluator will make the final determination and put into writing his/her justification and the certified staff member's rebuttal, if necessary.
19. Any and all grievances/disagreements with regards to any aspect of this document and/or any part of the summative evaluation will be remedied by the superintendent as the final arbiter or school board, whenever the dispute is between the superintendent and school board.
20. There is an implied assumption that all performance evaluations have an element of professional subjectivity. However, every attempt will be given to the certified staff member to provide evidence to his/her support a given position that may or may not agree with a determination by his/her evaluator.
21. There is also an assumption that school board members, who are evaluating a superintendent, will only evaluate his position and no other certified position. Every attempt will be made to train the school board on how to properly evaluate the superintendent so they may execute an effective and fair evaluation of the superintendent.
22. Any new certified staff members in their first year at Centerville-Abington Community Schools Corporation will not be held responsible for data/growth that is not reflective of their service.
23. The building principal will do everything possible to keep students in our corporation from being instructed by two teachers rated ineffective for two consecutive years in a row. The building principal will notify parents when a student assignment to an ineffective teacher for the second year is unavoidable.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

:

Administrator -Any certified administrator employed by Centerville-Abington Community Schools. This would be the superintendent, assistant superintendent, principals, assistant principals, athletic director, guidance counselors at the high school and junior high schools, and the school psychologist.

Assessment – Teacher uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.

Core Professionalism – Each teacher must satisfactorily pass each of these mandatory core professional areas each year: Attendance, Tardies, Rules/Procedures/Policies, and Respect/Rapport.

Effective Instruction - Teachers facilitate student academic practice so that all students are participating and have the opportunity to gain mastery of the objectives.

Evaluator –

1. Any certified administrator employed by Centerville-Abington Community Schools who has been trained in evaluating skills and is responsible for supervising other administrative personnel.
2. The school board, when acting solely as a five member unit in their legal capacity in the evaluation process of the superintendent. Individual school board members have no authority or responsibility in the evaluation process of any other school employee. Note: As per Indiana Code, all evaluators must be appropriately trained in school personnel evaluative techniques and skills.

Evaluation Comments – These statements are written by the evaluator as part of the summative evaluation conference form. These comments should reflect the proficiency level of the teacher in regards to each teaching domain found on the form. The teacher may be found to be proficient with distinction, proficient, have an emerging proficiency, or may need improvement for any one of the expectations within the five domains. Comments should also reflect material from the Professional Self-Reflection Growth Form submitted by the teacher.

- ❖ *Highly Effective*– Performance consistently exhibits multiple strengths that have a strong, positive impact on students and the school climate. Teacher serves as a model. Areas for professional growth are self-directed.
- ❖ *Effective* – Performance typically exhibits multiple strengths that favorably impact students and the school climate. Teacher serves as a model in some areas. Areas for professional growth are generally self-directed.
- ❖ *Improvement Necessary* – Performance typically exhibits strengths that impact favorably on students and school climate.
- ❖ *Ineffective*– Performance frequently exhibits weaknesses that negatively impact students and the school climate. Areas for professional growth will be identified and an improvement plan will be developed. Direct and immediate intervention is required by administrator.

Locally Identified Assessment - An end of course or end of grade level assessment which meets all relevant and applicable Indiana Academic Standards and that is approved by the school administration because the administration believes the specified assessment serves as a reliable, valid, rigorous measure of student achievement and progress for a specified course or grade level.

Observation - Teachers shall be evaluated using multiple sources of evidence and data. A minimum of two classroom observations (at least one announced and one unannounced) shall be done annually. A formal conference must be held to share the final summative evaluation.

Post Conference Observation Meeting - A meeting between the administrator and evaluator may be held after any observational and/or evaluative activity or event. There must be a pre-observation and a post-observation meeting on the announced classroom visit.

Professional Practice Evidence - Data collected by the evaluator and/or data submitted by the individual that provides objective evidence to support the final summative evaluation rating. Evidence must directly correlate to the performance evaluation components, as outlined in this evaluation document.

Summative Performance Evaluation - An official, summative evaluation in which instructional, leadership, professionalism and student achievement data are collected, analyzed, and a determination is made regarding the individual evaluation rating and/or placement. The summative evaluation shall occur at least on an annual basis. All certificated evaluated employees will receive completed feedback within seven business days from the completion of the evaluation.

Summative Student Achievement Data (Formal and Informal) - Student academic performance information that consists of the results of multiple student academic assessments and/or activities. Following are some potential assessments and/or activities that may be used as student achievement data: The school's rank/grade as per the state grading system for individual schools (A-F), State Growth Model information, ISTEP+, End of Course Assessments, NWEA, mClass, local corporation identified assessments, teacher constructed assessments, student projects and/or assignments, observations, and any other academic assessment or activity determined to be appropriate by the evaluator.

Professional Leadership – Teachers develop and sustain the intense energy and leadership within their school community to ensure the achievement and growth of all students.

Professional Self-Reflection Growth Form – Allows the teacher to do a self-reflection of their professional experiences since the last evaluation. This form is to be completed by the teacher and given to the evaluator at the date requested before the written summative evaluation is completed.

Purposeful Planning – Teachers use content area standards to develop a rigorous curriculum relevant for all students; building meaningful units of study, continuous assessments and a system for tracking student progress as well as plans for accommodations and changes in response to a lack of student progress. Guidance counselors may have weekly, monthly, and yearly plans rather than daily lesson plans.

Student Achievement and Growth Data – Teachers, in collaboration with administrators/evaluators, will determine appropriate and relevant data that will provide evidence of student achievement and growth. The data will be collected and presented at the time of the final evaluation. Student Achievement Data will account for 50% of the total evaluation rating.

Teacher Assistance Plan – A collaborative plan developed by the evaluator and the teacher designated for assistance to improve identified deficiency in the teaching domain.

Teacher Remediation Plan – A plan developed by the evaluator for immediate and time-sensitive changes to improved identified deficiency(ies) in the teaching domain.

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS AND PROCESSES

1. All principals, the assistant superintendent and school psychologist will be evaluated in summative form at least one time annually by the superintendent of schools. Principals will evaluate assistant principals, counselors and the athletic director. Additional self-summative evaluations shall be determined at the discretion of the employer/administrator. Administrators shall be evaluated by measuring his/her professional performance with regard to and in comparison with the criteria and components described and set out in this evaluation document. Administrators shall be rated in one of four categories with regard to their summative evaluation. The four categories are “highly effective,” “effective,” “improvement necessary” and “ineffective.” A copy of the completed evaluation, including any documentation related to the evaluation, must be provided to the administrator, not later than (7) business days after the evaluation is conducted.

2. Multiple observational and/or evaluative activities or events of various lengths of time may be used as one basis to collect data to inform the summative evaluation for each administrator. Evaluator ratings for all components of the summative evaluation for each administrator shall be based upon overall performance outcomes and sufficient objective evidence, data, and/or documentation, free from bias or subjective opinion, versus preferred methodology and/or processes. The annual summative evaluation must be completed by the last administrator contractual day of the school year unless necessary student achievement data from the state has not been supplied by the last administrator contractual day of the school year. In that case, the evaluation may be completed as soon as the evaluator has the data in question and can reasonably schedule a meeting with the administrator(s) still needing finalized summative evaluations. In the event of administrator termination, cancelation of contract and/or reduction in force, the evaluator and/or the Superintendent may implement the statutory process necessary even without state assessment data. In these cases, all other necessary and relevant data may be used in the termination, cancelation of contract and/or reduction in force process.

3. Student achievement data will be compiled and analyzed by the evaluators to inform the summative evaluation for each administrator.
4. Upon completion of any observational and/or evaluative activity or event, the evaluator may provide activities for performance improvement and/or professional development, which will be implemented by the administrator in question.
5. Any administrator receiving an “ineffective” or “improvement necessary” rating on any summative evaluation shall be placed on a performance improvement plan (remediation plan) by his/her evaluator. Specific professional performance goals, objectives, and/or professional development activities, with time frame expectations included, but not longer than (90) ninety school days in length, will be developed by the evaluator to correct the deficiencies noted in the evaluation for the administrator in question. The performance improvement/remediation plan must require the use of the administrator's license renewal credits in professional development activities intended to help the administrator achieve an effective rating on the next performance evaluation. If the superintendent did not conduct the performance evaluation, the superintendent may direct the use of the administrator's license renewal credits. The administrator will comply with and fully implement all recommendations and/or directives for performance improvement and/or professional development.
6. An administrator 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 the administrator received a rating of “ineffective.” The administrator is entitled to a private conference with the superintendent or superintendent's designee.

TEACHER AND ADMINISTRATOR PLACEMENT CATEGORIES

1. Probationary: Teacher/Administrators newly hired by Centerville-Abington Community Schools on or after **July 1, 2012**.
2. Established: Teacher/Administrators hired by Centerville-Abington Community Schools before **July 1, 2012**.
3. Professional: Any “Probationary” teacher/administrator rated on their summative evaluation as “effective” or “highly effective” in three of five years. (Note: This category placement cannot occur prior to the 2015-2016 school year.)

A “Professional” teacher/administrator as per the category listed above reverts to “Probationary” status if the administrator receives one “ineffective” summative evaluation. An “Established” administrator may be dismissed for incompetence upon receiving two consecutive

“ineffective” summative evaluation ratings or three out five summative evaluation ratings in the bottom two categories of performance (“improvement necessary” and/or “ineffective”).

The superintendent may decline to continue a probationary administrator’s contract if the probationary administrator:

1. Receives an “ineffective” rating on a summative evaluation.
2. Receives two consecutive “improvement necessary” ratings on a summative evaluation.
3. Receives any combination of “improvement necessary” or “ineffective” ratings within five year.

Evaluation

Teachers

Teachers shall be evaluated using multiple sources of data/evidence. Two observations shall be done annually (minimum of one announced). Data/evidence from on-going formal and/or informal observations shall be collected throughout the year. Both formal and informal data/evidence shall be compiled and a written summative evaluation conference shall be completed annually.

Pre-Observation Conference

The evaluator meets with the teacher prior to the observation to discuss the classroom setting, learning goals, and areas of concern.

Formal Observation

The evaluator observes the teacher in the classroom setting annually.

Post-Observation Conference

The evaluator meets with the teacher following the observation to discuss the lesson observed.

Further Data/Evidence Sharing/Gathering

Further formative information is gathered throughout the school year. Evidence/Data may be compiled through other review/observation methods such as: Classroom walk-throughs, professional development activities/classes/coursework, professional growth/improvement/remediation plans portfolios, pre/post observation lead questions, self-reflection and goal-setting, and parent communication.

Self-Evaluation

The Professional Self-Reflection Growth form shall be completed by the teacher to be included in the summative evaluation.

Summative Evaluation

This written summative evaluation and conference shall be completed annually by the teacher with the evaluator. Teacher receives a rating of Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, or Ineffective.

Teacher Receiving Improvement Necessary or Ineffective Rating

Evaluator and teacher shall develop a remediation plan of not more than 90 school days in length to correct the deficiencies noted in the Summative Evaluation.

Teacher Receiving Highly Effective or Effective Rating

Teacher has completed evaluation cycle for year.

PART A

Ratings for Each Statement in Each of the 6 Domains

Highly Effective - Performance consistently exhibits multiple strengths that have a strong, positive impact on students and the school climate. Teacher serves as a model.

Areas for professional growth are self-directed. Score = 3

Effective - Performance typically exhibits multiple strengths that favorably impact students and the school climate. Teacher serves as a model in some areas. Areas for professional growth are generally self-directed. Score = 2

Improvement Necessary - Performance typically exhibits strengths that impact favorably on students and school climate. Areas of professional growth can be identified.

Score = 1

Ineffective - Performance frequently exhibits weaknesses that negatively impact students and the school climate. Areas for professional growth will be identified. And an improvement plan will be developed. Direct and immediate intervention is required by administrator. Score = 0

5 Domains:

Classroom Culture

Purposeful Planning

Effective Instruction

Assessment

Professional Leadership

6th Mandatory Domain: Core Professionalism: Attendance, Tardies,

Student Achievement and Growth Data

Scoring: Part B score (100 points possible) will be calculated by the achievement of students in the classroom, based on objective data such as ISTEP, Student Learning Objectives, End of Course Assessments (ECA), and/or Locally Identified Assessments (LIA).

Teachers, in collaboration with evaluators, will determine appropriate and relevant data that will provide evidence of student growth. The data will be collected and presented at the time of the final evaluation. Student Growth Data will account for 50% of the total Summative Evaluation rating.

Grades 4 – 8 teachers must utilize ISTEP as the primary Achievement/Growth Data piece. Other achievement and growth data pieces may be utilized in compiling a teacher’s Student Achievement/Growth Data score, yet ISTEP must be weighted the most of those pieces.

Sample Student Growth Criteria: 50% or 100 points

80-100% of total students a teacher has any given year must pass at a rate of at least 80% correct responses on an end of course assessment and/or standardized test approved by the school corporation to be used for growth assessment to be considered a highly effective teacher. In subjects tested by the state, those are mandatory in assessing a teacher and will compose the primary measure of student learning.

60-79% of total students a teacher has any given year must pass at a rate of at least 80% correct responses on an end of course assessment and/or standardized test approved by the school corporation to be used for growth assessment to be considered an effective teacher. In subjects tested by the state, those are mandatory in assessing a teacher and will compose the primary measure of student learning.

40-59% of total students a teacher has any given year must pass at a rate of at least 80% correct responses on an end of course assessment and/or standardized test approved by the school corporation to be used for growth assessment to be considered a teacher in need of an improvement plan and is labeled as such. In subjects tested by the state, those are mandatory in assessing a teacher and will compose the primary measure of student learning.

Below 40% of total students a teacher has any given year do not pass at a rate of at least 80% correct responses on an end of course assessment and/or standardized test approved by the school corporation to be used for growth assessment to be considered a teacher in need of an improvement plan and is labeled as ineffective. In subjects tested by the state, those are mandatory in assessing a teacher and will compose the primary measure of student learning.

Sample Score for Student Achievement Growth Data Category 1: 50% or 100 pts. poss.

Growth for at least 80% of the students will result in a score of 80-100 points

Growth for 60-79% of the students will result in a score of 60-79 points

Growth for 40-59% of the students will result in a score of 40-59 points

Growth of 39.9% or fewer of the students will result in a score of zero 0-39 points

Sample Evaluation scoring: 84% pass rate = 84 points

“Those teachers who are required to use a state mandated assessment in the data component may use local assessments in addition to the state assessment. Grades 4-8 are required to use the state assessment as the primary piece of student data in a multiple assessment data piece.” 51% / 49% Rule

Summary and Rating: Evaluation Instrument

Based on multiple observations and classroom visits, in addition to examination of student achievement data, the evaluator/s can make the following conclusions based evaluation criteria:

Indicator		Max. Poss. Pts.	Percent of Total
Classroom Culture		21	20%
Purposeful Planning		15	15%
Effective Instruction		36	35%
Assessment		9	12%
Professional Leadership		18	18%
Total	Category 2	99 + 1 = 100 Points	50%
Student Growth	Category 1	100 Points	50%

Sample Calculation for Evaluation Piece

Total points scored in five areas of evaluation comprises 50% of total scoring

Sample: 84 points scored in 5 domains plus 1 point in Mandatory Domain

Sample Total for Category 1 and 2: $84 + 84 = 168 =$ Highly Effective

Sample Overall Rating Scale from Evaluation and Achievement and Growth combined:

Key w/data	Optional Scoring + or - Pts	Rating
160-200 points		Highly Effective
140-159.999		Effective
120-139.999		Needs Improvement
120 and below		Ineffective

Part B - Student Achievement/Teacher Evaluation Plans

Student Achievement Data Centerville Senior High School – PART B

Scoring for Centerville Senior High School Teachers

Teachers, in collaboration with administrators, determined appropriate and relevant data that will provide evidence of student achievement and growth.

Scoring: 50% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the achievement of students in the classroom, based on objective data such as End of Course Assessments (**ECA**), NWEA, and/or Locally Identified Assessment (**LIA**) based on Indiana State standards and a locally developed vocabulary assessment. Achievement will be based on # of students at 80% mastery on each data point. If a student is in a class for less than **30** school days per semester, that student may not count in the scoring.

English 10, Algebra 1 and Biology: This score must be tied to how well students score on the

state-wide End of Course Assessment (ECA). For teachers who teach a combination of courses the score will be calculated from a combination of the rubrics. 1-2 Algebra I or English 10 ECA classes = 30%; 3 or more = 40%. For the remaining courses, the teacher's score will use the rubric listed below.

ECA 1-2 courses ECA 3 or more courses

ECA = 30% ECA = 40%

Vocabulary Assessment = 30% Vocabulary Assessment = 20%

LIA = 30% LIA = 30%

NWEA Reading = 10% NWEA Reading = 10%

1-2 Biology ECA courses = 15%; 3 or more ECA Biology courses = 20%. For the remaining courses, the teacher's score will use the rubric listed below.

ECA 1-2 courses ECA 3 or more courses

ECA = 15% ECA = 20%

Vocabulary Assessment = 25% Vocabulary Assessment = 20%

LIA = 50% LIA = 50%

NWEA Reading = 10% NWEA Reading = 10%

**Science, Social Studies, Math, English, Business, Family and Consumer Science, Industrial
Technology, Music, Physical Education, Health, Fine Arts**

All will develop Locally Identified Assessments (LIA) for each course he/she teaches that reflect the state student learning objectives outlined by DOE or from an accepted LIA assessment tool

developed externally or internally. Each teacher will then be graded on how well his/her students did on the LIA, NWEA and the vocabulary assessment. The following rubric will be used:

LIA = 80%

NWEA Reading = 10%

Vocabulary Assessment = 10%

Special Education: Any teacher who is designated “Teacher of Record” or “Teacher of Service” for students with disabilities. The scores of any special education student who does not accept services, will not impact the teacher’s overall score. Data will be collected during annual case reviews throughout the school year. Sample scoring: Special Education-Diploma Students Special Education-Non-Diploma Students IEP goal attainment = 40% ISTAR goal attainment = 100%

ECA Improvement = 50%

NWEA Reading = 10%

Bonus Points:

A teacher may earn bonus points based on the following school wide data:

1. Graduation rate improvement: Any % increase amount, add 1-5 points to total score.

A. 85%-89% graduation rate = add 1 point

B. 90% or greater graduation rate = add 5 points.

2. Percentage of total students taking an advanced placement course and receiving a score of 3 or higher on the advanced placement exam and/or percentage of student receiving three credits from a dual credit course.

A. 20-29% = add 1 point

B. 30-39% = add 3 points

C. 40% or greater = add 5 points

3. Overall school grade.

School Grade of an A = add 5 points

School Grade of a B add 3 points

School Grade of C, D, F = add no points

Sample Scoring: Part A + Part B, Plus Optional Scoring Added

Professional Observation: 84 points

Student Achievement Data: 84 points

Total adding both sections: 168 points

Add Optional points from above: 8 points

TOTAL POINTS: 176 TOTAL

Overall Rating Scale from Part A and Part B combined

Total Evaluation Score Subtotal + Optional Points Rating

160-200 points 168 + 8 = 176 total points Highly Effective

140-159 Effective

120-139 Improvement Necessary

Below 120 Ineffective

Student Achievement Data Centerville Junior High School Data – PART B

Scoring for Centerville-Abington Junior High School Teachers

Teachers, in collaboration with administrators, will determine appropriate and relevant data that will provide evidence of student achievement and growth.

Scoring: 50% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the achievement of students in the classroom, based on objective data such as ISTEP, Student Learning Objectives, NWEA, End of Course Assessments (**ECA**), and/or Locally Identified Assessments (**LIA**) based on Indiana State Standards and a locally developed vocabulary assessment. Achievement will be based on # of students at 80% mastery of each data point.

7th and 8th grade Language Arts teachers and math teachers: For these teachers, the

ISTEP GROWTH SCORE **MUST** be the **PRIMARY** data piece used in Part B. Use the ISTEP+ growth model, NWEA and LIA's for each teacher and convert to a percentage which becomes the actual points for Part B. One can take the actual % of aggregate total number of students showing growth in state-wide testing and that % becomes a portion of that teacher's points for part B. ISTEP Growth Model data will be released by the Indiana Department of Education and the scoring will transfer into points in the following manner:

4 = 100 points

3 = 80 points

2 = 60 points

1 = 40 points

Sample Scoring: First determine what rounded percentage of the day a given ISTEP Growth Teacher teaches. 25%, 33%, 50%, 75%, 100%, etc. Then use the conversion table above for the ISTEP Growth piece and multiply that Growth Score from the DOE to the percentage chosen. Then the remaining % will be multiplied by the other data from classes not ISTEP Growth. So, if only one class is ISTEP, it is recommended that 25% be used for Growth and the remaining 75% be from the combination of all other classes. Review the chart below to observe the specific percentage designated for each type of assessment

Assessment Type Percent Designated

ISTEP+ Data 50%

LIA Data 30%

NWEA - Reading 10%

Vocabulary 10%

ISTEP+ Data 40%

ECA 1-2 courses 20%

LIA Data 20%

NWEA – Reading 10%

Vocabulary 10%

Science, Social Studies, Business, Technology, Music, PE, Fine Arts, Practical Arts, Media Specialist, Math, English not listed above, and Other: All will develop Locally Identified Assessments (LIA) for each grade level he/she teaches that reflect the state student learning objectives outlined by DOE or from an accepted LIA assessment tool developed externally or internally. Each teacher will then be graded on how well his/her students did on the LIA. Vocabulary will also be one of the assessment types.

Assessment Type Percent Designated

LIA Data 80%

Vocabulary 10%

NWEA – Reading 10%

Special Education: Any teacher who is designated “Teacher of Record” or “Teacher of Service” for students with disabilities, except MO and Severe students, will be graded on the guidelines below. Teachers of MO and Severe students will be graded on goal attainment %. The scores of any special education student, who does not accept services, will not impact the teacher’s overall scores. 80-100% of all students labeled with a disability score any improvement on the ISTEP scores from the previous year earns (actual % is points for Part B scoring) 60-79% earns (actual % is points for Part B scoring)

40-69% earns (actual % is points for Part B scoring) Below 40% earns (actual % is points for Part B scoring)

Optional for Special Ed: IEP goals attained can also be factored into Part B such as 80% of

goals attained; 60%, etc. ISTAR can also be considered in terms of growth on the same percentages as above. Combining Two Scoring Factors into Part B:

84% of students show improvement/meet goals on tests $55\% \times 84\% = 42$ points

90% of students attain their IEP goals $45\% \times 90\% = 45$ points for a total of 87 points for Part B.

Assessment Type Percent Designated

ISTEP+ Data 50%

LIA Data (IEP goals) 40%

NWEA – Reading 10%

ADD-ON SCORING:

A school corporation may choose to add or subtract points for each teacher based on schoolwide

data. Some examples might be:

1. Overall school score may be used:

School Grade of “A” = add 5 points

School Grade of “B” add 3 points

School Grade of “C” add 1 point

School Grade of “D” subtract 3 points

School Grade of “F” subtract 5 points

2. Any improvement in overall school score, one full letter grade adds 1-5 points to score.

3. Attendance rates and disciplinary factors could also be incorporated.

Sample Scoring: Part A + Part B, Plus Optional Scoring Added

Professional Observation: 84 points

Student Achievement Data: 84 points

Total adding both sections: 168 points

Add Optional points from above: 8 points

Add or subtract school grade: “A” = 5 points

TOTAL POINTS: 181 TOTAL Points for Parts A & B

Overall Rating Scale from Part A and Part B combined

Total Evaluation Score Subtotal + Optional Points Rating

160-200 points $168 + 8 + 5 = 181$ total points Highly Effective

140-159 Effective

120-139 Improvement Necessary

Below 120 Ineffective

Student Achievement Data – Part B
Scoring for Rose Hamilton Elementary School

Kindergarten, 1st and 2nd Grade Teachers

All tied to student test scores in combined Math and Reading sections of NWEA, mClass standardized tests and the LIA NCA Vocabulary Test.

80–100% pass rate for all three tests. (Actual % is points for Part B scoring)

60-79% earns (Actual % is points for Part B scoring)

40-59% earns (Actual % is points for Part B scoring)

Below 40% earns (Actual % is points for Part B scoring)

The chart below gives the specific percentage designated for each type of assessment.

Assessment Type	Percent Designated
NWEA	45%

mClass	45%
Vocabulary	10%
School Grade (Bonus Points)	5/A; 3/B; 1/C

Example of Combining Scoring Factors into Part B:

90% of students show proficiency on NWEA test 90% X 45% = 41 points

84% of students show proficiency on mClass test 84% X 45% = 38 points

80% of students show proficiency on Vocabulary test 80% X 10% = 8 points

87 points

*Add on up to 5 more points for School Grade

Student Achievement Data-Part B
Scoring for Centerville-Abington Elementary School and
Rose Hamilton Elementary School

SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER
SPEECH & HEARING SPECIALIST

All tied to IEP student test scores in combined Math and Reading sections of ISTEP or mClass, NWEA, and IEP Goals.

The chart below gives the percentage designated for each type of assessment. Special Education teachers will use ISTEP, NWEA, and IEP Goals.

<i>ASSESSMENT TYPE</i>	<i>PERCENT DESIGNATED</i>
ISTEP or mClass	10%
NWEA	10%
IEP Goals	80%
School Grade (Bonus Points)	5/A; 3/B; 1/C

Example of Combining Scoring Factors into Part B:

64% of students show proficiency on ISTEP test or mClass $64\% \times 10\% = 6$ points

72% of students show proficiency on NWEA test $72\% \times 10\% = 7$ points

90% of students achieve goals in IEP $90\% \times 80\% = 72$ points

85 points

*Add on up to 5 more points for School Grade

Student Achievement Data-PART B

Scoring for Centerville-Abington Elementary Teachers

Updated November 2013

Teachers, in collaboration with administrators, will determine appropriate and relevant data that will provide evidence of student achievement and growth.

Scoring Grade 3:

- ▶ 26% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by student proficiency using IREAD Pass Rate (80-100%=4 60-79% =3 40-59% =2 0-39%=1)
- ▶ 25% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by ISTEP Pass Rate (average if more than one subject)(or 80-80 Rule)
- ▶ 25% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the number of students meeting the NWEA Target Rit or Goal Rit on reading and math in the classroom(or 80-80 Rule)
- ▶ 24% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the number of students obtaining 80% or higher on the vocabulary tests (on average of core subjects taught by teacher) in the classroom (or 80-80 Rule)

Scoring Grade 4:

- ▶ 26% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by student proficiency using ISTEP Growth Model
- ▶ 25% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by ISTEP Pass Rate (average if more than one subject) (or 80-80 Rule)
- ▶ 25% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the number of students meeting the NWEA Target Rit or Goal Rit on reading and/or math in the classroom(or 80-80 Rule)
- ▶ 24% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the number of students obtaining 80% or higher on the vocabulary tests (on average of core subjects taught by teacher) in the classroom (or 80-80 Rule)

Scoring Grade 5:

- ▶ 26% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by student proficiency using ISTEP Growth Model (5th grade SS- 80-100%=4 60-79% =3 40-59% =2 0-39%=1)
- ▶ 25% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by ISTEP Pass Rate (average if more than one subject) (or 80-80 Rule)
- ▶ 25% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the number of students meeting the NWEA Target Rit or Goal Rit on reading and/or math in the classroom(or 80-80 Rule)
- ▶ 24% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the number of students obtaining 80% or higher on the vocabulary tests (on average of core subjects taught by teacher) in the classroom (or 80-80 Rule)

Scoring Grade 6:

- ▶ 26% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by student proficiency using ISTEP Growth Model (6th grade Science- 80-100%=4 60-79% =3 40-59% =2 0-39%=1)

- ▶ 25% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by ISTEP Pass Rate (average if more than one subject) (or 80-80 Rule)
- ▶ 25% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the number of students meeting the NWEA Target Rit or Goal Rit on reading and math in the classroom(or 80-80 Rule)
- ▶ 24% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the number of students obtaining 80% or higher on the vocabulary tests (on average of core subjects taught by teacher) in the classroom (or 80-80 Rule)

ASSESSMENT TYPE

PERCENT DESIGNATED

ISTEP Data (Growth Model)	26%
ISTEP Passing Rate	25%
NWEA (Grade Level Rit/Goal Rit)	25%
Vocabulary Test (80%)(80-80 Rule)	24%
School Grade (Bonus Points)	5/A; 3/B; 1/C
ISTEP Bonus Points	5

*Add on up to 5 more points for School Grade

**Add on 5 more points if 90% or more students pass ISTEP in one or more areas

Scoring Related Arts, 6th Grade Social Studies, 5th Grade Science:

- ▶ 34% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the number of students passing LIA (Locally Identified Assessment) with a score of 80% or higher(or 80-80 Rule)
- ▶ 33% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the number of students in grade level that meet NWEA Target Rit or Goal Rit on reading (or 80-80 Rule)
- ▶ 33% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the number of students obtaining 80% or higher on the vocabulary tests given to the particular grade level (80-80 Rule)

ASSESSMENT TYPE***PERCENT DESIGNATED***

LIA	34%
NWEA Reading	33%
NCA Vocabulary Test	33%
School Grade (Bonus Points)	5/A; 3/B; 1/C

*Add on up to 5 more points for School Grade

Scoring Special Education Teachers (TOS)

- ▶ 34% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by ISTEP improvement in designated area(or 80-80 Rule)
- ▶ 33% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by NWEA improvement in designated area(or 80-80 Rule)
- ▶ 33% of total evaluation score (100 points) will be calculated by the number of students who achieve IEP goals(or 80-80 Rule)

ASSESSMENT TYPE***PERCENT DESIGNATED***

ISTEP IMAST Data	34%
NWEA (improvement)	33%
IEP Goals (Progress Monitoring)	33%
	5/A; 3/B; 1/C

--	--

*Add on up to 5 more points for School Grade

SCORING BONUS FOR ALL:

- ▶ A school grade bonus will be added for each teacher according to the yearly grade designated to the school by the state, in the following manner: A=5 pts. B=3 pts. C=1 pt. *Add on up to 5 more points for School Grade

Evaluation Tool

Standard for Success online evaluation tool allows our school to automate and organize the data collection and management of certified staff evaluations in a manner that makes the observations meaningful and drives pedagogical change.

The Building Administrator has:

- 24/7 Access
- Mobile compatible for quick Walk-Throughs
- Automatic timestamps during scripting
- Indicators code matched to scripting
- Multiple sorting options
- Color coded for quick evaluation
- Drill down to get data specific data on specific groups
- View compiled data for building level decision making
- Add and respond to comments
- View historical data

The District Administrator has:

- 24/7 Access
- Mobile compatible for quick Walk-Throughs
- District/School/Admin Summaries
- District/School/Admin Comparisons
- Drill down to get specific data on specific groups
- View historical data
- View compiled data for district level decision making

The Teacher has:

- 24/7 Access
- View and print evaluations
- Perform self-evaluations
- Perform peer evaluations
- Add comments to evaluation
- Pre/Post Observation forms
- Upload artifacts and supporting evidence
- Access historical evaluations

Training

All administrators are trained each year on how to evaluate and how to use SFS evaluation tool. This helps to keep our administrators up-to-date on the latest technology plus helps to improve their ability to evaluate.

Teacher Assistance Program

The Teacher Assistance Program is intended to provide assistance and support for teachers in teaching domain areas that need improvement. The teacher may be asked to identify a mentor-colleague to participate in the improvement planning. Evaluators must share that this program is an option as part of an on-going evaluation process.

If a teacher has received a rating of *ineffective* or *improvement necessary* rating in any of the six domains of any Formative Evaluation, the evaluator and/or teacher may decide to place the teacher on a Teacher Assistance Program. A teacher who receives a Summative Evaluation rating of *ineffective* or *improvement necessary* for one Summative Evaluation shall be placed on a Remediation Plan

The steps of the Assistance Program include:

- A. Summative Evaluation conference
- B. Assistance Planning conference
- C. Documentation

The activities during these steps will include:

- A. During an evaluation conference, the evaluator will discuss with the teacher the areas of concern. The teacher will be given a written copy of the following:
 - 1. Professional performance/teaching domain area(s) of concern.
 - 2. Specific, reasonable expectations, which would strengthen the teacher's performance.A date for an assistance planning conference will be mutually identified. A teacher may elect to notify the CEA that he/she has been placed on an Assistance Plan. The teacher shall be given the opportunity to respond, in writing, to this review, such response

becoming a part of the employment file.

- B. During the Assistance Planning conference, the teacher and evaluator will work, collaboratively, to outline deficiencies and a plan for improvement, using the Teacher Assistance Plan Form. The teacher may elect to have CEA representation at this and any subsequent meeting.
- C. During the following school year:
The teacher will create a portfolio of work which addresses the weaknesses and which documents teacher strengths and/or improvements. This document may be placed in the employee's file. The evaluator is responsible to have documented-contact with the teacher throughout the year to dialogue and provide support.
- D. At the end of the documentation year, the Summative Evaluation conference will be used to evaluate all domains as well as to review progress made on the Assistance Plan. At this time, the evaluator will inform the teacher whether or not sufficient improvement has been made in the area(s) identified in the Assistance Plan.

Teacher Remediation Program

A teacher who receives a Summative Evaluation rating of *ineffective* or *improvement necessary* for one Summative Evaluation shall be placed on a Remediation Program . The Teacher Remediation Program is intended to provide remediation of teaching domain areas for which a teacher has been deficient. The Superintendent or designee will notify the President of the CEA, in writing, that a staff member has been placed in the Teacher Remediation Program. The teacher may be asked to identify a mentor-colleague to participate in the improvement planning. The teacher may elect to have CEA representation at any Teacher Remediation Program conferences.

The steps in the Teacher Remediation Program include:

- A. Planning conference
- B. Plan activities
- C. Teacher Self-Reflection report
- D. Plan Evaluation conference

The activities during these steps will include:

- A. The Planning conference will include the evaluator and the teacher. It may include the mentor-colleague. It may also include the Superintendent or designee and may include the CEA President or designee. The Remediation Program will be written in collaboration with the evaluator and the teacher. The Remediation Program will include:
 - 1. A list of the deficient teaching domains;
 - 2. A list of specific, reasonable performance expectations;
 - 3. A list of any professional development activities;

4. A list of support provisions from the evaluator, the colleague-mentor, or others;
 5. A timeframe for completion of the plan with a maximum of 90 school days.
- B. The teacher, evaluator, and mentor-colleague will carry out the activities outlined in the plan. The evaluator is responsible to have documented-contact with the teacher throughout the 90 school days to dialogue and provide feedback.
- C. The teacher will complete the Teacher Self-Reflection report. The report will include a review of the improvement activities and how they have influenced the teacher's professional practice.
- D. At the end of the 90 school days timeframe identified in the plan, the evaluator will conduct a Remediation Program Evaluation conference. The evaluator will submit a summative narrative detailing the assistance period and recommendations. Should the evaluator determine said deficiencies have not been corrected, the staff member may be subject to termination.

Centerville-Abington Community Schools

Bylaws & Policies

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 receives as follows:

- 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

Adopted 8/23/17
Revised 4/11/18

© Neola 2017

Dear Mr. Stevenson and Indiana Department of Education Officials,

As President of the Centerville-Abington Education Association, I am pleased to report that the Centerville-Abington Community School Corporation's (CASC) Evaluation Manual as presented on March 15, was approved by the certified teachers who were present during the voting process.

According to state law, 75% of those teachers must vote yes on the manual for it to be adopted by the school corporation. After the votes were tallied, 100% of those present voted to adopt the evaluation manual as presented by the CEA President and fellow committee members.

The CEA would like to deeply thank the Superintendent and CACS Administration officials for working closely and collaborating heavily on the evaluation tool to ensure Centerville-Abington Community Schools continues today and far into the future to be rated an A school district according to IDOE formulas. With the adoption of this evaluation manual, the community can be sure that the most highly qualified and most effective teachers continue to practice their craft within the Centerville-Abington Community schools and are rewarded for doing so.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brad Ream", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Mr. Brad Ream M.Ed
Social Studies Dept.
Centerville-Senior High School
CEA President