

# ***Teacher Evaluation Plan***



***Peru Elementary School District 124***

## Table of Contents

<b>Section</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
I.	Teacher Evaluation Plan Development Process	1
II.	The Teacher Evaluation Framework	1
III.	Committee Members and Plan Approval	1
IV.	Core Beliefs of the Teacher Evaluation Process	1
V.	Goals of the Teacher Evaluation Plan	2
VI.	The Domains, Components and Elements	2
VII.	Levels of Performance and the Four Rating Categories	3
VIII.	Domain Rating System	3
IX.	Professional Practice Rating Score (70 Percent)	3-4
X.	Student Growth Rating Score (30 Percent)	4-5
XI.	Final Summative Score and Rating	5
XII.	Observation and Evaluation Timeframes and Schedule	5-6
XIII.	Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory Ratings	7
XIV.	Summative Evaluation Rating and Written Response	7-8
XV.	Assignments, Representation, Training and Disclaimers	8
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>Title</b>	
Appendix A	Framework for Teaching Summary	
Appendix B	Evaluation Plan Timeframes	
Appendix C	Student Learning Objective Template	
Appendix D	SLO Roster and Scoring Template	
Appendix E	Pre-Observation Self-Evaluation	
Appendix F	Pre-Observation Conference Guiding Questions	
Appendix G	Post-Observation Reflection Conference	
Appendix H	Annual Professional Responsibilities Data Collection	
Appendix I	Individual Growth Plan	
Appendix J	Teacher Job Description	
Appendix K	Formative Evaluation Framework	
Appendix L	Final Summative Evaluation Score and Rating Report	

## **I. Teacher Evaluation Plan Development Process**

In 2012, a committee of teachers, administrators and a member of the Board of Education meticulously researched and developed the Peru Elementary School District 124 Teacher Evaluation Plan that follows. In part, this process was necessary to ensure compliance with the Illinois Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA), which is Public Act 96-0861. PERA required significant changes to how teachers are evaluated and how evaluations are used.

The development of a research-based teacher evaluation plan that incorporates “the growth of student learning and the growth of the teacher as a professional” was part of the Strategic Plan for Peru Elementary School District 124. The focus was to develop a more effective evaluation plan that focuses on the growth of the teacher and provides a more objective and clear means of communication throughout the process. The task of this committee was to study, plan, research, develop and implement a new, comprehensive teacher evaluation plan that is in compliance with PERA, and also that meets the needs of the district and the professional growth needs of the district’s teachers with the ultimate goal of improving the process of teaching and learning. This committee has continued this work to develop the student growth model in a manner that is relevant, meaningful and professional.

## **II. The Teacher Evaluation Framework**

After considerable research, including a group study of Charlotte Danielson’s *A Framework for Teaching (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*, the committee focused on the development of an evaluation instrument aligned with Danielson’s framework. Danielson has revolutionized the teacher evaluation process with language among the four domains that is clear, concise and more easily understood between the teacher and the evaluator. It also recognizes professional growth as a major component in the process.

## **III. Committee Members and Plan Approval**

The members directly involved with the Teacher Evaluation Plan Committee are: Brandi Anderson-Maier, Tara Backes, Melissa Bosnich, Carolyn Bryant, Melissa Cass, Jane Charbonneau, Mark Cross, Dana Dawson, Cindy Gustat, Chris Kelsey, Lori Madden, Sara McDonald, Somer Moore, Sherri Pannier, Rachel Pett and Phil Whaley. On August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2012, the committee voted unanimously to approve this evaluation plan, which was followed by unanimous approval by the Board of Education. The committee continues to periodically review and update the plan as needed, and the Board approves the plan annually. The student growth model was approved and implemented for 2016-17.

## **IV. Core Beliefs of the Teacher Evaluation Process**

The committee developed a list of eight core beliefs that we believe are critical to the teacher evaluation process. In no particular order, these beliefs are as follows:

- ✓ The evaluation should be part of an ongoing process.
- ✓ There should be clarity of expectations for both the teacher and the evaluator.
- ✓ The evaluation should be based on continual improvement of instruction with the goal of improved student learning.
- ✓ The evaluation should be flexible enough to account for different teaching assignments, grade levels and professional responsibilities.
- ✓ The evaluation process should be collaborative in nature.
- ✓ The evaluation process should include self-reflection and self-assessment.
- ✓ The evaluation process should take into account the professional growth and experience of the teacher.
- ✓ Professional growth can always take place and improvement should never end.

## **V. Goals of the Teacher Evaluation Plan**

The committee also developed five goals as work progressed on the Teacher Evaluation Plan. In no particular order, these goals are as follows:

- ✓ To develop an evaluation tool that ultimately improves teaching and learning.
- ✓ To provide a fair and consistent method of teacher evaluation across the school district that meets the diverse needs of the staff.
- ✓ To provide a common language that allows for clear expectations about effective instruction and professional dialogue.
- ✓ To allow teachers to play a direct, active role in the process of their own evaluation, including opportunities for self-reflection and professional growth.
- ✓ To develop a plan that is legally sound and in compliance with PERA.

## **VI. The Domains, Components and Elements**

Danielson's framework outlines four "Domains of Teaching Responsibility", as well as components under each domain. The Teacher Evaluation Plan Committee modified the components slightly to fit the needs of the District's teachers, while also allowing for exactly five components under each domain.

The Framework for Teaching Summary (Appendix A) provides more detailed elements under each component, and the Formative Evaluation Framework (Appendix K) includes descriptors for each performance level for the four domains and twenty components. The four domains, as well as the five components under each domain, are as follows:

### **Domain 1 Planning and Preparation**

- 1A Demonstrating Knowledge of Content, Pedagogy and Resources
- 1B Demonstrating Knowledge of Students
- 1C Setting Instructional Outcomes
- 1D Designing Coherent Instruction
- 1E Designing Student Assessments

### **Domain 2 The Classroom Environment**

- 2A Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
- 2B Establishing a Culture for Learning
- 2C Managing Classroom Procedures
- 2D Managing Student Behavior
- 2E Organizing Physical Space

### **Domain 3 Instruction**

- 3A Communicating with Students
- 3B Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
- 3C Engaging Students in Learning
- 3D Using Assessment in Instruction
- 3E Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

### **Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities**

- 4A Reflecting on Teaching
- 4B Maintaining Accurate Records
- 4C Communicating with Families
- 4D Growing and Developing While Participating in a Professional Community
- 4E Showing Professionalism

## **VII. Levels of Performance and the Four Rating Categories**

In compliance with PERA, the Teacher Evaluation Plan includes four specific rating categories that correspond with Danielson's Levels of Performance. The four evaluation rating categories are: Excellent, Proficient, Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory.

## **VIII. Domain Rating System**

Under each of the domains, individual teachers are rated according to the above levels for each of the twenty components. The five component ratings under each domain are then used to determine the overall rating for the corresponding domain as follows:

### **Excellent**

Excellent ratings in at least three of the components of the domain, with the remaining components rated as no lower than Proficient.

### **Proficient**

No more than one component rated as Needs Improvement, with the remaining components rated as Proficient or higher.

### **Needs Improvement**

One component rated as Unsatisfactory; OR more than one component rated as Needs Improvement, with the remaining components rated as Proficient or higher.

### **Unsatisfactory**

Any two or more components rated as Unsatisfactory.

## **IX. Professional Practice Rating Score (70 Percent)**

The overall Professional Practice Rating comprises 70 percent of the final summative rating calculation. Individual teachers are assigned a professional practice rating (with the Professional Practice score shown in parentheses) based on the four domain ratings as follows:

### **Excellent (4)**

Excellent ratings in three or more of the domains, with the remaining domain rated as Proficient.

### **Proficient (3)**

No more than one domain rated as Needs Improvement, with the remaining domains rated as Proficient or higher.

### **Needs Improvement (2)**

More than one domain rated as Needs Improvement, with the remaining domains rated as Proficient or higher.

### **Unsatisfactory (1)**

Any domain rated as Unsatisfactory.

### **Professional Practice Rating Score Conversion**

The Professional Practice rating score is based on Danielson's Levels of Performance as explained in Section IX. The rating categories are then converted to a Professional Practice score of 4, 3, 2 or 1 and those scores are then multiplied by 0.7 to convert these to a Professional Practice Weighted Score as follows:

<b>Professional Practice Rating Category</b>	<b>Professional Practice Score</b>	<b>70 Percent Weighting</b>	<b>Professional Practice Weighted Score</b>
Excellent	4	0.7	2.80
Proficient	3	0.7	2.10
Needs Improvement	2	0.7	1.40
Unsatisfactory	1	0.7	0.70

## **X. Student Growth Rating Score (30 Percent)**

The overall Student Growth rating is based on the two 15 percent student growth ratings, as agreed upon by the Teacher Evaluation Plan Committee, as well as the Joint PERA Committee. The 30 percent rating is comprised equally of a district-wide assessment (15 percent) and the utilization of Student Learning Objectives (15 percent). This table shows in a visual format the combined result of the Type I (district-wide assessment) and Type II or Type III assessments (SLOs).

<b>TYPE I ASSESSMENT (DISTRICT ASSESSMENT)</b>	<b>TYPE II OR TYPE III ASSESSMENT (SLOs)</b>				
		<b>EXCELLENT</b>	<b>PROFICIENT</b>	<b>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</b>	<b>UNSATISFACTORY</b>
	<b>EXCELLENT</b>	EXCELLENT	EXCELLENT	PROFICIENT	PROFICIENT
	<b>PROFICIENT</b>	EXCELLENT	PROFICIENT	PROFICIENT	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
	<b>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</b>	PROFICIENT	PROFICIENT	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
	<b>UNSATISFACTORY</b>	PROFICIENT	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	UNSATISFACTORY

### **Student Learning Objectives and SLO Roster and Scoring Template**

The first section of the Student Learning Objective Template must be completed and approved by September 1<sup>st</sup> and prior to the teacher proceeding with administering the assessment. The teacher completes the student names and baseline scores and submits the SLO Roster and Scoring Template (Appendix D) to the evaluator by October 1<sup>st</sup>. After following the instructions on Appendix D, the completed SLO Roster and Scoring Template is submitted to the evaluator by February 1<sup>st</sup>.

The teacher records data for the final score and indicates in the far right column whether each student met or exceeded the established growth target. The total number of students who met or exceeded the projected growth target is entered at the bottom of the scoring template to find the percentage. The percentage is then converted to the corresponding rating as follows:

<b>Percentage</b>	<b>SLO Rating</b>
75.01-100	Excellent
50.01-75.00	Proficient
25.01-50.00	Needs Improvement
1.00-25.00	Unsatisfactory

### **Student Growth Rating Score Conversion**

The overall Student Growth rating is then converted to a Student Growth score of 4, 3, 2 or 1. The Student Growth Score is then multiplied by 0.3 to convert it to a Student Growth Weighted Score as follows:

<b>Student Growth Rating Category</b>	<b>Student Growth Score</b>	<b>30 Percent Weighting</b>	<b>Student Growth Weighted Score</b>
Excellent	4	0.30	1.20
Proficient	3	0.30	0.90
Needs Improvement	2	0.30	0.60
Unsatisfactory	1	0.30	0.30

## **XI. Final Summative Score and Rating**

The calculation for the combined summative score and rating is made by combining the Professional Practice weighted score and the Student Growth weighted score (see Appendix L), resulting in the teacher receiving a Combined Summative Score and Final Summative Rating as follows:

<b>Combined Summative Score</b>	<b>Final Summative Rating</b>
3.70 - 4.00	Excellent
2.70 - 3.69	Proficient
2.00 - 2.69	Needs Improvement
1.00 - 1.99	Unsatisfactory

The following table shows in a different visual format the same results of the combined Professional Practice weighted score and the Student Growth weighted score to form the Final Summative Rating (see Appendix L):

<b>STUDENT GROWTH RATING (30 PERCENT)</b>	<b>PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE RATING (70 PERCENT)</b>				
		<b>EXCELLENT</b>	<b>PROFICIENT</b>	<b>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</b>	<b>UNSATISFACTORY</b>
	<b>EXCELLENT</b>	EXCELLENT	PROFICIENT	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	UNSATISFACTORY
	<b>PROFICIENT</b>	EXCELLENT	PROFICIENT	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	UNSATISFACTORY
	<b>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT</b>	PROFICIENT	PROFICIENT	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	UNSATISFACTORY
	<b>UNSATISFACTORY</b>	PROFICIENT	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	UNSATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY

## **XII. Observation and Evaluation Timeframes and Schedule**

As stated in the core beliefs and goals of the Teacher Evaluation Plan, the teacher evaluation process is an ongoing effort focused on the professional growth of the teacher and should ultimately improve teaching and learning. It is also a legal process with specific requirements and necessary timelines that need to be followed. The Evaluation Plan Timeframes are summarized in Appendix B.

### **Formal Observations**

A schedule with the planned week of dates of formal observations will be distributed by the evaluator to all affected teachers no later than the first student attendance day of the school year. Should circumstances arise that make it necessary to make changes to

this schedule, the evaluator or teacher will notify the other a minimum of one week prior to the rescheduled date, unless an earlier time is mutually agreed upon by both parties. Probationary teachers shall be formally observed at least two (2) times each probationary year and tenured teachers a minimum of once every two years.

### **Pre-Conference Forms and Schedule**

The evaluator and teacher will establish the specific dates and times of the pre-observation conference and formal observations. Formal observations will not be conducted during the first week of school or in the last full week and remaining days before winter break. Each formal classroom observation shall be a minimum of thirty (30) consecutive minutes.

The teacher will provide the evaluator with the completed Pre-Observation Self-Evaluation form (Appendix E) at least one (1) day prior to the scheduled pre-observation conference. Prior to the pre-observation conference, both the teacher and the evaluator should also refer to the Pre-Observation Conference Guiding Questions (Appendix F). This includes potential guiding questions intended to open up conversations between the teacher and evaluator about the lesson to be formally observed. This form does not need to be completed in writing or submitted, but can be used for notes or discussion.

### **Post-Observation Reflection Conference Forms and Schedule**

The post-observation reflection conference must take place within ten (10) school days of the formal observation. The teacher will provide the evaluator with the completed Post-Observation Reflection Conference form (Appendix G) within two (2) days after the scheduled observation. Any other necessary post-observation conference documents will be provided by the evaluator to the teacher at least one (1) day prior to the scheduled post-observation reflection conference.

### **Informal Observations**

In addition to the number of formal observations described above for probationary and tenured teachers, at least one informal observation must be conducted during each evaluation cycle. Informal observations do not require any notifications or forms; however, if any information from the informal observations is used in the final summative rating, then this information must be shared in writing to the teacher within ten (10) days after the completion of the informal observation and the teacher must have an opportunity to discuss this with the evaluator following the observation.

### **Annual Professional Responsibilities Data Collection**

Any artifacts or evidence of professional responsibilities must be submitted by the teacher to the evaluator on or with the Annual Professional Responsibilities Data Collection form (Appendix H) form by February 1<sup>st</sup> of each school year.

### **Missed Timelines and Special Circumstances**

Any teacher who is not evaluated during their scheduled evaluation year due to timelines missed by the evaluator will have a letter placed in his/her personnel file with a copy to the teacher stating that the lack of an evaluation signifies that the teacher is performing at an "excellent" level.

In the event a teacher medical leave or other unforeseen, long-term absence prevents the issuance of a final summative evaluation rating, a rating will not be provided and the teacher will be placed on the evaluation cycle the following year.

### **XIII. Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory Ratings**

An Individual Growth Plan (Appendix I) must be developed between the teacher and the evaluator within thirty (30) days after the completion of a summative evaluation rating in which a tenured teacher is rated as Needs Improvement in any one or more domains, or on the final summative evaluation rating. The plan should address any or all domains and/or components rated as Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory.

In addition to the development of the Individual Growth Plan, a tenured teacher receiving a domain or summative rating of Needs Improvement shall be evaluated again for the next ensuing school term with a minimum of two (2) formal observations and one (1) informal observation during the new evaluation cycle. The same timelines are otherwise followed as outlined in Section XII. The Individual Growth Plan is not utilized for non-tenured teachers who receive a rating of Needs Improvement.

#### **Unsatisfactory Rating and Remediation**

In the event a tenured teacher receives an overall summative evaluation rating of Unsatisfactory, a remediation plan will be developed in accordance with current statute. The remediation process includes a number of specific requirements for the teacher under remediation, the evaluator(s) and the consulting teacher, and also includes specific timelines per the law.

If a tenured teacher exhibits evidence of Unsatisfactory practice at any time, the summative evaluation process may be commenced to determine the rating. Should the rating be determined to be Unsatisfactory, then a remediation plan will be developed as described above.

The teacher will be provided with the opportunity to provide any artifacts or evidence in response to an Unsatisfactory rating, with the understanding that the timeline will follow the schedule determined in the remediation plan, rather than any other references contained in the Teacher Evaluation Plan.

### **XIV. Summative Evaluation Rating and Written Response**

All formal observations, conferences and final summative evaluations must be completed by March 1<sup>st</sup> of the summative evaluation year. Teachers shall be provided with a copy of the Final Summative Evaluation Score and Rating Report (Appendix L) at least 24 hours prior to the meeting to review the final document with the evaluator. One final copy must be signed and dated at that meeting by both the teacher and the evaluator indicating receipt of the summative evaluation, and this original hard copy is to be placed in the teacher's personnel file.

Signing the summative evaluation by the teacher shall indicate receipt, but not agreement with, the contents of the evaluation. If the teacher disagrees with the summative evaluation and/or narrative, his/her written response to the evaluation must be submitted within ten (10) working days of its receipt. Any written response will be attached to the summative evaluation in the personnel file.

#### **Personnel File**

Each teacher's personnel file shall contain the following minimum items of information: signed copies of all summative teacher evaluations, required medical information, current transcripts and any other information which could be used as a basis for discipline, re-employment, assignment, termination, transfer or determining salary.

The teacher may attach a written statement to any complaint or disciplinary action that is placed in the teacher's personnel file. If the complaint or disciplinary action is to be placed in the teacher's file, the teacher will receive verbal notice prior to written notice of the substance of the documentation.

## **XV. Assignments, Representation, Training and Disclaimers**

It is understood that the evaluator will generally be the principal at the particular building to which a teacher is assigned. In the event a teacher has a dual assignment, it will be clarified to the teacher at the beginning of the school term to which evaluator he/she is assigned. In the unlikely event an evaluator other than the building principal needs to be assigned, this will also be indicated at the beginning of the school term, or at the time this becomes necessary.

### **Association Representation**

Upon request of the teacher, a representative of the teacher association will be present during post-observation and/or summative evaluation conferences.

### **Teacher Evaluation Plan Training**

Once the Teacher Evaluation Plan is enacted, formal training and development on the new plan will be provided to all teachers. From that point on, new teachers in the district will be provided training on the evaluation plan prior to the completion of any formal observations or summative evaluations. It is ultimately the responsibility of each individual teacher to be completely familiar with the teacher evaluation process, timelines, forms and teacher responsibilities. Questions or clarification should be directed to the evaluator or the superintendent. Prior to conducting any formal observations or summative evaluations, evaluators must complete required training that is in compliance with current state statute.

### **Teacher Evaluation Plan Disclaimers**

This Teacher Evaluation Plan is intended to be flexible and adaptable to all the various teaching positions within the district. Evaluators will consider the uniqueness of each teacher's assignment when making judgments about their effectiveness. Specific job variations such as the number of students taught and the instructional time available may impact such factors such as the ability to individualize and differentiate instruction, communicate individually with parents and devote large amounts of time doing assessments.

Furthermore, any issues or conflicts that may arise within the Peru Elementary School District 124 Teacher Evaluation Plan or throughout the teacher evaluation process will be brought forth to the appropriate parties so that any issues may be resolved in writing.