



Staff Performance Evaluation Plan Submission Coversheet

SY 2019-20

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. **The 2019 submission due date is 9/13/2019.**

School Corporation Name:	M.S.D. of Warren County
School Corporation Number:	8115

Annual Evaluations			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input checked="" 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	7
Objective Measures of Student Achievement and Growth			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input checked="" 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 	7
<input checked="" 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. 	10
<input checked="" 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) 	11
Rigorous Measures of Effectiveness			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input checked="" 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) 	7

Designation in Rating Category			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
☒ A summative rating as one of the following: highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, or ineffective	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(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 	7
☒ A definition of negative impact for certificated staff with statewide assessments ☒ A definition of negative impact for certificated staff without statewide assessments ☒ 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. 	10-14
☒ 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 	7
Evaluation Feedback			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
☒ An explanation of evaluator's recommendations for improvement and the time in which improvement is expected	IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(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 	7
Evaluation Plan Discussion			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
☒ 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 	8

Evaluators			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input checked="" 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 	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 	N/A
<input checked="" 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	8
Feedback and Remediation Plans			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input checked="" 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	9
<input checked="" 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 	9
<input checked="" 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	9
<input checked="" 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	9
Instruction Delivered by Teachers Rated Ineffective			
Requirement	Statutory / Regulatory Authority	Examples of Relevant Information	Reference Page Number(s)
<input checked="" 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	9
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The procedures established to communicate to parents when student assignment to consecutive teachers rated as ineffective is unavoidable	IC 20-28-11.5-7(d)	Description of how parents will be informed of the situation	9

M.S.D. of Warren County School Corporation Evaluation Rubrics

The following evaluation rubrics will be utilized by certified evaluators:

- RISE 2.0 Teacher Rubric
- ICASE Special Education Teacher Rubric
- Reading Specialist Effectiveness Rubric
- Speech Language Pathologist Effectiveness Rubric
- Elementary/Middle School Counselor Rubric (v2)
- RISE Indiana Counselor Effectiveness Rubric 2.0
- RISE 2.0 Principal Effectiveness Rubric
- RISE 2.0 Assistant Principal Effectiveness Rubric
- NIAAA Athletic Director Effectiveness Rubric
- Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Rubric
- Director of Instructional Technology Rubric
- Indiana Superintendent Effectiveness Rubric

M.S.D. of Warren County School Corporation utilizes **Pivot powered by Five-Star Technology Solutions** as the software for observations and summative evaluation of all certified members of the staff.

M.S.D. of Warren County School Corporation Evaluators

The following evaluators have/will have completed RISE Evaluators Certification and Training through the West Central Indiana Education Service Center conducted by approved trainers of the Indiana Department of Education.

Building/District Level Administrators

Elementary School Principals

High School Principal and Assistant Principal

As. Superintendent - Director of Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment

Superintendent

The superintendent will serve as the “Primary” evaluator for all building and district level administrators. Building level administrators are to serve as “Primary” evaluators for their respective buildings, as well as “Secondary” evaluators in other buildings within the corporation as needed. Contracted evaluators, if approved, may serve as “Secondary” evaluators provided they have been certified in the above mentioned training.

Teachers with 3 or more years of experience within the MSD of Warren County who have been rated as “Effective” or “Highly Effective” during the previous year will have at minimum two (2) short and one (1) long observation. Teachers with 0-2 years of experience, as well as teachers rated as “Improvement Necessary” or “Ineffective” will have at minimum three (3) short and two (2) long observations. Evaluators have the professional discretion to conduct additional observations as needed.

The M.S.D. of Warren County School Board has been trained in the evaluation process for the superintendent based on the model provided by the Indiana School Boards Association and the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents. This training was conducted by the Wabash Valley Education Center. Subsequent “in-house” workshops have been conducted as new Board members have been elected.

Evaluation Plans for all certificated employee groups are provided to the M.S.D. of Warren County School Board annually during an established meeting of the Board. Evaluation Plans for the certificated staff will be discussed annually with the teachers’ representative committee.

IC 20-28-11.5-6 Completed evaluation; remediation plan; conference with superintendent

Sec. 6. (a) A copy of the completed evaluation, including any documentation related to the evaluation, must be provided to a certificated employee not later than seven (7) days after the evaluation is conducted.

(b) If a certificated employee receives a rating of ineffective or improvement necessary, the evaluator and the certificated employee shall develop a remediation plan of not more than ninety (90) school days in length to correct the deficiencies noted in the certificated employee's evaluation. The remediation plan must require the use of the certificated employee's license renewal credits in professional development activities intended to help the certificated employee achieve an effective rating on the next performance evaluation. If the principal did not conduct the performance evaluation, the principal may direct the use of the certificated employee's license renewal credits under this subsection.

(c) A teacher who receives a rating of ineffective may file a request for a private conference with the superintendent or the superintendent's designee not later than five (5) days after receiving notice that the teacher received a rating of ineffective. The teacher is entitled to a private conference with the superintendent or superintendent's designee.

As added by P.L.90-2011, SEC.39.

IC 20-28-11.5-7 Instruction by teacher rated ineffective

Sec. 7. (a) This section applies to any teacher instructing students in a content area and grade subject to [IC 20-32-5-2](#) (for a school year ending before July 1, 2018), and [IC 20-32-5.1](#) (for a school year ending after June 30, 2018).

(b) A student may not be instructed for two (2) consecutive years by two (2) consecutive teachers, each of whom was rated as ineffective under this chapter in the school year immediately before the school year in which the student is placed in the respective teacher's class.

(c) If a teacher did not instruct students in the school year immediately before the school year in which students are placed in the teacher's class, the teacher's rating under this chapter for the most recent year in which the teacher instructed students, instead of for the school year immediately before the school year in which students are placed in the teacher's class, shall be used in determining whether subsection (b) applies to the teacher.

(d) If it is not possible for a school corporation to comply with this section, the school corporation must notify the parents of each applicable student indicating the student will be placed in a classroom of a teacher who has been rated ineffective under this chapter. The parent must be notified before the start of the second consecutive school year.

As added by P.L.90-2011, SEC.39. Amended by P.L.242-2017, SEC.21; P.L.192-2018, SEC.13.

EVALUATION GUIDANCE: NEGATIVE IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING

IC 20-28-11.5-4 (c) A plan must include the following components:

(6) A provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective

IC 20-28-11.5-8 To implement this chapter, the state board shall adopt rules that establish standards that define actions that constitute a negative impact on student achievement.

Regulations

511 IAC 10-6-4 (c) Negative impact on student learning shall be defined as follows:

(1) For classes measured by statewide assessments with growth model data, the department shall determine and revise at regular intervals the cut levels in growth results that would determine negative impact on growth and achievement. (2) For classes that are not measured by statewide assessments, negative impact on student growth shall be defined locally where data show a significant number of students across a teacher's classes fails to demonstrate student learning or mastery of standards established by the state.

(d) The department will provide guidance to districts on the best selection of assessments.

Indiana law required the State Board of Education (SBOE) to adopt rules that established standards to define actions that constitute a negative impact on student achievement. These standards apply to teachers with Indiana Growth Model data and teachers of non-tested subjects. This document provides guidance on integrating the definitions of negative impact on student achievement and growth into locally developed staff performance evaluation systems.

NEGATIVE IMPACT ON STATEWIDE ASSESSMENTS

Negative impact on student learning, as measured by student performance on statewide assessments, is characterized by a significant decrease in student achievement and notably low levels of student growth. The department will calculate negative impact for all teachers with Indiana Growth Model data. The determination of negative impact is based on two key variables:

1. Mean ISTEP+ scale score – ISTEP+ scale scores for all students assigned to a teacher will be averaged and then compared to the same variable from the previous year. In order for a teacher to be identified as negatively impacting student learning, the mean ISTEP+ scale score must drop by 15 or more scale points from one year to the next.
2. Median student growth percentile - The median student growth percentile of all students assigned to a teacher will be measured. In order for a teacher to be identified as negatively impacting student learning, the median student growth percentile must be 15 or less.

The criteria for both variables must be met in order for a teacher to be identified as negatively impacting student learning. This rigorous requirement supports an accurate identification of negative impact and protects against statistical anomalies.

For example, if a teacher's students' mean ISTEP+ scale score decreases by 15 scale points or more from one year to the next AND the teacher's students' median student growth percentile is 15 or below, then the teacher is identified as having a negative impact on student learning.

IF (year 1 mean) – (year 2 mean) \geq 15 AND (year 2 median) \leq 15 THEN negative impact

NEGATIVE IMPACT ON LOCALLY SELECTED ASSESSMENTS (non-tested subjects)

School corporations are required to define negative impact on student learning for teachers who do not have data from the Indiana Growth Model. Although the SBOE provides flexibility in how negative impact is defined for locally selected assessments, definitions need to address three key areas:

1. Academic standards – the subject or content standards teachers are responsible for teaching.
2. Demonstration of mastery—the degree to which students will master the standards, and the method by which this mastery will be demonstrated and measured.
3. Significant number of students – the number of students assigned to a specific teacher who must fail to demonstrate mastery of the academic standards for a teacher to be identified as negatively impacting student learning.

Local definitions of negative impact on student learning should be based on the objective measures of student achievement and growth selected for use in teachers' performance evaluation systems. Criteria for the three key areas mentioned above should be defined as teachers and administrators collaborate to set expectations for student learning and teacher performance at the beginning of each school year.

The criteria that define negative impact on student learning for teachers of non-tested subjects should be as rigorous as those that define negative impact on student learning for teachers with Indiana Growth Model data.

Example 1: Kindergarten – 2nd Grade Teacher

Teacher(s): Kindergarten, 1st Grade, 2nd Grade

Pre-Work: Step 1	Approved Assessment Approved Mastery Score	Assessment: mCLASS Score:		
Pre-Work: Step 2	Level of Student Preparedness	High – 5 (Green on Fall mCLASS) Medium – 7 (Yellow on Fall mCLASS) Low – 3 (Red on Fall mCLASS)		
	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
	Exceptional number of students achieve content mastery	Significant number of students achieve content mastery	Less than significant number of students achieve content mastery	Few students achieve content mastery
Step 3: Class Learning Objective	At least 8 of 10 red or yellow students increase one color level between the fall and spring test. No student's level decreases.	At least 6 of 10 red or yellow students increase one color level between the fall and spring test. No student's level decreases.	At least 4 of 10 red or yellow students increase one color level between the fall and spring test. Almost no student's level decreases.	Fewer than 4 of 10 students increase one color level and/or many students decrease in level between the fall and spring test.
Negative Impact	Less than 3 students increase one color level and/or 7 students decrease in level between the fall and spring test.			

Example 2: 5th or 7th Grade Social Studies Teacher

Teacher(s): 5th or 7th Grade Social Studies Teacher

Pre-Work: Step 1	Approved Assessment	Assessment: SocialStudiesISTEP+		
	Approved Mastery Score	Score: Pass		
Pre-Work: Step 2	Level of Student Preparedness	High – 3 Medium - 15 Low - 5		
	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
	Exceptional number of students achieve content mastery	Significant number of students achieve content mastery	Less than significant number of students achieve content mastery	Few students achieve content mastery
Step 3: Class Learning Objective	At least 21 out of 23 students achieve a Pass or Pass+ on the Social Studies ISTEP+ Assessment.	At least 19 out of 23 students achieve a Pass or Pass+ on the Social Studies ISTEP+ Assessment.	At least 12 out of 23 students achieve a Pass or Pass+ on the Social Studies ISTEP+ Assessment.	Fewer than 12 out of 23 students achieve a Pass or Pass + on the Social Studies ISTEP+ Assessment.
Negative Impact	Fewer than 11 out of 23 students achieve a Pass or Pass+ on the Social Studies ISTEP+ Assessment.			

Example 3: Elementary Music Teacher

Teacher(s): Elementary Music Education Teacher

Pre-Work: Step 1	Approved Assessment	Assessment: TeacherCreatedRubricAssessment		
	Approved Mastery Score	Score: 6outof9RubricPoints		
Pre-Work: Step 2	Level of Student Preparedness	High – 5 Medium - 12 Low - 4		
	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
	Exceptional number of students achieve content mastery	Significant number of students achieve content mastery	Less than significant number of students achieve content mastery	Few students achieve content mastery
Step 3: Class Learning Objective	At least 20 out of 21 students achieve a score of 6 or higher on the Music Mastery Rubric.	At least 18 of 21 students achieve a score of 6 or higher on the Music Mastery Rubric.	At least 13 of 21 students achieve a score of 6 or higher on the Music Mastery Rubric.	Fewer than 13 of 21 students achieve a score of 6 or higher on the Music Mastery Rubric.
Negative Impact	Fewer than 12 of 21 students achieve a score of 6 or higher on the Music Mastery Rubric.			

INCLUSION IN SUMMATIVE RATING

Teachers and administrators should have an understanding of the definitions of negative impact on student learning at the beginning of the evaluation cycle, as well as the procedures by which a teacher’s rating will be adjusted if he or she is identified as negatively impacting student learning. A teacher identified as having a negative impact on student learning cannot receive a final evaluation result of effective or highly effective. The final evaluation rating will either be improvement necessary or ineffective and will depend on the combination of all measures included in the performance evaluation.

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.

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