Monroe County Community School Corporation

Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan

We believe:

- multiple data points, a variety of information sources, and other quantitative and qualitative considerations are required for a fair and accurate assessment of teacher performance.

- the system should create a culture of trust and confidence among all educators.

- collegial professional dialogue is important for continuous growth.

- the appraisal system should incorporate collegial decision-making.

- the system should be flexible and include procedures to address anomalies and inconsistencies.

“Collaboration will drive excellence in teaching.”

The culture of education is changing. Our district chooses to respond positively and professionally to create a fair teacher appraisal plan that positively impacts student learning.
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Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan

Introduction
When teachers succeed, students succeed. Research has proven that no school-level factor matters more to students’ success than high-quality teachers. To support our teachers, we need to clearly define excellent practice and results; give accurate, useful information about teachers’ strengths and development areas; and provide opportunities for growth and recognition.

Purpose and Rationale of the Evaluation System
The primary purpose of the MCCSC Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan is to support student success by designing an appraisal system that will drive excellence in teaching through collaboration, professional development, accountability, and respect for educators as self-directed learners. Beyond meeting the requirements of the law, this system is designed to support the district’s mission, to gather data to inform practice for the continued growth and development of our teachers and to ensure a culture of professionalism.

To accomplish this, supervision and evaluation must be affected by continuous, constructive and collaborative processes among professional educators in a climate characterized by trust, support, clear expectations and the availability of appropriate resources and materials. Teachers and their evaluators must share the responsibility for achieving professional and creative growth and competence.

The following principles form the structure for the MCCSC Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan:
• Student learning is directly affected by teacher competence.
• Teacher competence is positively affected by the integration of teacher evaluation and professional development.
• Teachers, like students, must be continual learners.
• An effective evaluation plan requires a clear definition of teaching and learning and a clear system to assess it.
• The gaps between expectation for student performance and actual student performance should guide the content of professional learning.

The establishment of professional goals, observation, self-reflection and the collection and analysis of other data sources of teaching and learning begin to operationalize these ideas. This document emphasizes the linkages among teacher evaluation, professional learning and improved student learning.

Belief Statements
• Multiple data points, a variety of information sources, and other quantitative and qualitative considerations are required for a fair and accurate assessment of teacher performance.
• The system should create a culture of trust and confidence among all educators.
• Collegial professional dialogue is important for continuous growth.
• The appraisal system should incorporate collegial decision-making.
• The system should be flexible and include procedures to address anomalies and inconsistencies.
Evaluation and Support System Overview
The MCCSC Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan consists of multiple measures to paint an accurate and comprehensive picture of teacher performance. All teachers will be evaluated the Teacher Performance Evaluation Rubric.

Teacher Performance Evaluation Rubric: An evaluation of the core instructional practices and skills that positively affect student learning. This will be based on the four domains included in the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model.

Performance Level Rating
Scores from each of the two categories will be combined to produce a summative performance rating of Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, or Ineffective. (IC-20-28-11.5-4)

- **Highly Effective:** A Highly Effective teacher consistently exceeds expectations. This is a teacher who has demonstrated excellence, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes. The highly effective teacher’s students, in aggregate, have generally exceeded expectations for academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the Indiana Department of Education.

- **Effective:** An Effective teacher consistently meets expectations. This is a teacher who has consistently met expectations, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes. The effective teacher’s students, in aggregate, have generally achieved an acceptable rate of academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the Indiana Department of Education.

- **Improvement Necessary:** A teacher who is rated as Improvement Necessary requires a change in performance before he/she meets expectations. This is a teacher who a trained evaluator has determined to require improvement in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes. In aggregate, the students of a teacher rated Improvement Necessary have generally achieved a below acceptable rate of academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the Indiana Department of Education.

- **Ineffective:** An Ineffective teacher consistently fails to meet expectations. This is a teacher who has failed to meet expectations, as determined by a trained evaluator, in locally selected competencies reasonably believed to be highly correlated with positive student learning outcomes. The Ineffective teacher’s students, in aggregate, have generally achieved unacceptable levels of academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the Indiana Department of Education.
**Negative Impact on Learning**

Plans must include the existing definition for Negative Impact (below) pending any updates from State Board of Education (SBOE). Negative impact is currently defined in SBOE rule at 511 IAC 10-6-4(c) as follows:

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.

**Procedures to Ensure Students Do Not Receive Instruction from Ineffective Teachers Two Years in Row**

This section applies to any teacher instructing students in a content area and grade subject to IC 20-32-4-1(a)(1) and IC 20-32-5-2.

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. If this situation cannot be avoided, parents will be notified according to State statute.

**Teacher Performance Evaluation Rubric**

All certified staff members will be evaluated according to a Teacher Performance Evaluation Rubric. The MCCSC Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan is founded on the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model.

The Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model is based on a number of previous, related works, including *What Works in Schools* (Marzano, 2003), *Classroom Instruction That Works* (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001) *Classroom Management That Works* (Marzano, 2003), *Classroom Assessment and Grading That Work* (Marzano, 2006), *The Art and Science of Teaching* (Marzano, 2007), and *Effective Supervision: Supporting the Art and Science of Teaching* (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). Each of these works was generated from a synthesis of educational research and theory. Thus, the model can be considered an aggregation of the research on those elements that have traditionally been shown to correlate with student academic achievement.

**Classroom Teacher:**

**[Hyperlink](#)** to: [MARZANO CENTER TEACHER OBSERVATION PROTOCOL FOR THE 2014 MARZANO TEACHER EVALUATION MODEL](#)

This evaluation framework is an evaluation framework for certified instructors who have specific students assigned to them for a grade or credit.
Non-Classroom Teacher:
**Hyperlink** to: MARZANO CENTER NON-CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL EVALUATION MODEL

The Non-Classroom Instructional Personnel Evaluation Model is an evaluation framework for certificated instructors whose primary job is not day-to-day instruction of students. Instructional support personnel typically provide appropriate support to students, schools, and districts in a non-classroom setting; positions may include both instructional support personnel such as educational specialists, media specialists, and instructional coaches, and student services personnel such as counselors, school psychologists, and career specialists. Building evaluators and non-classroom personnel may agree to use either rubric, based on the unique roles and duties of non-classroom personnel in each building.

Teacher Performance
The Teacher Performance Rubric provides 100% of the total rating for the Performance Evaluation System.

The Teacher Performance Rubric (100%) includes four domains:
- Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors
- Domain 2: Planning and Preparing
- Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching
- Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism

The Domain ratings and Design Questions are weighted to produce the Overall Instructional Practice Status Score rating for domains 1-4 using the conjunctive scoring method within the i-Observation program (Appendix A: Conjunctive Scoring Example and Tool). Good instruction matters more than anything else a teacher can do to improve student outcomes. Therefore, the Classroom Strategies and Behaviors Domain is weighted significantly more than the others.
Elements of the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model – 100% of Summative Rating

The Marzano Classroom Teacher Evaluation Model contains sixty elements designed to inform the instructional practices of teachers. There are forty-one elements in Domain 1 (Classroom Strategies and Behaviors), eight in Domain 2 (Planning and Preparing), five in Domain 3 (Reflecting on Teaching), and six in Domain 4 (Collegiality and Professionalism).

The Marzano Non-Classroom Teacher Performance Evaluation Model contains thirty-three elements designed to inform the instructional practices of non-classroom teachers. There are sixteen elements in Domain 1 (Instructional Support Strategies and Behaviors), seven in Domain 2 (Planning and Preparing), four in Domain 3 (Reflecting on Teaching), and six in Domain 4 (Collegiality and Professionalism).

Marzano Classroom Teacher Evaluation Model

Domain 1 Classroom Strategies and Behaviors contains 9 Design Questions (DQ) (68% of Rubric Score).

- **Design Question #1**: What will I do to establish and communicate learning goals, track student progress, and celebrate success? There are 3 elements of this DQ and the elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall DQ.
- **Design Question #2**: What will I do to help students effectively interact with new knowledge? There are 8 elements of this DQ and the elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall DQ.
- **Design Question #3**: What will I do to help students practice and deepen their understanding of new knowledge? There are 7 elements of this DQ and the elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall DQ.
- **Design Question #4**: What will I do to help students generate and test hypotheses about new knowledge? There are 3 elements of this DQ and the elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall DQ.
- **Design Question #5**: What will I do to engage students? There are 9 elements of this DQ and the elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall DQ.
- **Design Question #6**: What will I do to establish and maintain classroom rules and procedures? There are 2 elements of this DQ and the elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall DQ.
- **Design Question #7**: What will I do to recognize and acknowledge adherence or lack of adherence to rules and procedures? There are 3 elements of this DQ and the elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall DQ.
- **Design Question #8**: What will I do to establish and maintain relationships with students? There are 3 elements of this DQ and the elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall DQ.
- **Design Question #9**: What will I do to communicate high expectations for all students? There are 3 elements of this DQ and the elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall DQ.

Domain 2 Planning and Preparing is made up of 8 elements. These 8 elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall Domain 2 score. (14% of Rubric Score).
Domain 3 Reflecting on Teaching is made up of 5 elements. These 5 elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall Domain 3 score. (8% of Rubric Score).

Domain 4 Collegiality and Professionalism is made up of 6 elements. These 6 elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall Domain 4 score. (10% of Rubric Score).

Marzano Non-Classroom Teacher Evaluation Model
Domain 1 Instructional Support Strategies and Behaviors contains 3 Design Questions (DQ) (68% of Rubric Score).

- **Design Question #1**: What will I do to establish and communicate learning goals, track student progress, and celebrate success? There are 3 elements of this DQ and the elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall DQ.

- **Design Question #2**: What will I do to help establish content? There are 6 elements of this DQ and the elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall DQ.

- **Design Question #3**: What will I do to help facilitate engagement? There are 7 elements of this DQ and the elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall DQ.

Domain 2 Planning and Preparing is made up of 7 elements. These 7 elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall Domain 2 score. (14% of Rubric Score).

Domain 3 Reflecting on Teaching is made up of 4 elements. These 4 elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall Domain 3 score. (8% of Rubric Score).

Domain 4 Collegiality and Professionalism is made up of 6 elements. These 6 elements will be used to guide the evidence used to demonstrate proficiency in the overall Domain 4 score. (10% of Rubric Score).

*It is recommended that a minimum number of 50 ratings be accumulated over the course of one year.*
Marzano Teacher Evaluation Map

2014 Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model
Learning Map

Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors
Domain 1 is based on the Art and Science of Teaching Framework and identifies the 41 elements or instructional categories that happen in the classroom. The 41 instructional categories are organized into 9 Design Questions (DQs) and further grouped into 3 Lesson Segments to define the Observation and Feedback Protocol.

Lesson Segment
Involving Routine Events

DQ1: Communicating Learning Goals and Feedback
  1. Providing Rigorous Learning Goals and Performance Scales (Rubrics)
  2. Tracking Student Progress
  3. Celebrating Success

DQ2: Establishing Rules and Procedures
  4. Establishing Classroom Routines
  5. Organizing the Physical Layout of the Classroom

Lesson Segment
Addressing Content

DQ2: Helping Students Interact with New Knowledge
  6. Identifying Critical Content
  7. Organizing Students to Interact with New Content
  8. Previewing New Content
  9. Chunking Content into “Digestible Bites”
  10. Helping Students Process New Content
  11. Helping Students Elaborate on New Content
  12. Helping Students Record and Represent Knowledge
  13. Helping Students Reflect on Learning

DQ3: Helping Students Practice and Deepen New Knowledge
  14. Reviewing Content
  15. Organizing Students to Practice and Deepen Knowledge
  16. Using Homework
  17. Helping Students Examine Similarities and Differences
  18. Helping Students Examine Their Reasoning
  19. Helping Students Practice Skills, Strategies, and Processes
  20. Helping Students Revise Knowledge

DQ4: Helping Students Generate and Test Hypotheses
  21. Organizing Students for Cognitively Complex Tasks
  22. Engaging Students in Cognitively Complex Tasks Involving Hypothesis Generation and Testing
  23. Providing Resources and Guidance for Cognitively Complex Tasks

Lesson Segment
Enacted on the Spot

DQ5: Engaging Students
  24. Noticing When Students are Not Engaged
  25. Using Academic Games
  26. Managing Response Rates
  27. Using Physical Movement
  28. Maintaining a Lively Pace
  29. Demonstrating Intensity and Enthusiasm
  30. Using Friendly Controversy
  31. Providing Opportunities for Students to Talk about Themselves
  32. Presenting Unusual or Intriguing Information

DQ7: Recognizing Adherence to Rules and Procedures
  33. Demonstrating “What Now?”
  34. Applying Consequences for Lack of Adherence to Rules and Procedures
  35. Acknowledging Adherence to Rules and Procedures

DQ8: Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships with Students
  36. Understanding Students’ Interests and Backgrounds
  37. Using Verbal and Nonverbal Behaviors that Indicate Affection for Students
  38. Displaying Objectivity and Control

DQ9: Communicating High Expectations for All Students
  39. Demonstrating Value and Respect for Low Expectancy Students
  40. Asking Questions of Low Expectancy Students
  41. Probing Incorrect Answers with Low Expectancy Students

Note: DQ refers to Design Question in the Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Framework. The 9 DQs organize the 41 elements in Domain 1. The final Design Question, DQ10: Developing Effective Lessons Organized into a Cohesive Unit, is contained in Domain 2: Planning and Preparing.
Model Learning Map

Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Teacher Evaluation Model
Learning Map

Domain 2: Planning and Preparing

- Planning and Preparing for Lessons and Units
  - 41. Effective Scaffolding of Information with Lessons
  - 43. Lessons within Units
  - 44. Attention to Established Content Standards

- Planning and Preparing for Use of Resources and Technology
  - 45. Use of Available Traditional Resources
  - 46. Use of Available Technology

- Planning and Preparing for the Needs of English Language Learners
  - 47. Needs of English Language Learners

- Planning and Preparing for the Needs of Students Receiving Special Education
  - 48. Needs of Students Receiving Special Education

Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching

- Reflecting on Teaching
  - Evaluating Personal Performance
    - 50. Identifying Areas of Pedagogical Strength and Weakness
    - 51. Evaluating the Effectiveness of Individual Lessons and Units
    - 52. Evaluating the Effectiveness of Specific Pedagogical Strategies and Behaviors
  - Developing and Implementing a Professional Growth Plan
    - 53. Developing a Written Growth and Development Plan
    - 54. Monitoring Progress Relative to the Professional Growth and Development Plan

Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism

- Collegiality and Professionalism
  - Promoting a Positive Environment
    - 55. Promoting Positive Interactions with Colleagues
    - 56. Promoting Positive Interactions about Students and Parents
  - Promoting Exchange of Ideas and Strategies
    - 57. Seeking Mentorship for Areas of Need or Interest
    - 58. Mentoring Other Teachers and Sharing Ideas and Strategies
  - Promoting District and School Development
    - 59. Adhering to District and School Rules and Procedures
    - 60. Participating in District and School Initiatives

©2011 Robert J. Marzano. Can only be digitized in iObservation.
iObservation is a registered trademark of Learning Sciences International®
www.MarzanoEvaluation.com
Final Summative Performance Level Rating

The final summative rating will be determined by the data collected by the principal or designee in all areas of the Monroe County Community School Corporation Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan that apply to each individual teacher based on his/her teaching grouping/assignment.

Category Ratings

Once the Overall Instructional Practice Status Score is calculated, the rating will correlate with one of the four categories seen below and a Final Summative Performance Level Rating will be assigned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
<td>4.000-3.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.299-2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Necessary</td>
<td>1.999-1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>1.499-1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Borderline points are rounded to the next highest category.
(Appendix B: Summative Scoring for Teachers)
Number of Teacher Days Required for a Qualifying Evaluation – Planned Leave

A Qualifying Evaluation refers to an evaluation of a teacher who has attended a minimum number of “school” days required for the evaluation to be considered for any additional compensation resulting from the collective bargaining process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAYS PRESENT</th>
<th>EVALUATION PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120+ “school” days</td>
<td>No change – As prescribed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 60-119 “school” days| Teacher Performance Evaluation Rubric weighted for their category.  
- Rubric score will include data from at least one formal and one informal observation by primary evaluator |
| 0-59 “school” days  | Evaluation declared incomplete for the school year                                                                                                  |

A teacher who questions how his/her summative rating is affected by an extended leave may request a meeting with the building principal.

Teachers Who Serve Multiple Schools

The Primary Evaluator will be the principal in the building where the teacher has the most FTE. Principals from all of the schools served will collaborate to develop the teacher evaluation.

Teachers On Temporary Contracts

Teachers who are on temporary contracts would follow the normal evaluation schedule for new teachers.

Evaluators

Primary Evaluator

A Primary Evaluator is a licensed administrator who is a principal or assistant principal assigned to the teacher's building and is the person chiefly responsible for the summative evaluation of a teacher. This evaluator is responsible for collecting evidence themselves and reviewing evidence collected by any secondary evaluators. Each teacher has only one primary evaluator who remains in that role throughout the school year. The Primary Evaluators must perform a minimum of one formal and one informal observation per year for each teacher. All other observations may be conducted by secondary evaluators.

Secondary Evaluator

A Secondary Evaluator is a licensed administrator who may supplement the work of a primary evaluator by conducting observations, providing feedback or gathering evidence and artifacts of student learning. Each teacher may have more than one secondary evaluator depending on the grade levels and/or buildings taught. The Primary Evaluator selects the Secondary Evaluator based on need for specialized insight or a desire to gain another perspective.

Training for Staff Responsible for Evaluation

Administrators responsible for conducting staff evaluations will receive training in observation skills, artifact and document analysis, conferencing and mentoring skills, professional growth plan development, and
feedback skills. This training will be ongoing and will occur annually. Training will incorporate procedures needed to ensure validity, reliability, and consistency in collecting and using evidence to promote teacher growth. A new administrator shall be trained as soon as is possible. Principals will serve as primary and/or secondary evaluators for all certificated employees.

**Teacher Evaluation Process and Timeline**

The annual evaluation process between a teacher and his/her primary evaluator is initiated by an orientation to the process. Evaluators will meet with teachers within the first 30 work days, or as soon as reasonably possible to discuss the evaluation process and respective roles and responsibilities. In this meeting, they will discuss individual, school, and corporation goals and priorities.
Teacher Evaluation Process

First two weeks of school
All teachers complete Teacher Self-Reflection Tool and develop 1-3 SMART Goals (may be school-wide goals).

Classroom walk-throughs
2 per year (10 min each)
Unannounced
Written feedback within 7 school days

1st and 2nd year teachers in MCCSC or any teacher rated as “Improvement Necessary” or “Ineffective” in the last 3 years

2 Formal Observations (30 min each)
1 per sem/last by March 1
May be announced, or unannounced
Preconference recommended
Teacher Performance Reflective Conference and feedback within 7 school days

If necessary,
Plan of Assistance
Developed at any point in the year

Veteran teachers with at least 2 full years of teaching experience

1 Formal Observation (30 min)
1 per year/by March 1 (additional, if requested)
May be announced, or unannounced
Preconference recommended
Teacher Performance Reflective Conference and feedback within 7 school days

If necessary,
A structured Plan of Assistance
Developed at any point in the year

All formals, walkthroughs and all four domains completed by May 15
Summative Performance Conference by end of the School Year
To be held once all Instructional Practice Scores have been received and evaluated
Teacher Performance Level Determined
Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, or Ineffective

If Teacher Performance Level is determined to be “Improvement Necessary” or “Ineffective”, Structured Plan of Assistance developed

Within 90 days Structured Plan of Assistance is concluded with recommendation made for renewal, non-renewal, or renewal, but placed on on-going Plan of Assistance
Resources to Support Teacher Performance

Teacher Self-Reflection Tool
Within the first two weeks of school, each teacher will complete the Teacher Self-Reflection Tool found within his/her individual iObservation account. This tool provides an opportunity to become familiar with the Teacher Performance Evaluation Rubric and focus on areas of personal growth.

One to Three SMART Goals
The Teacher Self Reflection tool will be utilized to reflect on individual, school, and corporation goals as directed by the principal. This process will guide and narrow the focus for the development of SMART Goals. SMART goals are Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Timely.

Professional Growth and Development Plan
Using SMART goals each teacher will create an annual Professional Growth and Development Plan. Notice that one element of Domain 3 includes the development of a written Professional Growth and Development Plan which could be used as an indicator of the Reflecting on Teaching Domain.

An important part of developing professionally is the ability to self-reflect on performance. A professional development plan is a tool for teachers to assess their own performance and set development goals. In this sense, a professional development plan supports teachers who strive to improve performance, and can be particularly helpful for new teachers. Although every teacher is expected to set goals around his/her performance, only teachers who have a rating of Ineffective or Improvement Necessary after a formal observation or the completion of the Summative Evaluation Performance Level Rating are required to have a formal professional development plan which will be monitored by an evaluator. Notice that one element of Domain 3 includes the development of a written Growth Plan which could be used as an indicator of the Reflecting on Teaching Domain.

MCCSC is committed to taking the time to differentiate the opportunities for all teachers to enhance their professional skills to better serve our students. The use of evaluation information in order to create rewarding professional development opportunities for our staff, tied directly to their needs identified within the evaluation process, will be vital to our student learning outcomes.

The digital reporting tool used for the teacher evaluations, will sum the rating on each element of each of the four domains. Those elements in which teachers receive the most “not using” or “beginning” marks will serve as guides for future professional development opportunities offered to MCCSC staff.

Teachers in their first two years are encouraged to complete a professional development plan with the support of their primary evaluator. These teachers will benefit from early and frequent feedback on their performance. Evaluators should adjust timing of observations and conferences to ensure these teachers receive the support they need. This helps to support growth and also to set clear expectations on the instructional culture of the building and school leadership.

Classroom Observations/Evaluations
During the school year, evaluators (both primary and secondary) will collect evidence through a series of observations and conferences. The following table indicates the minimum requirements for observations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Type</th>
<th>Length (minimum)</th>
<th>Frequency (minimum)</th>
<th>Pre-Conference</th>
<th>Post-Conference</th>
<th>Written Feedback</th>
<th>Announced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Observation</strong></td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>2/year; 1/semester; 2nd before March 1</td>
<td>Optional, but recommended, will be conducted at the request of teacher and/or evaluator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Within 7 work days</td>
<td>Evaluator Discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For teachers in their 1st or 2nd year of employment in MCCSC OR any teacher who was rated “Improvement Necessary” or “Ineffective” within past 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Observation</strong></td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>1/year before March 1; additional if requested by teacher or principal</td>
<td>Optional, but recommended, will be conducted at the request of teacher and/or evaluator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Within 7 work days</td>
<td>Evaluator Discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For veteran teachers with at least 2 full years of MCCSC teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Walk-throughs</strong></td>
<td>10 min.</td>
<td>2/year</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>At the discretion of the teacher and/or evaluator</td>
<td>Within 7 work days</td>
<td>Unannounced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All formals, walkthroughs and all four domains completed by May 15th. Summative Performance Conference by end of the School Year.

**Evaluative Evidence**

The types of evaluative evidence are as follows:

**A formal observation** is an extended observation (minimum of 30 minutes).

A **Classroom Walk-through** is a short unannounced classroom walkthrough (duration usually 10-15 minutes) by the evaluator to observe the teacher in any of the domain areas.

In addition, **artifacts** can be presented and reviewed as needed to document attainment of performance expectations. Artifacts are materials that relate to or affect instruction (e.g. lesson plans, assessments, unit planning materials, study guides, homework assignments, student work, professional development documentation, technology integration, student intervention documentation, newsletters, communication logs, discipline logs, emails, agendas, professional development presentations, and other materials of a similar nature).
Teacher Performance Reflective Conference

This conference is to be held after each formal observation to reflect upon the Teacher Performance Evaluation Rubric. A copy of the rubric with the evaluator’s comments and observation notes will be available to the teacher within seven “school” days of the observation. At the conference, the teacher and evaluator will:

2. Review Rubric elements observed.
3. Answer questions and clarify the expectations of the evaluator.
4. Review pieces of evidence/artifacts the teacher could use to document attainment of performance expectations.

If the evaluator has determined that the teacher’s performance needs improvement, the teacher and evaluator will:

1. Review the specific performance expectation(s) not being met.
2. Specify what is needed to improve the level of performance.
3. Discuss goal setting and appropriate resources and guidance.
4. Develop and implement a Plan of Assistance or a Structured Plan of Assistance. (See p. 25)

Special Provisions for Teachers in Their First Year of Teaching with MCCSC

It has been and is appropriate to review a first year teacher’s employment status at the end of the first and/or first complete year of employment with MCCSC in order to determine whether the performance has been satisfactory to continue as a teacher with MCCSC.

MCCSC may undertake this review and make such a determination on employment retention whether or not the teacher was placed on either type of improvement plan provided by MCCSC Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan.

In certain occasions, the performance of a beginning teacher reveals that the teacher is incapable of performing his or her teaching duties in a manner that is not detrimental or injurious to the students’ education or safety. In these unusual situations, MCCSC may make a retention decision before the end of that teacher’s first and/or first complete year. Further, depending upon the seriousness of the teacher’s inability to perform his/her duties, such determination may be made concerning employment retention without the initiation of or completion of any improvement plan.

Plan of Assistance

When developing/implementing the Plan of Assistance, the evaluator will:

1. Identify and review the specific performance expectations not being met.
2. Specify what is needed to improve the level of performance.
3. Provide suggestions, resources, strategies, and support the teacher may use to improve performance.
4. Provide timelines for the teacher to follow when addressing performance elements, ensuring the teacher has reasonable time to show improvement.
5. Provide ongoing observations and feedback to the teacher throughout the duration of the plan.
Whenever a teacher is required to have a Plan of Assistance, the building principal will inform the Superintendent or designee who will inform the MCEA president. If a Plan of Assistance is in place and the teacher transfers to another MCCSC building, the Plan of Assistance will continue.

**Summative Performance Conference**

A Summative Performance Level Rating will be determined at or before the summative performance conference. The teacher will receive a copy of or have access to the MCCSC Summative Teacher Performance Evaluation document to be signed by both the assigned primary evaluator and the teacher found in iObservation.

At the conference the evaluator will:

1. Review the reason(s) for the Summative Performance Level Rating and answer questions.
2. Discuss performance level – Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, Ineffective.
3. Discuss with the teacher the evaluative recommendation for the next school year (i.e. Renewal, Non-Renewal, Plan of Assistance or Structured Plan of Assistance for Improvement Necessary OR Ineffective.)

**Structured Plan of Assistance for Improvement Necessary or Ineffective**

**Summative Performance Level Rating**

If a teacher’s Summative Performance Level Rating is *Improvement Necessary* or *Ineffective*, the teacher and evaluator shall develop a Structured Plan of Assistance. When implementing a Structured Plan of Assistance, the evaluator will:

1. Identify and review the elements and student growth expectations not being met.
2. Specify what evidence is needed to improve the level of performance.
3. Provide suggestions, resources, strategies, and support the teacher may use to improve performance.
4. Require the use of the certified staff’s license renewal credits (PGP) in professional development activities intended to help the certified staff achieve an effective rating on the next performance evaluation.
5. Provide timelines for the teacher to follow when addressing performance expectations, ensuring the teacher has reasonable time to show improvement (up to 90 instructional days).
6. Provide ongoing observations and feedback to the teacher throughout the duration of the plan.

Whenever a teacher is required to have a Structured Plan of Assistance, the building principal will inform the Superintendent or designee who will inform the MCEA president.

A teacher who receives a summative 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*.

If a principal provides a teacher a written preliminary decision to either non-continue or cancel the teacher’s contract, the teacher has five (5) school days to request a conference with the superintendent.

**Second Evaluator**

When a teacher is required to be placed on a Plan of Assistance or a Structured Plan of Assistance or receives a Summative Performance Level Rating of *Improvement Necessary* or *Ineffective*, at the option
of the teacher or the administrator, a second evaluator shall be appointed by the Superintendent or designee. The second evaluator will be an administrator in the building of the teacher making the request/primary evaluator making the request (or if necessary, an administrator from another building that possesses appropriate expertise). Notice of this appointment shall be sent to the teacher. The second evaluator shall review the Plan of Assistance and previous evaluations. In addition to the evaluator, the second evaluator shall monitor the teacher’s progress on the plan and make a judgment on contract renewal. The second evaluator and primary evaluator will discuss the teacher’s progress and status with the final responsibility of determination of employment status resting with the building principal.

Oversight Process
A committee of teachers and administrators will oversee data reliability/validity and procedural issues. The committee will meet monthly. In addition to discussing the evaluation process throughout the school year, teachers will be given the opportunity through the discussion process to offer input into any possible revisions and/or additions they deem necessary in order to improve upon the teacher evaluation process.

The plan will be in writing and before explaining the plan to the governing body, the Superintendent of the school corporation shall discuss the plan with teachers or the teacher’s representative, if there is one.
Appendix A: Conjunctive Scoring Example and Tool

One way of calculating Marzano’s “Instructional Practice Status Score” (baseline)

1. For each Domain, determine the percentage of scores at each level (1-4)

Also, referred to as “eggs in a basket” (Red = 4, Blue = 3, Green = 2, Yellow = 1, Purple = 0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Total scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain 1</td>
<td>9 (18%)</td>
<td>26 (52%)</td>
<td>11 (22%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 2</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 3</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 4</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (66%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Refer to Proficiency Scale to Determine Status Score for each Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective (4)</th>
<th>Effective (3)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 55% at level 4</td>
<td>At least 55% at level 3 and 4</td>
<td>Less than 55% at level 3 and 4 and less than 50% at level 1 and 0</td>
<td>Greater than or equal to 50% at level 1 and 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1</th>
<th>Domain 2</th>
<th>Domain 3</th>
<th>Domain 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% 3s and 4s</td>
<td>60% 3s and 4s</td>
<td>50% 3s and 4s</td>
<td>66% 3s and 4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Determine Overall Instructional Practice Status Score by weighting each Domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status Score</th>
<th>Domain 1</th>
<th>Domain 2</th>
<th>Domain 3</th>
<th>Domain 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Score</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall IP Status Score</td>
<td>2.04 + .42 + .16 + .30 = 2.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To calculate final *Summative Performance Level Rating*, Instructional Practice Overall Status Score will be factored in the table below:

**Corporation Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Improvement Necessary</th>
<th>Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.000 - 3.300</td>
<td>3.299 – 2.000</td>
<td>1.999– 1.500</td>
<td>1.499 – 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.700</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Summative Scoring for Teachers and Additional Certified Staff

Teacher Performance Evaluation

Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Domains</th>
<th>Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 2: Planning and Preparing</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 4: Professionalism</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Percent of Domains</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Summative Performance Level Rating

Overall Instructional Practice Status Score = __________________

Summative Rating = ______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
<th>4.000-3.300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>3.299-2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Necessary</td>
<td>1.999-1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>1.499-1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>