April 29, 2015

All Certified Personnel;

For the last two and a half years, a committee comprised of teachers, MCEA leaders and administrative team members have been working to create an evaluation plan for teachers as required by law. The members of the committee are Judy DeMuth, Peggy Chambers, Jan Bergeson, Donna Bernens-Kinkead, Beth Crowe, Paul Farmer, Lucy Fischman, Mark Fletcher, Matthew Hoagland, John Hudson, Kathleen Hugo, Jeana Kerr, Kris McGlaun, Tammy Miller, Andrea Mobley, David Pillar, Wendy Tamborino, and Sarah Westphal. The committee has also worked with the support of INTASS from the Center on Education and Lifelong Learning at Indiana University under the direction of Dr. Sandi Cole.

The Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan was submitted and approved by the MCCSC Board of School Trustees on April 28, 2015. It was discussed at a work session on April 14, 2015. The plan meets all statutory requirements, aligning with our mission, belief, and core values statements, and fosters a culture of collegiality, growth, and improvement. Beginning in November 2014, teachers and principals have piloted the Teacher Performance Rubric and accompanying software. Feedback from those participants has driven professional development planning for the future.

We have met the legal requirements of the law and are confident all certified personnel will be evaluated in a manner conducive to professional growth. Principals will continue to provide ongoing professional development to teachers about the evaluation process. The MCCSC website has up to date information about the plan, including answers to frequently asked questions, which can be submitted through that page as well.

Please refer to the plan for more specific details. The plan is available under the Human Resources/Teacher Evaluation page of the mccsc.edu website. The evaluation plan is based on 90% rubric and 10% student-growth data. State tests (ISTEP and ECA) along with the corporation grade will comprise the 10% student-growth data piece for state tested subjects. Initially we believed that non-state tested subject areas could use just one measure (the corporation grade) to account for the 10% student-growth data piece. The student-growth data piece has been a discussion point in this year’s General Assembly and as a result, the Department of Education has emphasized the use of multiple measures to be used for state non-tested subjected areas. We will work with teachers to use current questions to construct an assessment that will be added to the corporation grade for the 10% student-growth data piece for state non-tested subjects.

Thanks to the committee for their tireless efforts in creating a model that aligns with our collaborative endeavors and drives excellence in teaching on behalf of our students.

Professionally Yours,

Dr. Judith DeMuth
Superintendent