

Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Teacher Evaluation and Development Plan

July 2019



Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007,
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District Teacher Evaluation and Development Plan

The purpose of this handbook is to outline and explain the Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District (BHMSD) Teacher Evaluation and Development Plan. The model is a modification of the IDOE's RISE Teacher Evaluation model. During the 2011-2012 school year, a committee of eleven members met several times to develop this handbook. The committee included the following people:

Wayne Barker, Superintendent
Brad Yates, Business Manager/Transportation Director
Julie Meitzler, Elementary Principal
Tom Gibson, Middle School Principal
Steve Baker, High School Principal
Cheryl Williams, 2nd Grade Teacher
Amy Gerber, Elementary Art Teacher
Marcia Hotopp, 5th Grade Teacher
Tyson Brooks, 7th Grade Science Teacher
Tami Wuest, High School Social Studies Teacher
Leah Huggins, High School Family & Consumer Sciences Teacher

The review during the 2014-2015 school year for modifications to be applied for the 2015-2016 school year were the result of the following committee members' efforts:

Wayne Barker, Superintendent
Brad Yates, Business Manager/Transportation Director
Julie Meitzler, Elementary Principal
Claire Paul, Middle School Principal
Steve Baker, High School Principal
Amy Gerber, Elementary Art Teacher
Tyson Brooks, 7th Grade Science Teacher
Tami Wuest, High School Social Studies Teacher
Leah Huggins, High School Family & Consumer Sciences Teacher

The review during the 2017-2018 school year for modifications to be applied for the 2018-2019 school year were the result of the following committee members' efforts:

Wayne Barker, Superintendent
Brad Yates, Business Manager/Transportation Director
Julie Meitzler, Elementary Principal
Rick Mettler, Middle School Principal
Steve Baker, High School Principal
Amy Gerber, Elementary Art Teacher
Tyson Brooks, 7th Grade Science Teacher
Tami Wuest, High School Social Studies Teacher

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Deb Johnson, High School Language Arts Teacher

The review during the 2018-2019 school year for modifications to be applied for the 2019-2020 school year were the result of the following committee members' efforts:

Wayne Barker, Superintendent
Brad Yates, Asst. Superintendent
Julie Meitzler, Elementary Principal
Rick Mettler, Middle School Principal
Steve Baker, High School Principal
Amy Gerber, Elementary Art Teacher
Tyson Brooks, 7th Grade Science Teacher
Tami Wuest, High School Social Studies Teacher
Kim Mayer, 6th Grade Math Teacher

The following handbook represents a collaborative effort that ensures the BHMSD Teacher Evaluation and Development plan is in compliance with state law (Senate Enrolled Act 1)- and applies to all teachers, counselors, and librarians of Bluffton-Harrison M.S.D.

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Guiding Principles

1. Nothing BHMSD can do for our students matters more than giving them effective teachers. Teachers are the most important school factor in how much children learn.
2. Teachers deserve to be treated like professionals. BHMSD is committed to creating evaluations that are fair, accurate and consistent, based on multiple factors that paint a complete picture of each teacher's success in helping students learn.

Legislative Context

- In the spring of 2011, the Indiana legislature passed IC 20-28-11.5, a new law relating to the evaluation of all certified teaching staff.
- The new law introduced 6 main requirements:
 - Every certified employee must receive an evaluation annually;
 - Every evaluation system must include four performance categories: Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Ineffective; and
 - Every evaluation system must incorporate objective measures of student growth and achievement as a significant portion of a teacher's evaluation.
 - Rigorous measures of effectiveness, including observations and other performance indicators.
 - An explanation of the evaluator's recommendations for improvement and the time in which improvement is expected.
 - A provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective.

Performance Level Ratings

Each teacher will receive a rating at the end of the school year in one of four performance levels:

- **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, which are 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, which are 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, which are 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

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

locally selected competencies, which are 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.

Overview of Components

Every teacher is unique, and the classroom is a complex place. This evaluation relies on multiple sources of information to paint a fair, accurate, and comprehensive picture of a teacher's performance. Teachers will be evaluated on two major components:

1. **Professional Practice** – Assessment of instructional knowledge and skills that influence student learning, as measured by competencies set forth in the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric. All teachers will be evaluated in the domains of Planning, Instruction, Leadership, and Core Professionalism.
2. **Student Learning** – Teachers' contribution to student academic progress, assessed through multiple measures of student academic achievement and growth.

Length of Service:

Every teacher must work 120 days or more to receive a summative evaluation rating as outlined in the Teacher Evaluation and Development Plan. If a teacher works less than 120 days throughout the school year, the teacher will be observed and evaluated as time permits, but will not receive a summative evaluation rating.

Training for Evaluators:

All individuals who evaluate certificated employees and support in evaluation skills receive training prior to evaluating any certificated employee.

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Timeline

August – September

- Teacher and evaluator meet for the Beginning-of-the Year Conference

August – December

- Evaluator makes classroom observations and provides feedback

November – February

- Teacher and evaluator meet for the Mid-Year Conference at teacher's request or evaluator's discretion

January – May

- Evaluator continues to make classroom observations and provide feedback

May – June

- Evaluator completes observations and scores Teacher Effectiveness Rubric

Upon Collection of Data

- Teacher and evaluator meet for the End-of-Year Conference
- Evaluator completes Summative Evaluation

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Evaluation Steps

Step 1 – Beginning-of-Year Conference – all certified employees will be evaluated annually. The teacher meets with the primary evaluator near the beginning of the school year (August or September). The purpose of the meeting is to

- review the evaluation process and
- highlight priority competencies and indicators from the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric

Primary evaluator will write a professional development plan with teachers on an improvement plan near the beginning of the school year.

Step 2 – Classroom Observations – During the school year, evaluators (both primary and secondary) will collect evidence through a series of observations and conferences.

The following table indicates minimum requirements for observations.

Beginning Teacher (less than 2 years of teaching experience) OR Any teacher who was rated <i>Improvement Necessary</i> or <i>Ineffective</i> within the past 5 years.						
Observation Type	Length (minutes)	Frequency	Pre-Conference	Post-Conference	Written Feedback	Announced
Extended	More than 20 minutes	2/year (1/semester)	Optional	Yes	Within 5 days	Evaluator's discretion
Short	10 – 20 minutes	1/year	No	No	Within 3 days	No

Veteran Teachers (2 or more years of teaching experience)						
Observation Type	Length (minutes)	Frequency	Pre-Conference	Post-Conference	Written Feedback	Announced
Extended	More than 20 minutes	2/year (1/semester)	Optional	Optional	Within 5 days	Evaluator's discretion

Optional Forms

Pre-Observation Form (Form 1)

Post-Observation Form (Forms 2 & 3)

If a teacher is on an improvement plan, that plan will determine the number of observations and feedback.

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Step 3 – Mid-Year Conference (by teacher’s request or evaluator’s discretion)

– This conference is to be held in November, December, January, or February where the primary evaluator and teacher meet to discuss performance thus far.

This conference will be **mandatory** if a teacher is in jeopardy of being rated as *ineffective* or *improvement necessary* based on prior observations, or has been rated *ineffective* or *needs improvement* on an evaluation within the past 5 years. This conference is optional for any teacher new to BHMSD with less than 2 total years of teaching experience.

Optional Forms

Mid-Year Professional Practice Check-In Form (Form 4)

Step 4 – Teacher Effectiveness Rubric: Scoring (Appendix C)

1. **The primary evaluator compiles ratings and notes from observations, conferences, and other sources of information.** At the end of the school year, the primary evaluator should have collected a body of information representing teacher practice from throughout the year. In addition to notes from observations and conferences, teachers may be asked to provide evidence of planning and leadership. See Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Domains 1 and 3.
2. **The primary evaluator uses professional judgment to establish a final rating.** In the summative conference, the evaluator should discuss the teacher’s performance on the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric.
3. **Core Professionalism is incorporated.** This domain represents non-negotiable aspects of the teaching profession; attendance, on-time arrival, policies and procedures, and respect. This domain only has two rating levels: *Does Not Meet Standards* and *Meets Standard*. The evaluator uses available information and professional judgment to decide if a teacher has not met standards in each of the four indicators. If a teacher has met standards in each of the four indicators, the score does not change. If the teacher did not meet standards in one or more of the four indicators, he or she automatically has a 1-point deduction.

Scoring Requirement: 1 is the lowest score a teacher can receive. If, after deducting a point from the teacher’s final Teacher Effectiveness Rubric score, the outcome is a number less than 1, then the evaluator should replace this score with a 1. For example, if a teacher has a final rubric score of 1.75, but then loses a point because not all of the core professionalism standards were met, the final rubric score should be 1 instead of 0.75.

Final Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Score, Domains 1-3 Score: _____

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Step 5: Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring – The final Teacher Effectiveness Rubric score is then combined with the scores from the teacher’s student learning measures in order to calculate a final rating.

Review of Components – Each teacher’s summative evaluation score will be based on the following components and measures:

- 1. Professional Practice – Assessment of instructional knowledge and skills**
Measure: Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER)
- 2. Student Learning – Contribution to student academic progress**
Measure: School-wide Learning Measure (SWL) – IDOE’s A-F Ratings
Measure: Individual Growth Model (IGM) – IDOE’s 1-4 Ratings

The School-wide Learning Measure is determined based upon the school’s current grade as defined by the IDOE. If a teacher teaches at more than one building, the school’s score that the teacher spends the majority of his/her day shall be used. If a teacher spends equal time in more than one building, the school’s scores will be averaged. The following scale shall determine the amount of points awarded:

- A = 4
- B = 3
- C = 2
- D = 1
- F = 0

If IGM data was used, this measure only applies to teachers of grades 4 through 8 who teach ELA or math. The method for scoring this measure would come from the IDOE. This growth model data score must be included in the teacher summative score.

Negative impact on student learning shall be defined as follows:

- For classes measured by statewide assessments with growth model data, the IDOE shall determine and revise at regular intervals the cut levels in growth results that would determine negative impact on growth and achievement.
- For classes that are not measured by statewide assessments, negative impact on student growth shall be defined where data shows a significant number of students across a teacher’s classes fails to demonstrate student learning or mastery of standards established by the state. Data will include, but not be limited to, grades, classroom assessments, standardized tests, student performance, etc. This negative impact on student growth shall be determined by the primary evaluator.
- A teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective.

Weighting of Measures – The primary goal of the weighting method is to treat teachers as fairly and as equally as possible. At this point, the evaluator should have calculated or received individual scores for the following measures: Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER), School-wide Learning Measure (SWL), and Individual Growth Model (IGM).


Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

All teacher evaluations will be comprised using one of the following two percentage groups:

- I. 80% Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER) – Observations
20% School-wide Learning Measure Data (SWL) – DOE A-F rating by building
100% Summative Teacher Evaluation Score




Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

- II. 80% Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER) – Observations
- 12% Individual Growth Model data (IGM)* – DOE data
- 8% School-wide Learning Measure Data (SWL) – DOE A-F rating by building
- 100% Summative Teacher Evaluation Score

*If Individual Growth Model data is not made available from the IDOE, all BHMSD teacher evaluation scores will be calculated using Model 1.



Once the weights are applied appropriately, an evaluator will have a final decimal number.

Component	Raw Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Teacher Effectiveness Rubric			
Individual Growth Model (if applicable)			
School-Wide Learning Measure			
Sum of the Weighted Scores			

*To get the final weighted score, simply sum the weighted scores from each component. This final weighted score is then translated into a rating on the following scale.

Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
1.0 Points	1.75 Points	2.5 Points	3.5 Points
	→	→	→
			→
			4.0 Points

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District
 Adopted: January 25, 1977
 Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
 May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Note: Borderline points always round up.

Step 6: Summative evaluation– BHMSD provides the final rating for all teachers.

Teacher Remediation Plan – If a teacher is in jeopardy of receiving or has received a rating of *ineffective* or *improvement necessary*, the evaluator and the teacher shall develop a remediation plan of not more than 90 school days in length to correct the deficiencies noted in the evaluation. The remediation plan must require the use of the teacher’s license renewal credits in professional development activities intended to help the teacher improve. The *Professional Development Plan* form (Form 5) is an optional form that can be used.

The BHMSD Teacher Evaluation Process will be reviewed by teacher and administrative representatives at the conclusion of the 2014-2015 school year and annually thereafter. All evaluation procedures will be discussed and modifications may occur if deemed necessary to improve the BHMSD Teacher Evaluation Process.

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Appendix A

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

**Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019**

Appendix A

Appeal – A teacher who received a rating of *ineffective* may file a request for a private conference with the superintendent not later than 5 days after receiving notice that the teacher received a rating of *ineffective*. The teacher is entitled to a private conference with the superintendent.

Parent Notice – A student may not be instructed for 2 consecutive years by teachers rated as *ineffective*. If it is not possible, the school corporation must notify the parents by letter of each applicable student before the start of the second consecutive year indicating the student will be placed in a classroom of a teacher who has been rated *ineffective*.

IDOE Reports – Before August 1, 2013 (and each year following), the school corporation shall provide the results of the teacher performance evaluations including the number of teachers placed in each performance category to the IDOE. The results may not include the names of teachers.

Compensation – A teacher rated *ineffective* or *improvement necessary* may not receive any raise or increment for the following year if the teacher's employment contract is continued.

Tenure Categories – New Teacher Tenure Categories begin July 1, 2012

- A. Probationary Teacher (IC 20-28-6-7.5) – A teacher who has not received a rating (newly hired) or an established/professional teacher who receives a rating of *ineffective* or an established/professional teacher who receives two consecutive ratings of *improvement necessary*.
- B. Established Teacher (IC 20-28-6-8) – A teacher who serves under contract before July 1, 2012 and enters into another contract before July 1, 2012. All current teachers become established teachers on July 1, 2012.
- C. Professional Teacher (IC 20-28-6-7.5) – A teacher who receives a rating of *effective* or *highly effective* for at least 3 years in a 5-year (or shorter) period. A professional teacher becomes probationary if he/she receives a rating of *ineffective* or 2 consecutive ratings of *improvement necessary*.

Contract Cancellation Grounds (IC 20-28-7.5-1)

- A. Probationary Teacher
 1. One (1) *ineffective* rating
 2. Two (2) consecutive years of *improvement necessary*
 3. Justifiable decrease in teaching positions – After June 20, 2012, RIF's in positions must be based on performance and not seniority
 4. Any reason considered relevant to the school's interest
- B. Established/Professional Teacher
 1. Justifiable decrease in positions – After June 30, 2012, RIF's in positions must be based on performance and not seniority
 2. Immorality
 3. Insubordination
 4. Incompetence

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

- a. Two (2) consecutive years of *ineffective* ratings; or
 - b. *Ineffective* or *improvement necessary* in three (3) years of any 5-year period
5. Neglect of duty
 6. Certain felony convictions
 7. Other good and just cause

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Appendix B – Forms

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Form 1

Pre-Observation Form - Teacher

Note: This form may be used in conjunction with a pre-conference, but can also be exchanged without a pre-conference prior to the observation.

School: _____ Observer: _____

Teacher: _____ Grade/Subject: _____

Date and Period of Scheduled Observation: _____

Dear Teacher:

In preparation for your formal observation, please answer the questions below and attach any requested material.

1. What learning objectives or standards will you target during this class?
2. How will you know if students are mastering/have mastered the objective?
3. Is there anything you would like me to know about this class in particular?
4. Are there any skills or new practices you have been working on that I should look for?

Please attach the following items for review prior to your scheduled observation:

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Form 2

Post-Observation Form - Evaluator

Instructions: The primary post-observation document should simply be a copy of the observation notes taken in the classroom. This form is designed to summarize and supplement the notes.

School: _____ Observer: _____

Teacher: _____ Grade/Subject: _____

Date of Observation: _____

Domain 2: Areas of Strength Observed in the Classroom (identify specific competencies):

Domain 2: Areas of Improvement Observed in the Classroom (identify specific competencies):

Domain 1: Analysis of Information (including strengths and weaknesses) in Planning:

Domain 3: Analysis of Information (including strengths and weaknesses) in Leadership:

Action Steps for Teacher Areas of Improvement:

This section should be written by the teacher and evaluator during the post conference.

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Form 3

Post-Observation Form - Teacher

School: _____ Observer: _____
Teacher: _____ Grade/Subject: _____
Date of Observation: _____

Dear Teacher:

In preparation for our post-conference, please complete this questionnaire and bring it with you when we meet. Your honesty is appreciated and will help us to have a productive conversation about your performance and areas for improvement.

1. How do you think the lesson went? What went well and what didn't go well?
2. Did you accomplish all that you wanted to in terms of students mastering the objectives of the lesson? How do you know? If not, why do you think it did not go as planned?
3. If you were to teach this lesson again, what would you do differently?
4. Did the results of this lesson influence or change your planning for future lessons?

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District
Adopted: January 25, 1977
Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Form 4

Mid-Year Check-In Form

School: _____ Summative Evaluator: _____

Teacher: _____ Grade/Subject: _____

Date: _____

Note: Mid-year check-in conferences can be helpful for evaluators to assess what information still needs to be collected, and for teachers to understand how they are performing thus far. It should be understood that the mid-year rating is only an assessment of the first part of the year and does not necessarily correspond to the end-of-year rating. If there has not yet been enough information to give a mid-year rating, circle N/A.

Number of Extended Observations Prior to Mid-Year Check-in: _____

Number of Short Observations Prior to Mid-Year Check-in: _____

Domain 1: Planning	Mid-Year Assessment of Domain 1
1.1 Utilize Assessment Data to Plan 1.2 Create Objective-Driven Lesson Plans and Assessments	
Mid-Year Rating (Circle One)	4 – Highly Effective 3 – Effective 2 – Improvement Necessary 1 – Ineffective N/A

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District
 Adopted: January 25, 1977
 Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
 May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Domain 2: Instruction	Mid-Year Assessment of Domain 2
2.1 Develop Student Understanding and Mastery of Lesson Objectives 2.2 Demonstrate and Clearly Communicate Content Knowledge to Students 2.3 Engage Students in Academic Content 2.4 Check for Understanding 2.5 Modify Instruction as Needed 2.6 Develop Higher Level of Understanding Through Rigorous Instruction and Work 2.7 Maximize Instructional Time 2.8 Create Classroom Culture of Respect and Collaboration 2.9 Set High Expectations for Academic Success	
Mid-Year Rating (Circle One)	4 – Highly Effective 3 – Effective 2 – Improvement Necessary 1 – Ineffective N/A

Domain 3: Planning	Mid-Year Assessment of Domain 3
3.1 Seek Professional Skills and Knowledge 3.2 Advocate for Student Success 3.3 Engage Families in Student Learning	
Mid-Year Rating (Circle One)	4 – Highly Effective 3 – Effective 2 – Improvement Necessary 1 – Ineffective N/A

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District
Adopted: January 25, 1977
Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
 May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Domain 4: Professionalism	Mid-Year Assessment of Domain 4	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attendance 2. On-Time Arrival 3. Policies and Procedures 4. Respect 		
Mid-Year Rating (Circle One)	Meets Standards	Does Not Meet Standards

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Adopted: January 25, 1977

Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
 May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Form 5

Professional Development Plan

Using relevant student learning data, evaluation feedback and previous professional development, establish at least 3 areas of professional growth below. Each of your goals is important but you should rank your goals in order of priority. On the following pages, complete the growth plan form for each goal.

Goal	Achieved?
1.	
2.	
3.	

Name			
School			
Grade Level(s)		Grade Level(s)	
Date Developed		Date Developed	
Primary Evaluator Approval	x	Primary Evaluator Approval	x

Professional Growth Goal #1							
Overall Goal: Using your most recent evaluation, identify a professional growth goal below. Include how you will know that your goal has been achieved. Identify alignment to evaluation framework: (ex: teacher practice domain 2, competency 2.2)	Action Steps and Data: Include detailed steps and the data you will use to determine whether each benchmark is met	Benchmarks and Data: Set benchmarks to check your progress throughout the year (minimum 3). Also include data you will use to ensure your progress is adequate at each benchmark.				Evidence of Achievement: How do you know that your goal has been met?	
	Action Step 1	___/___/___	___/___/___	___/___/___	___/___/___		
		Data:	Data:	Data:	Data:		
	Action Step 2	___/___/___	___/___/___	___/___/___	___/___/___		
		Data:	Data:	Data:	Data:		

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District
Adopted: January 25, 1977
Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
 May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Professional Growth Goal #2						
<p>Overall Goal: Using your most recent evaluation, identify a professional growth goal below. Include how you will know that your goal has been achieved. Identify alignment to evaluation framework: (ex: teacher practice domain 2, competency 2.2)</p>	<p>Action Steps and Data: Include detailed steps and the data you will use to determine whether each benchmark is met</p>	<p>Benchmarks and Data: Set benchmarks to check your progress throughout the year (minimum 3). Also include data you will use to ensure your progress is adequate at each benchmark.</p>				<p>Evidence of Achievement: How do you know that your goal has been met?</p>
	<p>Action Step 1</p>	<p>__/__/__</p>	<p>__/__/__</p>	<p>__/__/__</p>	<p>__/__/__</p>	
		<p>Data:</p>	<p>Data:</p>	<p>Data:</p>	<p>Data:</p>	
	<p>Action Step 2</p>	<p>__/__/__</p>	<p>__/__/__</p>	<p>__/__/__</p>	<p>__/__/__</p>	
		<p>Data:</p>	<p>Data:</p>	<p>Data:</p>	<p>Data:</p>	

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District
Adopted: January 25, 1977
Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
 May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Professional Growth Goal #3							
Overall Goal: Using your most recent evaluation, identify a professional growth goal below. Include how you will know that your goal has been achieved. Identify alignment to evaluation framework: (ex: teacher practice domain 2, competency 2.2)	Action Steps and Data: Include detailed steps and the data you will use to determine whether each benchmark is met	Benchmarks and Data: Set benchmarks to check your progress throughout the year (minimum 3). Also include data you will use to ensure your progress is adequate at each benchmark.				Evidence of Achievement: How do you know that your goal has been met?	
	Action Step 1	___/___/___	___/___/___	___/___/___	___/___/___		
		Data:	Data:	Data:	Data:		
	Action Step 2	___/___/___	___/___/___	___/___/___	___/___/___		
		Data:	Data:	Data:	Data:		

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District
Adopted: January 25, 1977
Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
 May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

FILE CODE: AFC

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District
Adopted: January 25, 1977
Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000, October 22, 2007
May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018, July 15, 2019

Form 6

Final Summative Rating

School: _____ Summative Evaluator: _____

Teacher: _____ Date: _____

Grade/Subject: _____

Note: This form may be completed based on information collected and assessed throughout the year. Evaluators may complete this form and make a copy for the teacher to discuss results during the end-of-year summative conference.

Number of Extended Observations: _____

Number of Short Observations: _____

If the teacher “Meets Standards” in Domain 4 (Professionalism), deduct 0 points. The final teacher score remains the same as in the previous step. If the teacher “Does Not Meet Standards,” deduct 1 point from the score calculated in the previous step.

Final Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Score, Domains 1-4: _____

Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District
Adopted: January 25, 1977
Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000,
October 22, 2007, May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018

Circle the group to which the teacher belongs. Then use the appropriate weights to calculate the final rating:

Group 1

Group 2


Choose only one set of weights				
Measure	Rating (1-4)	GROUP 1 Weights	GROUP 2 Weights	Weighted Rating
Teacher Practice Score		80%	80%	
Indiana Growth Model		-	12%	
School-wide Learning Measure		20%	8%	

Use the following formula to calculate:

1. Rating x % Weight = Weighted Rating
2. Sum of Weighted Ratings = Final Summative Score

Final Summative Evaluation Score: _____

Use the chart below and the Final Summative Evaluation Score to determine the teacher's final rating.



Note: Borderline points always round up.

Final Summative Rating:

Ineffective Improvement Necessary Effective Highly Effective

Tenure Category:

Current School Year

Next School Year

Probationary Teacher
 Established Teacher
 Professional Teacher

Probationary Teacher
 Established Teacher
 Professional Teacher

Teacher Signature

I have met with my evaluator to discuss the information on this form and have received a copy.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Evaluator Signature

I have met with this teacher to discuss the information on this form and provided a copy.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District

Teacher Effectiveness Rubric

June 2015



Source: Bluffton-Harrison Metropolitan School District
Adopted: January 25, 1977
Revised: February 28, 1985, December 30, 1987, August 22, 1989, June 26, 2000,
October 22, 2007, May 21, 2012, May 20, 2013, May 18, 2015, July 16, 2018

DOMAIN 1: PURPOSEFUL PLANNING

Teachers use Indiana content area standards to develop a rigorous curriculum relevant for all students: building meaningful units of study, continuous assessments and a system for tracking student progress as well as plans for accommodations and changes in response to a lack of student progress.

Competencies		Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
1.1	Utilize Assessment Data to Plan	<p>At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Incorporates differentiated instruction strategies in planning to reach every student at his/her level of understanding 	<p>Teacher uses prior assessment data to formulate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Achievement goals, unit plans, AND lesson plans that are measurable, aligned to content standards, and includes benchmarking. 	<p>Teacher uses prior assessment data to formulate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Achievement goals, unit plans, OR lesson plans, but not all of the above 	Teacher rarely or never uses prior assessment data when planning.
1.2	Create Objective-Driven Lesson Plans and Assessments	<p>At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Plans for a variety of differentiated instructional strategies, anticipating where these will be needed to enhance instruction -Incorporates a variety of informal assessments/checks for understanding as well as summative assessments where necessary and uses all assessments to directly inform instruction 	<p>Based on unit plan, teacher plans daily lessons by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Identifying lesson objectives that are aligned to state content standards -Matching instructional strategies as well as meaningful and relevant activities/assignments to the lesson objectives -Designing formative assessments that measure progress towards mastery and inform instruction 	<p>Based on unit plan, teacher plans daily lessons by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Identifying lesson objectives that are aligned to state content standards -Matching instructional strategies and activities/assignments to the lesson objectives <p>Teacher may not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Design assignments that are meaningful or relevant -Plan formative assessments to measure progress towards mastery or inform instruction 	Teacher rarely or never plans daily lessons OR daily lessons are planned, but are thrown together at the last minute, thus lacking meaningful objectives, instructional strategies, or assignments.

DOMAIN 2: EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION

Teachers facilitate student academic practice so that all students are participating and have the opportunity to gain mastery of the objectives in a classroom environment that fosters a climate of urgency and expectation around achievement, excellence and respect.

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.1:</p> <p>Develop student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives</p> <p><i>For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students can explain what they are learning and why it is important, beyond repeating the stated objective -Teacher effectively engages prior knowledge of students in connecting to lesson. Students demonstrate through work or comments that they understand this connection 	<p>Teacher is effective at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lesson objective is specific, measurable, and aligned to standards. It conveys what students are learning and what they will be able to do by the end of the lesson -Objective is written in a student-friendly manner and/or explained to students in easy-to-understand terms -Importance of the objective is explained so that students understand why they are learning what they are learning -Lesson builds on students' prior knowledge of key concepts and skills and makes this connection evident to students -Lesson is well-organized to move students towards mastery of the objective 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lesson objective conveys what students are learning and what they will be able to do by the end of the lesson, but may not be aligned to standards or measurable -Objective is stated, but not in a student-friendly manner that leads to understanding -Teacher attempts explanation of importance of objective, but students fail to understand -Lesson generally does not build on prior knowledge of students or students fail to make this connection -Organization of the lesson may not always be connected to mastery of the objective 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lesson objective is missing more than one component. It may not be clear about what students are learning or will be able to do by the end of the lesson. -There may not be a clear connection between the objective and lesson, or teacher may fail to make this connection for students -Teacher may fail to discuss importance of objective or there may not be a clear understanding amongst students as to why the objective is important -There may be no effort to connect objective to prior knowledge of students -Lesson is disorganized and does not lead to mastery of objective

Notes:

1. One way in which an observer could effectively gather information to score this standard is through brief conversations with students (when appropriate).
2. In some situations, it may not be appropriate to state the objective for the lesson (multiple objectives for various “centers,” early-childhood inquiry-based lesson, etc). In these situations, the observer should assess whether or not students are engaged in activities that will lead them towards mastery of an objective, even if it is not stated.

FILE CODE: AFC

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.2:</p> <p>Demonstrate and Clearly Communicate Content Knowledge to Students</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students</p> <p>For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher fully explains concepts in as direct and efficient a manner as possible, while still achieving student understanding -Teacher effectively connects content to other content areas, students' experiences and interests or current events in order to make content relevant and build interest -Explanations spark student excitement and interest in the content -Students participate in each other's learning of content through collaboration during the lesson -Students ask higher-order questions and make connections independently, demonstrating that they understand the content at a higher level 	<p>Teacher is effective at demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher demonstrates content knowledge and delivers content that is factually correct -Content is clear, concise and well-organized -Teacher restates and rephrases instruction in multiple ways to increase understanding -Teacher emphasizes key points or main ideas in content -Teacher uses developmentally appropriate language and explanations -Teacher implements relevant instructional strategies learned via professional development 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher delivers content that is factually correct -Content occasionally lacks clarity and is not as well organized as it could be -Teacher may fail to restate or rephrase instruction in multiple ways to increase understanding -Teacher does not adequately emphasize main ideas, and students are sometimes confused about key takeaways -Explanations sometimes lack developmentally appropriate language -Teacher does not always implement new and improved instructional strategies learned via professional development 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher may deliver content that is factually incorrect -Explanations may be unclear or incoherent and fail to build student understanding of key concepts -Teacher continues with planned instruction, even when it is obvious that students are not understanding content -Teacher does not emphasize main ideas, and students are often confused about content -Teacher fails to use developmentally appropriate language -Teacher does not implement new and improved instructional strategies learned via professional development

Notes:

1. Content may be communicated by either direct instruction or guided inquiry depending on the context of the classroom or lesson.
2. If the teacher presents information with any mistake that would leave students with a significant misunderstanding at the end of the lesson, the teacher should be scored a Level 1 for this competency.
3. Instructional strategies learned via professional development may include information learned during instructional coaching sessions as well as mandatory or optional school or district-wide PD sessions.

FILE CODE: AFC

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.3:	Teacher is highly effective at engaging students in academic content	Teacher is effective at engaging students in academic content	Teacher needs improvement at engaging students in academic content	Teacher is ineffective at engaging students in academic content
Engage students in academic content	<p>For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher provides ways to engage with content that significantly promotes student mastery of the objective -Teacher provides differentiated ways of engaging with content specific to individual student needs -The lesson progresses at an appropriate pace so that students are never disengaged, and students who finish early have something else meaningful to do -Teacher effectively integrates technology as a tool to engage students in academic success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3/4 or more of students are actively engaged in content at all times and not off-task -Teacher provides multiple ways, as appropriate, of engaging with content, all aligned to the lesson objective -Ways of engaging with content reflect different learning modalities or intelligences -Teacher adjusts lesson accordingly to accommodate for student prerequisite skills and knowledge so that all students are engaged -ELL and IEP students have the appropriate accommodations to be engaged in content -Students work hard and are deeply active rather than passive/receptive (See Notes below for specific evidence of engagement) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Fewer than 3/4 of students are engaged in content and many are off-task -Teacher may provide multiple ways of engaging students, but perhaps not aligned to lesson objective or mastery of content -Teacher may miss opportunities to provide ways of differentiating content for student engagement -Some students may not have the prerequisite skills necessary to fully engage in content and teacher's attempt to modify instruction for these students is limited or not always effective -ELL and IEP students are sometimes given appropriate accommodations to be engaged in content -Students may appear to actively listen, but when it comes time for participation are disinterested in engaging 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fewer than 1/2 of students are engaged in content and many are off-task -Teacher may only provide one way of engaging with content OR teacher may provide multiple ways of engaging students that are not aligned to the lesson objective or mastery of content -Teacher does not differentiate instruction to target different learning modalities -Most students do not have the prerequisite skills necessary to fully engage in content and teacher makes no effort to adjust instruction for these students -ELL and IEP students are not provided with the necessary accommodations to engage in content -Students do not actively listen and are overly disinterested in engaging

Notes:

1. The most important indicator of success here is that students are actively engaged in the content. For a teacher to receive credit for providing students a way of engaging with content, students must be engaged in that part of the lesson.
2. Some observable evidence of engagement may include (but is not limited to): (a) raising of hands to ask and answer questions as well as to share ideas; (b) active listening (not off-task) during lesson; (c) active participation in hands-on tasks/activities.
3. Teachers may provide multiple ways of engaging with content via different learning modalities (auditory, visual, kinesthetic/tactile) or via multiple intelligences (spatial, linguistic, musical interpersonal, logical-mathematical, etc). It may also be effective to engage students via two or more strategies targeting the same modality.

FILE CODE: AFC

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.4:</p> <p>Check for Understanding</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at checking for understanding</p> <p>For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher checks for understanding at higher levels by asking pertinent, scaffold questions that push thinking; accepts only high quality student responses (those that reveal understanding or lack thereof) -Teacher uses open-ended questions to surface common misunderstandings and assess student mastery of material at a range of both lower and higher-order thinking 	<p>Teacher is effective at checking for understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher checks for understanding at almost all key moments (when checking is necessary to inform instruction going forward) -Teacher uses a variety of methods to check for understanding that are successful in capturing an accurate “pulse” of the class’s understanding -Teachers uses wait time effectively both after posing a question and before helping students think through a response -Teacher doesn’t allow students to “opt-out” of checks for understanding and cycles back to these students -Teacher systematically assesses every student’s mastery of the objective(s) at the end of each lesson through formal or informal assessments (see note for examples) 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at checking for understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher sometimes checks for understanding of content, but misses several key moments -Teacher may use more than one type of check for understanding, but is often unsuccessful in capturing an accurate “pulse” of the class’s understanding -Teacher may not provide enough wait time after posing a question for students to think and respond before helping with an answer or moving forward with content -Teacher sometimes allows students to “opt-out” of checks for understanding without cycling back to these students -Teacher may occasionally assess student mastery at the end of the lesson through formal or informal assessments 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at checking for understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher rarely or never checks for understanding of content, or misses nearly all key moments -Teacher does not check for understanding, or uses only one ineffective method repetitively to do so, thus rarely capturing an accurate “pulse” of the class’s understanding -Teacher frequently moves on with content before students have a chance to respond to questions or frequently gives students the answer rather than helping them think through the issue -Teacher frequently allows students to “opt-out” of checks for understanding and does not cycle back to these students -Teacher rarely or never assesses for mastery at the end of the lesson

Notes:

1. Examples of times when checking for understanding may be useful are: before moving on to the next step of the lesson, or partway through independent practice.
2. Examples of how the teacher may assess student understanding and mastery of objectives:
 - a. Checks for Understanding: thumbs up/down, cold-calling
 - b. Do Nows, Turn and Talk/Pair Share, Guided or Independent Practice, Exit Slips

FILE CODE: AFC

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.5:</p> <p>Modify Instruction as Needed</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at modifying instruction as needed</p> <p>For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher anticipates student misunderstandings and preemptively addresses them -Teacher is able to modify instruction to respond to misunderstandings without taking away from the flow of the lesson or losing engagement 	<p>Teacher is effective at modifying instruction as needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher makes adjustments to instruction based on checks for understanding that lead to increased understanding for most students -Teacher responds to misunderstandings with effective scaffolding techniques -Teacher doesn't give up, but continues to try to address misunderstanding with different techniques if the first try is not successful 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at modifying instruction as needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher may attempt to make adjustments to instruction based on checks for understanding, but these attempts may be misguided and may not increase understanding for all students -Teacher may primarily respond to misunderstandings by using teacher-driven scaffolding techniques (for example, re-explaining a concept), when student-driven techniques could have been more effective -Teacher may persist in using a particular technique for responding to a misunderstanding, even when it is not succeeding 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at modifying instruction as needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher rarely or never attempts to adjust instruction based on checks for understanding, and any attempts at doing so frequently fail to increase understanding for students -Teacher only responds to misunderstandings by using teacher-driven scaffolding techniques -Teacher repeatedly uses the same technique to respond to misunderstandings, even when it is not succeeding

Notes:

1. In order to be effective at this competency, a teacher must have at least scored a 3 on competency 2.4 – in order to modify instruction as needed, one must first know how to check for understanding.
2. A teacher can respond to misunderstandings using “scaffolding” techniques such as: activating background knowledge, asking leading questions, breaking the task into small parts, using mnemonic devices or analogies, using manipulatives or hands-on models, using “think alouds,” providing visual cues, etc.

FILE CODE: AFC

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.6:	Teacher is highly effective at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work	Teacher is effective at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work	Teacher needs improvement at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work	Teacher is ineffective at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work
Develop Higher Level of Understanding through Rigorous Instruction and Work	<p>For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lesson is accessible and challenging to all students -Students are able to answer higher-level questions with meaningful responses -Students pose higher-level questions to the teacher and to each other -Teacher highlights examples of recent student work that meets high expectations; insists and motivates students to do it again if not great -Teacher encourages students' interest in learning by providing students with additional opportunities to apply and build skills beyond expected lesson elements (e.g. extra credit or enrichment assignments) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lesson is accessible and challenging to almost all students -Teacher frequently develops higher-level understanding through effective questioning -Lesson pushes almost all students forward due to differentiation of instruction based on each student's level of understanding -Students have opportunities to meaningfully practice, apply, and demonstrate that they are learning -Teacher shows patience and helps students to work hard toward mastering the objective and to persist even when faced with difficult tasks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lesson is not always accessible or challenging for students -Some questions used may not be effective in developing higher-level understanding (too complex or confusing) -Lesson pushes some students forward, but misses other students due to lack of differentiation based on students' level of understanding -While students may have some opportunity to meaningfully practice and apply concepts, instruction is more teacher-directed than appropriate -Teacher may encourage students to work hard, but may not persist in efforts to have students keep trying 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lesson is not aligned with developmental level of students (may be too challenging or too easy) -Teacher may not use questioning as an effective tool to increase understanding. Students only show a surface understanding of concepts -Lesson rarely pushes any students forward. Teacher does not differentiate instruction based on students' level of understanding -Lesson is almost always teacher directed. Students have few opportunities to meaningfully practice or apply concepts -Teacher gives up on students easily and does not encourage them to persist through difficult tasks

Notes:

1. Examples of types of questions that can develop higher-level understanding:
 - a. Activating higher levels of inquiry on Bloom's taxonomy (using words such as "analyze," "classify," "compare," "decide," "evaluate," "explain," or "represent")
 - b. Asking students to explain their reasoning
 - c. Asking students to explain why they are learning something or to summarize the main idea
 - d. Asking students to apply a new skill or concept in a different context
 - e. Posing a question that increases the rigor or the lesson content
 - f. Prompting students to make connections to previous material or prior knowledge
2. Higher-level questioning should result in higher-level student understanding. If it does not, credit should not be given.
3. Challenging tasks rather than questions may be used to create a higher level of understanding, and if successful, should be credited in this competency.
4. The frequency with which a teacher should use questions to develop higher-level understanding will vary depending on the topic and type of lesson.

FILE CODE: AFC

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.7:</p> <p>Maximize Instructional Time</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at maximizing instructional time</p> <p>For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Routines, transitions, and procedures are well-executed. Students know what they are supposed to be doing and when without prompting from the teacher -Students are always engaged in meaningful work while waiting for the teacher (for example, during attendance) -Students share responsibility for operations and routines and work well together to accomplish these tasks -All students are on-task and follow instructions of teacher without much prompting -Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations are rare; when they occur, they are always addressed without major interruption to the lesson 	<p>Teacher is effective at maximizing instructional time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students arrive on-time and are aware of the consequences of arriving late (unexcused) -Class starts on-time -Routines, transitions, and procedures are well-executed. Students know what they are supposed to be doing and when with minimal prompting from the teacher -Students are only ever not engaged in meaningful work for brief periods of time (for example, during attendance) -Teacher delegates time between parts of the lesson appropriately so as best to lead students towards mastery of objective -Almost all students are on-task and follow instructions of teacher without much prompting -Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations are rare; When they occur, they are almost always addressed without major interruption to the lesson 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at maximizing instructional time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Some students consistently arrive late (unexcused) for class without consequences -Class may consistently start a few minutes late -Routines, transitions, and procedures are in place, but require significant teacher direction or prompting to be followed -There is more than a brief period of time when students are left without meaningful work to keep them engaged -Teacher may delegate lesson time inappropriately between parts of the lesson -Significant prompting from the teacher is necessary for students to follow instructions and remain on-task -Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations sometimes occur; they may not be addressed in the most effective manner and teacher may have to stop the lesson frequently to address the problem 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at maximizing instructional time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students may frequently arrive late (unexcused) for class without consequences -Teacher may frequently start class late -There are few or no evident routines or procedures in place. Students are unclear about what they should be doing and require significant direction from the teacher at all times -There are significant periods of time in which students are not engaged in meaningful work -Teacher wastes significant time between parts of the lesson due to classroom management -Even with significant prompting, students frequently do not follow directions and are off-task -Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations are common and frequently cause the teacher to have to make adjustments to the lesson

Notes:

1. The overall indicator of success here is that operationally, the classroom runs smoothly so that time can be spent on valuable instruction rather than logistics and discipline.
2. It should be understood that a teacher can have disruptive students no matter how effective he/she may be. However, an effective teacher should be able to minimize disruptions amongst these students and when they do occur, handle them without detriment to the learning of the other students.

FILE CODE: AFC

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.8:</p> <p>Create Classroom Culture of Respect and Collaboration</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration</p> <p>For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students are invested in the academic success of their peers as evidenced by unprompted collaboration and assistance 	<p>Teacher is effective at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students are respectful of their teacher and peers -Students are given opportunities to collaborate and support each other in the learning process -Teacher reinforces positive character and behavior and uses consequences appropriately to discourage negative behavior -Teacher has a good rapport with students, and shows genuine interest in their thoughts and opinions 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students are generally respectful of their teacher and peers, but may occasionally act out or need to be reminded of classroom norms -Students are given opportunities to collaborate, but may not always be supportive of each other or may need significant assistance from the teacher to work together -Teacher may praise positive behavior OR enforce consequences for negative behavior, but not both -Teacher may focus on the behavior of a few students, while ignoring the behavior (positive or negative) of others 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students are frequently disrespectful of teacher or peers as evidenced by discouraging remarks or disruptive behavior -Students are not given many opportunities to collaborate OR during these times do not work well together even with teacher intervention -Teacher rarely or never praises positive behavior -Teacher rarely or never addresses negative behavior

Notes:

1. If there are one or more instances of disrespect by the teacher toward students, the teacher should be scored a Level 1 for this standard.
2. Elementary school teachers more frequently will, and are sometimes required to have, expectations, rewards, and consequences posted visibly in the classroom. Whether or not these are visibly posted, it should be evident within the culture of the classroom that students understand and abide by a set of established expectations and are aware of the rewards and consequences of their actions.

FILE CODE: AFC

Competency	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.9:</p> <p>Set High Expectations for Academic Success</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at setting high expectations for academic success</p> <p>For Level 4, much of the Level 3 evidence is observed during the year, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students participate in forming academic goals for themselves and analyzing their progress -Students demonstrate high academic expectations for themselves -Student comments and actions demonstrate that they are excited about their work and understand why it is important 	<p>Teacher is effective at setting high expectations for academic success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher sets high expectations for students of all levels -Students are invested in their work and value academic success as evidenced by their effort and quality of their work -The classroom is a safe place to take on challenges and risk failure (students do not feel shy about asking questions or bad about answering incorrectly) -Teacher celebrates and praises academic work -High quality work of all students is displayed in the classroom 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at setting high expectations for academic success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher may set high expectations for some, but not others -Students are generally invested in their work, but may occasionally spend time off-task or give up when work is challenging -Some students may be afraid to take on challenges and risk failure (hesitant to ask for help when needed or giveup easily) -Teacher may praise the academic work of some, but not others -High quality work of a few, but not all students, may be displayed in the classroom 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at setting high expectations for academic success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher rarely or never sets high expectations for students -Students may demonstrate disinterest or lack of investment in their work. For example, students might be unfocused, off-task or refuse to attempt assignments -Students are generally afraid to take on challenges and risk failure due to frequently discouraging comments from the teacher or peers -Teacher rarely or never praises academic work or good behavior -High quality work is rarely or never displayed in the classroom

Notes:

1. There are several ways for a teacher to demonstrate high expectations – through encouraging comments, higher-level questioning, appropriately rigorous assignments, expectations written and posted in the classroom, individual student work plans, etc.

DOMAIN 3: TEACHER LEADERSHIP

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

Competencies		Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
3.1	Seek Professional Skills and Knowledge	<p>At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Regularly share newly learned knowledge and practices with others -Seek out opportunities to lead professional development sessions -Go above and beyond in seeking out opportunities to collaborate 	<p>Teacher will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Actively pursue opportunities to improve knowledge and practice -Seek out ways to implement new practices into instruction, where applicable -Welcome constructive feedback to improve practices -Seek out and participate in regular opportunities to work 	<p>Teacher will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Attend all mandatory professional development opportunities -Participate in occasional opportunities to work with and learn from others <p>Teacher may not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Actively pursue optional professional development opportunities -Seek out ways to implement new practices into instruction -Accept constructive feedback well 	<p>Teacher rarely or never attends professional development opportunities. Teacher shows little or no interest in new ideas, programs, or classes to improve teaching and learning. Teacher rarely or never participates in opportunities to work with others.</p>
3.2	Advocate for Student Success	<p>At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Display commitment to the education of all the students in the school -Make changes and take risks to ensure student success 	<p>Teacher will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Display commitment to the education of all his/her students -Attempt to remedy obstacles around student achievement -Advocate for student's individualized needs 	<p>Teacher will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Display commitment to the education of all his/her students <p>Teacher may not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Advocate for students' needs 	<p>Teacher rarely or never displays commitment to the education of his/her students. Teacher accepts failure as par for the course and does not advocate for students' needs.</p>
3.3	Engage Families in Student Learning	<p>At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Strive to form relationships in which parents are given ample opportunity to participate in student learning -Is available to address concerns in a timely and positive manner, when necessary, outside of required outreach events 	<p>Teacher will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Proactively reach out to parents in a variety of ways to engage them in student learning -Respond promptly to contact from parents -Engage in all forms of parent outreach required by the school 	<p>Teacher will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Respond to contact from parents -Engage in all forms of parent outreach required by the school <p>Teacher may not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Proactively reach out to parents to engage them in student learning 	<p>Teacher rarely or never reaches out to parents and/or frequently does not respond to contacts from parents.</p>

DOMAIN 4: CORE PROFESSIONALISM RUBRIC

These indicators illustrate the minimum competencies expected in any profession. These are separate from the other sections in the rubric because they have little to do with teaching and learning and more to do with basic employment practice. Teachers are expected to meet these standards. If they do not, it will affect their overall rating negatively.

Indicator		Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard
1	Attendance	Individual demonstrates a pattern of unexcused absences	Individual has not demonstrated a pattern of unexcused absences
2	On-Time Arrival	Individual demonstrates a pattern of unexcused late arrivals (late arrivals that are in violation of procedures set forth by local school policy and by the relevant collective bargaining agreement)	Individual has not demonstrated a pattern of unexcused late arrivals (late arrivals that are in violation of procedures set forth by local school policy and by the relevant collective bargaining agreement)
3	Policies and Procedures	Individual demonstrates a pattern of failing to follow state, corporation, and school policies and procedures (e.g. procedures for submitting discipline referrals, policies for appropriate attire, etc)	Individual demonstrates a pattern of following state, corporation, and school policies and procedures (e.g. procedures for submitting discipline referrals, policies for appropriate attire, etc.)
4	Respect	Individual demonstrates a pattern of failing to interact with students, colleagues, parents/guardians, and community members in a respectful manner	Individual demonstrates a pattern of interacting with students, colleagues, parents/guardians, and community members in a respectful manner