

## Staff Performance Evaluation Program (SPEP)

### Central Nine Career Center

1. Overview: This plan was developed cooperatively between teachers and administrators of Central Nine Career Center (the School) and is applicable only to certificated staff members who teach classes or provide professional services within the high school division. The evaluation instrument offered by our Successful Practices Network (SPN) coach was used as the preliminary guide in developing the Teacher Evaluation Form. The Central Nine evaluation committee agreed that a locally-developed plan offered more potential to positively influence student outcomes, will more accurately evaluate teachers in our Career Technical Education (CTE) format and foster world-class teaching and students than adopting the RISE, the TAP or other models being promoted across the state. The SPEP was developed with the understanding that statewide End of Program (EOP) assessments satisfy IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(2)(A) and constitute "statewide assessments."
2. Components:
  - a. Sections 3 thru 10 apply to all non-administrative certificated employees;
  - b. Section 11 applies to building-level certificated administrators
3. Evaluator(s): teacher evaluations will be completed by an in-house master teacher, an outside vendor that provides a master teacher, building-level administrators, or any combination thereof as determined by the executive director (considered the superintendent for all purposes). The combination may be determined individually on a case-by-case basis. In the event that an outside evaluator, rather than an in-house Master Teacher, is chosen by the superintendent to provide the evaluation, such evaluation shall be formative and a building-level administrator (typically the principal and the curriculum director) shall provide the summative evaluation. Each teacher will be officially notified verbally, by e-mail or by letter no later than August 15<sup>th</sup> of each year who will be conducting their evaluation, though the School reserves the right to re-designate the evaluators as necessary.

Evaluations performed by a master teacher will primarily be formative in nature and all summative evaluations shall be performed by a building-level administrator (typically the principal and the curriculum director) as required by 511 IAC 10-6-2(b). In the case where there is one evaluator assigned, all evaluations will be conducted by that individual. All persons performing evaluations, whether administrators or administrator-designated individuals, whether in-house or an outside vendor and whether formative or summative, shall be trained in evaluation skills and provided support consistent with and as required by IC 20-28-11.5-5(b) and 511 IAC(a), as well as the proper administration of this SPEP. This includes, but is not limited to, training on how to collect and analyze evidence toward the summative evaluations and, if applicable, on evaluating evidence and the making of final summative evaluations. Training on

the collection and analysis of evidence should include the following topics: rubrics used to assess a teacher's professional practice, best practices in classroom observation, observation processes and logistics, giving feedback to teachers, analyzing student data, assessments and measures of student learning. Training relating to summative evaluations should include the following topics: summative scoring and professional development and remediation plans. Training may occur through professional development programs, supervisor-led training, virtual training or other similar means and methods. In addition, teachers evaluated pursuant to this SPEP may be trained regarding the following subjects: rubrics used to assess a teacher's professional practice, observation processes and logistics, analyzing student data, measures of student learning and summative scoring.

Master teachers must (1) have clearly demonstrated a record of effective teaching over several years, (2) be approved by the superintendent as being qualified, and (3) conduct evaluations as a significant part of their responsibilities. IC 20-28-11.5-4; IC 20-28-11.5-1.

- a. Qualifications of Master Teacher: Master teachers are required to have substantial experience in curriculum development, professional development and mentoring, most of which is directly or indirectly related to CTE. They must possess a current teaching license as recognized by the State of Indiana. They must represent the "gold standard" in teaching and serve as a role model to other instructional staff. Master teachers should have at least five years experience that includes a proven track record in increasing student achievement as evidenced by placement results, student competitions, skill attainment or other factors associated with college and career readiness. Master teachers must have contributed to their profession through activities such as, but not limited to, conducting research or external program evaluations for certification, publishing articles or other work in reputable education or technical journals, teaching at the post-secondary education level, presenting at conferences, and/or receiving awards that recognize their educational talents. Additionally, master teachers need to be impartial, well-reasoned and excellent communicators with students and adults alike.

Timing of Evaluations: Observations and formative evaluations shall be conducted consistent with this SPEP and may be more concentrated or less frequent and numerous, as determined by the needs of the evaluator(s). The observations and evaluations may be announced or unannounced; they may be random or scheduled; they may be conducted briefly or may be for an extended period of time, though at all times shall be of sufficient length so as to allow the evaluator the opportunity to draw evidences of performance of the certificated employee, with at least one observation lasting at least forty minutes. A minimum of two observations will be conducted for each summative evaluation or as otherwise required by 511 IAC 10-6-5. Formative evaluations may be written or verbal in nature. Documentation will be maintained by

the evaluator(s) of all observations and evaluations. A formal evaluation of a summative nature will take place at least annually, though may be more frequent at the sole discretion of the Superintendent. The formal, summative evaluation shall be completed prior to May 15<sup>th</sup> or at least 10 days before the last teacher contract day, whichever is earlier. Unless specifically determined otherwise, both the principal and the curriculum director will take an active role in authoring the summative evaluation instrument, remediation plan (if applicable), and will sign the document(s). The teacher will be asked to provide evidence, artifacts, and written narratives for all performance indicators any time prior to the scheduled evaluation discussion meeting. Whatever the teacher provides that is determined relevant to the evaluation criteria will be considered as part of the summative evaluation which will become part of a teacher's personnel file. Artifacts may be gathered and presented by the teacher, the evaluator(s) or both. The evaluator shall collect artifacts and evidence toward summative evaluations throughout the school year as required by 511 IAC 10-6-2(a).

4. Measures: In order to comply with the Indiana Code and Indiana Administrative Code, and in order to evaluate all aspects of certificated employees' performance, the Teacher Evaluation Form, Appendix A which is incorporated into this SPEP by reference, contains objective and subjective measures. These measures, as required or subsequently amended by 511 IAC 10-6-4(a), include those provided by the Indiana Department of Education based upon student achievement and/or growth on statewide assessments (as applicable), measures based on other assessments developed or procured by the School for the purpose of showing student growth and/or achievement and those measures closely aligned with content standards, as applicable, to reflect ambitious learning goals and proportional representation of content.
  - a. Objective measures are identified on the Teacher Evaluation Form as performance indicators 12, 13, 14, and 15. These include topics about Completion/Completers, Placement, College Readiness, and Skill Attainment. In order to be rated Effective or Highly Effective in these areas, the program for which a teacher is responsible must be producing results equal to or exceeding the State's expectations of the School. Trend data of no longer than a three consecutive year period may be considered by an evaluator in making a determination. These measures have been weighted more heavily (16, 12, 8, 4, respectively) than the other performance indicators on the Teacher Form.
  - b. Measures identified as performance indicators 1 – 11 are considered more subjective in nature, are not weighted as highly as the objective measures (4, 3, 2, 1, respectively), yet are intended to provide a rigorous measure of effectiveness. The rubric for evaluating these measures has been designed to indicate four levels of rigor in determining effectiveness of teachers and programs. Typically, a higher frequency of more complex and sustainable evidences or artifacts encourages a higher rating by the evaluator. A significant

determiner between a rating of Needs Improvement and Effective is the quality or reliability of the evidence or artifacts.

- c. Appendix C serves as the rubric by which the ratings are determined for each performance indicator and to which all evaluators will be trained. Artifacts are listed as samples and are not to be considered as an exhaustive list. These artifacts may be modified or individually customized, including adding to or deleting from the list at any time by the evaluator. If the list is modified, the change must be done in writing and clearly communicated to the teacher being evaluated.
5. Annual Performance Rating: All evaluated certificated employees must be rated at least annually, but possibly more than once at the discretion of the Superintendent, as Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary or Ineffective. IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(4). The State Board of Education has defined these ratings at 511 IAC 10-6-2(a) as:
- (a) Highly Effective. A highly effective teacher consistently exceeds expectations both in terms of student outcomes and instructional practice. 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 exceeded expectations for academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the department, which shall be published annually by August 1.
  - (b) Effective. An effective teacher consistently meets expectations both in terms of student outcomes and instructional practice. 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 achieved an acceptable rate of academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the department, which shall be published annually by August 1.
  - (c) Improvement Necessary. A teacher who is rated as improvement necessary requires a change in performance before he/she meets expectations either in terms of student outcomes or instructional practice. 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 achieved a below acceptable rate of academic

growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the department, which shall be published annually by August 1.

(d) Ineffective. An ineffective teacher consistently fails to meet expectations both in terms of student outcomes and instructional practice. 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 achieved unacceptable levels of academic growth and achievement based on guidelines suggested by the department, which shall be published annually by August 1.

The Teacher Evaluation Form delineates these ratings (either as 4, 3, 2, 1 or 16, 12, 8, 4, respectively) for each performance indicator. It is not required that a score be provided for every performance indicator and the failure to do so shall not invalidate or affect the validity of the evaluation. A total score will be tallied and then divided by 27. For any indicator that a determination cannot be reasonably made, the denominator will be reduced accordingly. An overall rating of 1-1.45 will be considered Ineffective, 1.46-2.45 Improvement Necessary, 2.46-3.45 Effective, and 3.46-4.0 Highly Effective.

6. Negative Effect. IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(6) prohibits any teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth from receiving a summative final rating of Highly Effective or Effective. This shall be defined by 511 IAC 10-6-4(c) as follows, or as subsequently amended:

(a) 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. Cut levels shall be published by the Indiana Department of Education by August 1.

(b) 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 fail to demonstrate student learning or mastery of standards established by the state.

7. Review and Recommendations: The evaluator(s) shall discuss the summative evaluation with the teacher prior to May 15<sup>th</sup> each year or at least 10 days before the last teacher contract day, whichever is earlier. IC 20-28-11.5-4(d). This will be accomplished by at least one of the evaluators whose signature is on the Teacher Form. The evaluator and the School shall provide the teachers with meaningful feedback relating to growth opportunities for further improvement, as well as the identification of the teacher's strengths and areas for improvement. One modification of no more than one level up or down to the evaluation may be

made following this discussion if the evaluator(s) receives or possesses convincing evidence to alter a rating. If more than one rating is being considered for alteration, the evaluator(s) must confer with all individuals involved in the process to receive a consensus before making a modification. If this delay occurs, the expectation that the process will conclude by the date noted above is waived.

The evaluator(s) shall provide an explanation of his or her recommendations for improvement and the time in which the improvement shall be made, as appropriate. IC 20-28-11.5-4(c)(5). This is to be done in writing and will be as specific as possible to ensure clarity and accountability. A copy of the completed evaluation, the recommendations and all documents related to the evaluation will be given to the certificated employee within seven days from the completion of the evaluation as required by IC 20-28-11.5-6(a). The evaluation and all related documents may be transmitted electronically or provided in hard copy form, either by hand delivery or placed in mailbox in a sealed envelope.

8. Remediation Plan: If the certificated employee receives a rating of Ineffective or Improvement Necessary, then the evaluator(s) and teacher shall develop a remediation plan (appendix B) of not more than ninety school days from the date that the plan is signed by the primary evaluator and the teacher to correct the deficiencies in the evaluation. The remediation plan shall link the teacher's performance evaluation results with professional development opportunities. These opportunities include, but are not limited to, coursework, professional development conferences, formal mentoring, modeling, coaching, and the creation of professional learning communities. There is no obligation to utilize the full ninety days and the certificated employee shall bear the responsibility of paying the costs of such remediation plan, if any. The remediation plan shall require the use of the teacher's license renewal credits in professional development activities intended to help the teacher achieve an effective rating. IC 20-28-11.5-6(b). The teacher shall be required to demonstrate how any proposed professional development activities relate to his or her evaluation results and will result in improvement. Subsequent evaluations may commence but cannot conclude or use observations made solely during the remediation plan period. In addition to the foregoing, new teachers and those receiving substandard ratings may receive additional direct support, which can include additional observations, coaching or mentoring
9. Conference Procedure: A teacher receiving an Ineffective rating may file a request for a private conference with the superintendent or his/her designee not later than five days after receiving notice of his or her rating. IC 20-28-11.5-6(c). The superintendent or his/her designee may choose to simply listen to the teacher's concerns or to engage in a discussion about the evaluation, the ratings, the remediation plan, or any other relevant matters at his or her sole discretion. The superintendent is not required to provide any verbal response or present any evidence at the conference. The conference may be recorded and/or attended by such other personnel, including counsel, as the superintendent shall deem necessary on behalf of the School. The superintendent shall respond in writing to the teacher within seven school days of

the conference with a determination. The determination shall either be 'inconclusive' and an alternate evaluator will be assigned to review the evaluation, or 'upheld' whereby the superintendent endorses the determination by the evaluator.

If an alternate evaluator is assigned, this person should emulate the characteristics of either a master teacher or a successful administrator or both and be familiar with the School SPEP. This person may conduct further observations and/or interviews with the teacher and/or the evaluators, but will not be required to do so. They will review the existing evaluation and share their opinion with the superintendent only. Upon review of the alternate evaluator's opinion, the superintendent shall either uphold the original evaluation rating or modify the rating at his or her sole discretion. This response shall be in writing and may be electronically transmitted to the teacher or delivered in hard copy by hand delivery or by placing the response in the teacher's mailbox. Subsequent evaluations may commence but cannot conclude or use observations made solely during the remediation plan period.

10. Parent Notification: Under Indiana law, students in certain identified courses may not be instructed for two consecutive years by two consecutive teachers receiving an ineffective rating in the preceding evaluation period before the start of the student's second consecutive year. IC 20-28-11.5-7. It is mutually understood that this applies only to courses within the Indiana Core 40 curriculum and the following ISTEP or ECA-tested areas: English/language arts, mathematics, science and social studies. There are no such courses currently offered at The School but if they are offered in the future, IC 20-28-11.5-7 will be adhered to, including all conditions about notifying parents of students who are placed in the classroom of an ineffective teacher of those classes.
11. Administrators: The Administrator Evaluation Form is attached as Appendix D. Building-level administrators will be evaluated at least annually by the superintendent or his/her designee in accordance with school board policy 1530. The evaluation shall be closely aligned with Indiana's building level administrator standards. Due process for administrators shall comply with Indiana Code 20-28-8.
12. Report to DOE: On or before July 31 of each year, The School will provide the results of its SPEP to the DOE, including the number of certificated employees placed in each category. Nothing in the report will identify the names or anything else personally identifiable that may allow DOE to discover the names of particular teachers in each category. IC 20-28-11.5-9.
13. Reliability: Results of this SPEP shall be monitored for reliability annually by the Superintendent and shared with the Board. Factors involved in determining the reliability of the process will be comparisons to statewide results overall, with groups or cohorts of similar demographic characteristics and in view of the performance ratings of the school as a whole. This monitoring will be longitudinal in nature and modifications will be made in order to reflect as accurately as

possible the impact of teachers and administrators on the results of student learning in each program area and as a school corporation.

14. Assurance: All standards and procedures in this SPEP that are directly derived from current laws set forth in the Indiana Code and/or Indiana Administrative Code shall be deemed automatically amended without further vote to reflect such amendments as may subsequently occur.

#### List of appendices

Appendix A – Teacher Evaluation Form

Appendix B – Teacher Improvement Plan

Appendix C – Teacher Evaluation Rubric

Appendix D – Administrator Evaluation Form

Appendix E – Administrator Evaluation Rubric

Appendix F – School Board Policy 1530

Appendix G – Indiana Code 20-28-8

This plan is endorsed by the administration, the governing body and the teaching staff by the following assurances:

1. The plan was approved by at least 75% of the teachers\* that voted on \_\_\_\_\_.
2. The plan was approved by the Board in a public meeting on March 8, 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Chief Administrator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Association President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of School Board President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date