Seymour Community School Corporation

Seymour Teacher Evaluation Process (STEP)

September 2022

To Excellence
Every One Every Day

The purpose of this handbook is to outline and explain the Seymour Community School Corporation Teacher Evaluation Process and Plan.

Note: IDOE notices/requirements that are issued after the approval of this document will be presented, implemented and/or approved by the Seymour Evaluation Committee.

Seymour Community School Corporation
Seymour Teacher Evaluation Process (STEP)

During the 2011-2012 school year, a committee of eleven members met to establish the first Seymour Teacher Evaluation Plan (STEP).   The following is a list current and past year's committee.

2021-22

　　　　Brandon Harpe, Superintendent
　　　　Lisa Freeman, SMS Teacher/SEA President
　　　　Paula Weaver, SHS Teacher/SEA President
　　　　Lisa Ferguson, Assistant Superintendent
　　　　Dee Beavers, Redding Teacher
　　　　Meghan Fleenor, Brown Teacher
　　　　Karen Dobrinski, Jackson Teacher
　　　　Mindy Clay, SMS Teacher
　　　　Dana Bullard, Emerson Teacher
　　　　Jennifer Miller, Redding Teacher
　　　　Joy Stuckwisch, SHS Special Education Teacher
　　　　Maria Hauersperger, 6GC Teacher
　　　　Tony Hack, Margaret R. Brown Principal
　　　　Diane Altemeyer, Director of Federal Programs
　　　　Julie Kelly, Emerson Elementary Principal
　　　　Daniel Mendez, SMS Principal
　　　　Mika Ahlbrand, Special Education Director
　　　　Talmadge Reasoner, SHS Assistant Principal

2022-23

　　　　Brandon Harpe, Superintendent
　　　　Lisa Freeman, SMS Teacher/SEA President
　　　　Paula Weaver, SHS Teacher/SEA President
　　　　Lisa Ferguson, Assistant Superintendent
　　　　Dee Beavers, Redding Teacher
　　　　Meghan Fleenor, Brown Teacher
　　　　Karen Dobrinski, Jackson Teacher
　　　　Mindy Clay, SMS Teacher
　　　　Dana Bullard, Emerson Teacher
　　　　Jennifer Miller, Redding Teacher
　　　　Joy Stuckwisch, SHS Special Education Teacher
　　　　Maria Hauersperger, 6GC Teacher
　　　　Tony Hack, Margaret R. Brown Principal
　　　　Julie Kelly, Emerson Elementary Principal
　　　　Daniel Mendez, SMS Principal
　　　　Mika Ahlbrand, Special Education Director

Guiding Principles
1. Nothing SCSC 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. SCSC 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.
3. Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, central office instructional leaders, principals, or assistant principals may be evaluators. All evaluators will receive training prior to evaluating any teacher. This training will take place prior to participation in the evaluation process. It will include IDOE training through local service centers, specific training with SCSC's evaluation tool program, and local professional development opportunities to support evaluation skills of each individual evaluator.

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 3 main requirements:
  o Every teacher must receive an evaluation annually;
  o Every evaluation system must include four performance categories: Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Ineffective; and
  o Every evaluation system must incorporate measures of student growth and achievement as a significant portion of a teacher's evaluation.

Performance Level Ratings
As required by Indiana Code 20-28-11.5, 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 <u>consistently exceeds</u> 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 <u>consistently meets</u> 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* <u>requires a change in performance</u> 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. Note: <u>Teachers who receive this rating are ineligible for any salary increase for the year in question.</u>
- **Ineffective: An *ineffective* teacher <u>consistently fails</u> to meet expectations.** This is a teacher who has failed to meet expectations, as determined by a trained evaluator, in 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. Note: <u>Teachers who receive this rating are ineligible for any salary increase for the year in question.</u>

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 are generally evaluated on the following:

1. **Teacher Effectiveness Rubric**– Assessment of instructional knowledge and skills that influence student learning, as measured by competencies set forth in the Seymour Teacher Evaluation Process. All teachers will be evaluated in the domains of Planning, Instruction, and Professionalism.

2. **Student Learning** – Teachers' contribution to student academic progress, assessed through multiple measures of student academic achievement and growth.

Note: *Walkthrough tools will be utilized by trained evaluators to gather district level data. The data gathered through the use of this tool will be viewed by evaluators but will not tie directly into the final rating calculation of the individual teacher. There is no guarantee each teacher will be rated using a walkthrough tool.*

Negative Impact Statement:

Any certified employee who is determined to have negatively impacted student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of "highly effective" or "effective".   Seymour Community School Corporation has defined and adopted a process whereby "negative impact on student learning" is clearly identified. Further, if a certified employee is rated as "ineffective" for two consecutive years and it is determined that he/she shall continue as an employee of Seymour Community School Corporation, parents of students who will have this teacher/certified employee following two consecutive years of an "ineffective" rating will be notified in writing with a written explanation as to why this situation has become unavoidable.

Negative Impact Definition per IC 20-28-11.5-8:

Negative impact on student learning shall be defined as follows: (1) Negative impact on student growth shall be defined locally where data show a significant number of students across a

teacher's classes fails to demonstrate student learning or mastery of standards established by the our school district or state.

1. Negative Impact is characterized by a significant decrease in student achievement and notably low levels of student growth. A teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective (4) or effective (3). IC 20-28-11.5-4
2.
3. [c] 6. Negative Impact on Student Learning is defined by the district as any teacher who is scored in the needs improvement (2) or the ineffective category (1) on their summative evaluation. This will be determined during the evaluation process as a teacher who fails to meet district expectations in academic standard or a significant number of students are unable to demonstrate mastery of academic standards. Teachers identified in the category of Negative Impact on student learning cannot receive a rating of highly effective (4) or effective (3).

A teacher receiving a summative evaluation rating or negative impact rating of 1 or 2 does not qualify for increments, raises, performance monies, and career increments.

Objective Measures of Student Achievement and Growth /Student Learning Objectives/SLO):   No longer required based on IDOE guidance

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 as needed and provide feedback

May – June
- Evaluator completes observations and scores Teacher Effectiveness Rubric
- Evaluator completes Summative Evaluation

Upon Collection of Data
- Teacher and evaluator may meet for the End-of-Year Conference. This conference will be held if requested by the teacher, unless the teacher has a rating/circumstance* that makes this meeting mandatory.
- Evaluator gives the teacher a copy of the Summative Evaluation (Form 6 or Evaluation Software generated document)

*This conference will be mandatory if a teacher is rated ineffective or improvement necessary or has been rated ineffective or needs improvement on an evaluation within the past 3 years. This conference is also mandatory for any teacher new to SCSC with less than 3 total years of teaching experience.

Evaluation Steps

Step 1 – Beginning-of-Year Conference – the teachers meet with the primary evaluator near the beginning of the school year (staff meeting or individually). The purpose of the meeting is to
- review the evaluation process and
- highlight priority competencies and indicators from the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric

Teachers on an improvement plan will meet with the primary evaluator near the beginning of the school year to review and update the improvement plan.

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 <u>minimum requirements</u> for observations.

Observation Type	Length (minutes)	Frequency	Pre-Conference	Post-Conference	Written Feedback	Announced
Formal (Extended)	No less than 40 minutes	1/year	Optional	Optional	Within 5 school days	No
Informal (Brief)	Approx. 10 minutes	1/year	No	No	Within 3 school days	No

<u>Optional Forms</u>
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.

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 3 years. This conference is also mandatory for any teacher new to SCSC with less than 3 total years of teaching experience.
*If at any time a teacher has an overall rating of ineffective or improvement necessary, a conference can be initiated.

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 shall provide evidence of planning, instruction, and professional practice. See Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Domains 1 - 3.

2. **The primary evaluator uses professional judgment to establish three, final ratings in Planning, Instruction, and Leadership.** After collecting information, the primary evaluator must use professional judgment to assess the teacher and assign a rating in each competency within the three domains. The three domain ratings should reflect the body of information available to the evaluator. In the summative conference, the evaluator should discuss the ratings with the teacher, using the information collected to support the final decision.

   At this point, each evaluator should have ratings in the first three domains that range from 1 (*Ineffective*) to 4 (*Highly Effective*).

   Scoring Requirement: Planning and instruction go hand-in-hand. Therefore, if a teacher scores a 1 (I) or 2 (IN) in Instruction, he or she cannot receive a rating of 4 (HE) in Planning.

3. **The primary evaluator uses established weights to calculate one rating for domains 1-3.** Each of the three final domain ratings is weighted according to importance and summed to form one rating for domains 1-3. As described earlier, the creation and design of the rubric stresses the importance of observable teacher and student actions. These are reflected in Domain 1: Planning (15%), Domain 2: Instruction (70%), and Domain 3: Professional Practice (15%). Effective instruction and classroom environment matter more than anything else a teacher can do to improve student outcomes.

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.

Domains 1-3 Weighted Scores

Domain	Rating (1-4)	Weight	Weighted Rating
Domain 1 - Planning		15 %	
Domain 2 - Instruction		70 %	
Domain 3 – Professional Practice		15 %	
Final Score for Domains 1-3			

Use the following formula to calculate by hand:
1. Rating * % Weight = Weighted Rating
2. Sum of Weighted Ratings = Final Score for Domains 1-3

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

Review of Components – Each teacher's summative evaluation score will be based on the following components and measures:
1. **Teacher Effectiveness Rubric – Assessment of instructional knowledge and skills**
    Measure: Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER)

2. **Student Learning – Contribution to student academic progress**

The School-wide Learning Measure is no longer applicable.

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).

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

I.   100% Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER) – Observations
        100% Summative Teacher Evaluation Score

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

Note: Borderline points always round up to the hundredth place.

Step 6: End-of-year summative evaluation conference – If requested* by the teacher, the primary evaluator meets with the teacher in a summative conference to discuss all the information collected in addition to the final rating. A copy of the completed evaluation, including any documentation related to the evaluation, must be provided to the teacher.

The SCSC Teacher Evaluation Process will be reviewed by teacher and administrative representatives at the conclusion of each school year. All evaluation procedures will be discussed and modifications may occur if deemed necessary to improve the SCSC Teacher Evaluation Process.

   *This conference will be mandatory if a teacher is rated ineffective or improvement necessary or has been rated ineffective or needs improvement on an evaluation within the past 3 years. This conference is also mandatory for any teacher new to SCSC with less than 3 total years of teaching experience.

Appendix A – Notes from Senate Enrolled Act 1 (IC-20-28-11.5)

Appendix A – Notes from Senate Enrolled Act 1 (IC 20-28-11.5)

Professional Development Plan – If a teacher 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. SCSC Clarification Notes: The *Professional Improvement Plan* form (Form 5) is an optional form that can be used. Day One of the 90 school day plan begins at the meeting the plan is shared.

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

Parent Notice – (IC 20-28-11.5-7) A student may not be instructed for 2 consecutive years by two consecutive teachers rated as *ineffective*. If it is not possible, the school corporation must notify the parents 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*. SCSC Clarification Notes: Notice served 30 days after all data is received by SCSC from IDOE

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 30, 2012, RIF's in positions must be based on performance and not seniority
4. Any reason considered relevant to the school's interest

B. Any Teacher/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
   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

Appendix B – Forms

Form 1 (optional)

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:

Form 2 (optional)

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 Professional Practice:

Action Steps for Teacher Areas of Improvement:
This section should be written by the teacher and evaluator during the post conference.

Form 3 (optional)

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?

Mid-Year Check-In Form

School: _____   Summative Evaluator: _____

Teacher: _____   Grade/Subject: _____

Date: _____

Note: Mid-year check-in conferences are optional for any teacher without a professional practice plan, but 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 Formal Observations Prior to Mid-Year Check-in: _____

Number of Informal 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 Set Ambitious and Measurable Achievement Goals 1.3 Develop Standards-Based Unit Plans and Assessments 1.4 Create Objective-Driven Lesson Plans and Assessments 1.5 Track Student Data and Analyze Progress	
Mid-Year Rating (Circle One)	**4 – Highly Effective 3 – Effective** **2 – Improvement Necessary 1 – Ineffective** **N/A**

Domain 2: Instruction	Mid-Year Assessment of Domain 2
I.1 Develop Student Understanding and Mastery of Lesson Objectives I.2 Demonstrate and Clearly Communicate Content Knowledge to Students I.3 Engage Students in Academic Content I.4 Check for Understanding I.5 Modify Instruction as Needed I.6 Develop Higher Level of Understanding Through Rigorous Instruction and Work I.7 Maximize Instructional Time I.8 Create Classroom Culture of Respect and Collaboration I.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: Professional Practice	Mid-Year Assessment of Domain 3
3.1 Contribute to School Culture 3.2 Collaborate with Peers 3.3 Seek Professional Skills and Knowledge 3.4 Advocate for Student Success 3.5 Engage Families in Student Learning	
Mid-Year Rating (Circle One)	**4 – Highly Effective 3 – Effective** **2 – Improvement Necessary 1 – Ineffective** **N/A**

Form 5

Professional Improvement 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:	

Professional Growth Goal #2					
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.)	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:	

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:	

Seymour Community School Corporation

Form 6 (required)

Final Summative Rating

School: _____   Summative Evaluator: _____

Teacher: _____   Date: _____

Grade/Subject: _____

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

Number of Formal Observations: _____

Number of Informal Observations: _____

Domains 1-3 Weighted Scores

Domain	Rating (1-4)	Weight	Weighted Rating
Domain 1		15%	
Domain 2		70%	
Domain 3		15%	
	Weighted	100%	
Final Teacher Effectiveness Rubric Score			

1. Rating * % Weight = Weighted Rating
2. Sum of Weighted Ratings = Weighted Score

Final Summative Evaluation Score: _____

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

Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
1.0	1.75	2.5	3.5

4.0

Points   Points   Points   Points   Points

Note: Borderline points always round up.

Final Summative Rating:

Ineffective ☐ Improvement Necessary ☐ Effective ☐ Highly Effective

Tenure Category: **<u>Current School Year</u>**   **<u>Next School Year</u>**

                                    Probationary Teacher   Probationary Teacher
                                    Established Teacher   Established Teacher
                                    Professional 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:_____