

Staff Performance Evaluation Plan On-Site Monitoring

Indiana Department of Education

Educator Effectiveness



**Indiana
Department of Education**

Glenda Ritz, NBCT

Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) Review Team will complete this document as a record of the On-Site Review of IC 20-28-11.5 and the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Flexibility Waiver. This document details the requirements of state. If any areas are found to be in partial compliance or out of compliance, a finding will be listed on the report generated by the team from the IDOE. This report will be completed within 30 business days of the visit to the Local Educational Agency (LEA).

District Name _____

District Contact and Email _____

Date of Visit _____

Section A: IC 20-28-11.5 Requirements of Staff Performance Plans		
A.1	<p>What staff performance plan did the district implement during the 2013-2014 school year?</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -RISE or modified RISE -TAP -PAR -Locally developed 	
A.2	<p>What staff performance plan is the district using for the 2014-2015 school year? Did the plan change? If so, what changes were made and how were the changes discussed with all stakeholders?</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Stakeholder Committee meetings 	
A.3	<p>Performance evaluations for all certificated employees, conducted at least annually</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -HR files matching evaluation results (check SPNS to DOE-ER submission) 	
A.4	<p>Objective measures of student achievement and growth to significantly inform the evaluation. The objective measures must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (A) student assessment results from statewide assessments for certificated employees whose responsibilities include instruction in subjects measured in statewide assessments; (B) methods for assessing student growth for certificated employees who do not teach in areas measured by statewide assessments; and (C) student assessment results from locally developed assessments and other test measures for certificated employees whose responsibilities may or may not include instruction in subjects and areas measured by statewide assessments. <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Locally adopted assessments; list of subjects and assessment used -Staff SLOs for non-tested subjects -schoolwide measures -student surveys or portfolios -professional measures 	

A.5	<p>What percentage of student growth and achievement is used for each group of teachers, administrators and superintendents?</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -student achievement and growth percentages for final summative rating -Evaluation plan and stakeholder meeting agendas 	
A.6	<p>Are all educators observed at least twice throughout the school year?</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -observation tracking -evidence collections 	
A.7	<p>How were SLOs developed?</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -agenda from SLO development meetings -SLO tracking document -SLO final end of year document to track progress 	
A.8	<p>Have SLOs been audited to ensure fidelity across all schools?</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -SLO compliance check -SLO audit documents -SLO tracking documents 	
A.9	<p>Rigorous measures of effectiveness, including observations and other performance indicators.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teacher Effectiveness Rubric 	
A.10	<p>An annual designation of each certificated employee in one (1) of the following rating categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (A) Highly effective. (B) Effective. (C) Improvement necessary. (D) Ineffective <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Summative Ratings Calculation (for teachers in groups 1, 2 & 3) -DOE-ER Report -Final Summative Evaluation Rating for Superintendent, all administrators and all 	

	teachers	
A.11	<p>An explanation of the evaluator's recommendations for improvement for all educators, and the time in which improvement is expected</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -feedback tracking documentation -process for tracking improvement -Template for Improvement Plan -HR files for staff with Improvement Necessary and Ineffective 	
A.12	<p>A provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective.</p> <p>(d) The evaluator shall discuss the evaluation with the certificated employee.</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Local definition of Negative Impact -Sample from non-tested teacher evaluation of negative impact 	
Section B: Compliance with IC 20-28-11.5		
B.1	<p>Was the evaluation plan submitted to the IDOE on time?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOE Online submission no later than November 1, 2013 • Was a coversheet completed? <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -DOE Online submission -Completed coversheet 	
B.2	<p>How were the final ratings calculated?</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -DOE-EE report -matrix of scores -Definition on calculation/Weights 	
B.3	<p>Did you have staff that were rated Improvement Necessary and Ineffective teachers? How was targeted professional development provided to them?</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -90 day staff improvement plan 	
B.4	<p>How is feedback being tracked for all educators?</p> <p>Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -tracking document for feedback 	

	-PD schedule -teacher performance	
B.4	Have any students been instructed by a teacher rated ineffective for two consecutive years? Evidence -Notification to parents	
B.5	How did the district provide training to all evaluators? Evidence -Agendas and PowerPoints from trainings -Ongoing training; inter-rater reliability	
B.6	How did the district leveraged Title II grant toward educator effectiveness? Evidence -Title IIa application program and funds	
B.7	Did anyone file for a private conference with the superintendent after the teacher received the rating of ineffective?	
B.8	Were any HR decisions made after the final summative scores were calculated?	
B.9	How can the IDOE help you with staff performance evaluation plan implementation?	
Section C: ESEA Flexibility Waiver		
C.1	Did the district conduct side by side comparison of highly effective and effective teachers to A-F schools in the district? Evidence Example: A school with ___% HE/E teachers vs. an F schools with only ___% HE/E teachers)?	
C.2	How did the district review their staff performance final ratings against student and teacher performance? Evidence -Evaluation of staff performance plan -ISTEP+, ECA, Grad Rate scores	
C.3	How did the district review their evaluation plan? Did the review result in plan or implementation improvements? Evidence -Evaluation Committee Review	

	-Data Analysis -modified plan or implementation documents	
Section D: Excellence in Performance Grant (if applicable)		
D.1	How was data collected on the effectiveness of the grant? Evidence -Data reporting stated in grant	
D.2	Did the district file for reimbursement of the funds? Evidence -Reimbursement form	
D.3	How many teachers were awarded funds? Evidence -Tracking of HE and Effective summative scores	
D.4	Were funds awarded as stated in the grant application? Evidence -Tracking of final scores and awards to teachers for performance	
D.5	Did the district meet the goals set in the Excellence in Performance Grant? Evidence -data connected to goals of the grant	
D.6	Did the Excellence in performance grant help retain Highly Effective and Effective teachers?	