

Culver Community Schools Focused Teacher Evaluation Model and Support Services Evaluation Rubrics

CCSC FTEM

Adapted from RISE 3.0 & Learning Sciences International

**Revised
September 2022**

Culver Community Schools is committed to provide all students with the opportunity to acquire academic skills, universal awareness, and emotional growth in a nurturing environment. Students will be encouraged to meet challenging expectations and to reach their maximum potential through traditional and innovative educational programs. We encourage the partnership of teachers, parents, students, and community members in this responsibility. We will strive to prepare each student to become a contributing member of society and a lifelong learner. The purpose of this evaluation is to improve teacher quality, reinforce professional growth and improvement, identify areas of training, and implement best practices universally.

CULVER COMMUNITY SCHOOLS TEACHER EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM

Indiana Teacher Evaluation: Public Law 90 and Senate Enrolled Act #1	3
Annual Evaluations	3
Rigorous Measures of Effectiveness	4
Performance Ratings	5
Overview of Components	6
Focused Teacher Evaluation Model (FTEM):	7
Background	7
Overview	7
Role of Professional Judgment	9
Teacher Evaluation Metrics	11
Teacher Remediation Plan	11
Ineffective Rating Conference Request	12
Ineffective Teacher Two Years in a Row	12
Appendix A-Glossary of Terms	13
Appendix B- Teacher Appreciation Grant Policy	14
Appendix C-Scoring Summaries	15
Teacher Evaluation Scoring Summary	16
Counselor Evaluation Scoring Summary	17
School Librarian Scoring Summary	18
Assistant Principal Scoring Summary	19
Principal Scoring Summary	20
Superintendent Scoring Summary	21
Appendix D - Rubrics	
Focused Teacher Evaluation Model	
RISE Indian Counselor Rubric	
Association of Indiana School Library Educators (AISLE) Rubric	
Indiana Assistant Principal Evaluation Rubric	
Indiana Principal Evaluation Rubric	
Indiana Superintendent Evaluation Rubric	

Indiana Teacher Evaluation: Public Law 90 and Senate Enrolled Act 1

The 2011 Education Agenda put students first by focusing on the teachers who most strongly influence student learning every day. To do this with the help of teachers and leaders throughout the state, the Indiana Department of Education developed an optional model evaluation system named RISE & Learning Sciences International has developed Focused Teacher Evaluation Model (FTEM). Evaluations must:

- **Be Annual:** Every teacher, regardless of experience, deserves meaningful feedback on his or her performance on an annual basis. An explanation of improvement and goals is expected.
- **Rigorous measures of effectiveness:** Evaluations should be student-focused. First and foremost, an effective teacher helps students make academic progress. A thorough evaluation system includes multiple measures of student performance and growth data must be one of the key measures to a rigorous standards-based system
- **Include Four Rating Categories:** To retain our best teachers, we need a process that can truly differentiate our best educators and give them the recognition they deserve. If we want all teachers to perform at the highest level, we need to know which individuals are achieving the greatest success and give support to those who are new or struggling. A provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of effective or higher.

Annual Performance Evaluations

- The evaluation plan is in writing and shall be explained to the governing body in a public meeting before the evaluations are conducted.
- The Superintendent of the school corporation will discuss the plan with the teachers or the teachers' representative.
- Each teacher, administrator, and the Superintendent of Schools will be evaluated on an annual basis.
- Each teacher should have a defined timeline, process, and format to receive meaningful feedback towards growth opportunities to ensure that evaluations capture progress between the beginning and the end of the school year. Meaningful feedback shall include identified strengths and areas for improvement.
- Pre-Conference need to be scheduled prior to first long observations.

- Post-Conference need to be scheduled after each long observation.
- Each teacher must have two (2) observations as part of formative evaluations that shall take place at reasonable intervals to ensure that teachers have the opportunity to demonstrate growth prior to a summative evaluation.
 - All educators must initially have a minimum of two (2) extended observations – at least one per semester and will remain in that mode unless rated as Highly Effective or Effective.
 - All educators rated as Highly Effective or Effective for at least two years consecutively must have a minimum of **one** extended observation per year and 1 short observation per year.
 - All educators rated as Highly Effective for at least three years consecutively must have a minimum of two short observations per year.
 - An extended observation lasts a minimum of 30 minutes. It can be unannounced. It may take place over one class or span two consecutive class periods.
 - A short observation, also known as a walk-through, lasts a minimum of 5 minutes and not longer than 30 minutes and should not be announced. There are no conferencing requirements around short observations, but a post-observation conference should be scheduled if there are areas of concern. An educator must receive timely written feedback following a short observation not more than 5 working days following the walk-through. This feedback may be in electronic format.
 - Additional observations both short and long, will be conducted at the evaluators' discretion.
 - Both extended and short observations are times for evaluators to collect information. Summative rating will be an average of all the observations. There will be no summative rating assigned until all information is collected and analyzed at the end of the year. However, all evaluators are expected to provide specific and meaningful feedback on performance following all observations. This feedback may be in writing and/or a meeting requested by the teacher or administrator.

Rigorous Measures of Effectiveness and Student Learning

Many parents' main question over the course of a school year is: "How much is my child learning?" Student learning is the ultimate measure of the success of a teacher, instructional leader, school, or district. To meaningfully assess the performance of an educator or a school, one must examine the growth and achievement of their students, using multiple measures aligned to learning standards.

<p><u>Achievement</u> is defined as meeting a uniform and predetermined level of mastery on subject or grade level standards.</p> <p><u>Achievement</u> is a set point or “bar” that is the same for all students, regardless of where they begin.</p>	<p><u>Growth</u> is defined as improving skills required to achieve mastery on a subject or grade level standard over a period of time.</p> <p><u>Growth</u> differentiates mastery expectations based upon baseline performance.</p>
--	---

There are multiple ways of assessing both growth and achievement. When looking at available data sources to measure student learning, we must use measurements that:

- Are accurate in assessing student learning and teacher impact on student learning
- Provide valuable and timely data to drive instruction in classrooms
- Are fair to teachers in different grades and subjects
- Are as consistent as possible across grades and subjects
- Allow flexibility for districts, schools, and teachers to make key decisions surrounding the best assessments for their students.

Multiple measures of teacher effectiveness in student learning may include the following:

- Homework/Test scores of students (both formative and summative) measuring mastery towards standards reflected in the gradebook and local assessments.
- Classroom presentation observations.
- Observation of student-teacher interaction.
- Teacher knowledge of subject matter and alignment to standards.
- Dedication and effectiveness of the teacher through time and effort on task.
- Contributions of teachers through group teacher interactivity in fulfilling the school improvement plan.
- Other items considered important by the school corporation in developing each student to the student's maximum intellectual potential and performance.

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 reasonably 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 reasonably 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 reasonably 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 locally selected competencies reasonably 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

In reviewing the current research during the development of the teacher effectiveness rubric, the goal was not to create a teacher evaluation tool that would try to be all things to all people.

Rather, the rubric focuses on evaluating teachers' primary responsibility: engaging students in rigorous academic content so that students learn and achieve. As such, the rubric focuses on

evaluating the effectiveness of instruction, specifically through observable actions in the classroom. The Focused Teacher Evaluation Model (FTEM) was created with classroom educators in mind and may not always be appropriate to use to evaluate school personnel who do not directly teach students, such as instructional coaches, counselors, etc. Though certain components of the Focused Teacher Evaluation Model (FTEM) can be easily applied to individuals in support positions, it is ultimately a corporation's decision whether or not to modify the Rubric or adapt a different evaluation system for these roles.

Every teacher is unique, and the classroom is a complex place. Effective evaluation relies on multiple sources of information to paint a fair, accurate, and comprehensive picture of a teacher's performance. All teachers will be evaluated on the following two major components and asked to develop educator goal(s):

1. **Professional Practice** – Assessment of instructional knowledge and skills that influence student learning, as measured by competencies set forth in the FTEM Rubric. All teachers will be evaluated in the domains of Standard- Based Planning, Standard-Based Instruction/Conditions for Learning, and Professional Responsibilities. (This is reflected in the summative evaluation score at 80%.

2. **Student Learning** – Teachers' contribution to student academic progress, assessed through multiple measures of student academic achievement and growth, looking at Rigorous Measures of Effectiveness reflected in the FTEM Rubric and local measures of student growth. Teachers must demonstrate how they examine the growth and achievement of their students, using multiple measures aligned to learning standards. This is reflected in the summative evaluation score at 10%.

3. **Educator Development of Goals** - Having individual goals facilitate educator development and improve professionalism, instruction, and/or student outcomes. Each educator will have goals pertaining to their individual professional focus that includes a school wide focus. The Goals will be established in the Fall and scored in the Spring. These Goals are agreed upon by the teacher and the evaluator. The Goals should be written in a S.M.A.R.T. format with a rating (1-4) scale to score with the evaluator. This is reflected in the summative evaluation score at 10%.

FTEM : Background and Context

The FTEM Rubric was developed for four key purposes:

1. To shine a spotlight on great teaching: The rubric is designed to assist principals in their efforts to increase teacher effectiveness, recognize teaching quality, and ensure that

all students have access to great teachers.

2. To provide clear expectations for teachers: The rubric defines and prioritizes the actions that effective teachers use to make gains in student achievement.

3. To support a fair and transparent evaluation of effectiveness: The rubric provides the foundation for accurately assessing teacher effectiveness along four discrete ratings.

4. To provide targeted support, assistance, professional development opportunities or resource allocation for struggling educators. It is recognized that all educators value feedback and strive to improve. However, educators rated as Ineffective and/or Needs Improvement will receive more attention from evaluators.

FTEM Rubric: Overview of Annually Measuring Professional Practice

Domain 1: Standards-Based Planning

1.1 Utilize and track Student Assessment Data to close the achievement gap

1.2 Set Ambitious and Measurable Achievement Goals in Lessons and Units

1.3. Develop Lessons and Assessments by Aligning Resources to Standard(s)

Domain 2: Standard Based Instruction/Conditions for Learning

2.1 Develop Student Understanding and Mastery of Lesson Objectives by Identifying Critical Content from the Standards

2.2 Demonstrate and Clearly Communicate New Content Knowledge

2.3 Engage Students in Academic Content by Helping Students Process New Content

2.4 Check for Understanding using Questions to Help Students Elaborate on Content

2.5 Modify Instruction as Needed by Reviewing the Content

2.6 Develop Higher Level of Understanding Through Practicing Skills, Strategies, and Processes; Examining Similarities and Differences/Reasoning; and Revising Knowledge

2.7 Maximize Instructional Time by Organizing Students to Interact with Content; Using Formative Assessments to Track Student Progress, and Providing Feedback and Celebrating Student Progress routinely.

2.8 Create Classroom Culture of Respect and Collaboration by Establishing and Acknowledging Adherence to Rules and Procedures; Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships in a Student-Centered Classroom; and Using Engagement Strategies.

2.9 Set and Communicate High Expectations for Academic Success for Each Student to Close the Achievement Gap.

Domain 3: Leadership

- 3.1 Contribute to School Culture by promoting Teacher Leadership*
- 3.2 Collaborate with Peers*
- 3.3 Seek Professional Skills and Knowledge maintain expertise in content and Pedagogy*
- 3.4 Advocate for Student Success*
- 3.5 Engage Families in Student Learning*

In addition to these three primary domains, the iObservation™ Rubric measures Professional Responsibilities.

Professional Responsibilities, which reflects the non-negotiable aspects of a teacher’s job. This domain represents non-negotiable aspects of the teaching profession, such as on-time arrival to school and respect for colleagues. This domain only has two rating levels: Does Not Meet Standard and Meets Standard. The evaluator uses available information and professional judgment to decide if a teacher has not met the standards for any of the five indicators:

- Attendance & On-Time Arrival
- Adhering to School and District Policies and Procedures
- Respect
- Maintaining Expertise in Content and Pedagogy
- Promoting Teacher Leadership and Collaboration

Information from the three primary domains will be used to complete the FTEM rubric following each evaluation. The evaluation shall be completed within 5 school days following an observation. Evidence from the observation, professional judgment, and information collected from the teacher evidence sheets will be used to complete each evaluation.

Note: To ensure that all evidence is included in an evaluation, teacher evidence sheets should be completed no later than 48 hours after an observation.

Role of Professional Judgment

Assessing a teacher’s professional practice requires evaluators to constantly use their professional judgment. No observation rubric, however detailed, can capture all of the nuances in how teachers interact with students, and synthesizing multiple sources of information into a final rating on a particular professional competency is inherently more complex than checklists or numerical averages. Accordingly, the iObservation™ Rubric provides a comprehensive framework for observing teachers’ instructional practice that helps evaluators synthesize what they see in the classroom, while simultaneously encouraging evaluators to consider all information collected holistically.

Evaluators must use professional judgment when assigning a teacher a rating for each competency as well as when combining all competency ratings into a single, overall domain score. Using professional judgment, evaluators should consider the ways and extent to which teachers’ practice grew over the year, teachers’ responses to feedback, how teachers adapted their practice to their current students, and the many other appropriate factors that cannot be directly accounted for in the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric before settling on a final rating. In short, evaluators’ professional judgment bridges the best practices codified in the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric and the specific context of a teacher’s school and students.

Summative Evaluation Results

Summative Conference: A conference where the primary evaluator and teacher discuss performance from throughout the year leading to a summative rating. This may occur in the spring if all data is available for scoring (coinciding with the End-of-Year Conference), or in the fall if pertinent data isn’t available until the summer (coinciding with the Beginning-of-Year Conference).

Summative Rating: The final summative rating is a combination of a teacher’s scores in the FTEM Rubric (Domain 1, 2,3 and professional responsibilities), Student Learning and their Goals. The results of the final Summative Rating will be given to the teacher within 7 days of determining the final score. The points correspond to the four summative ratings: Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Ineffective.

Domain 1-3: Ratings (EXAMPLE)

Rubric	Rating (1-4)	Weight	Weighted Rating
Domain 1: Planning	3.5	10%	0.35
Domain 2: Instruction	3.25	65%	2.11
Domain 3: Leadership	3	5%	0.15
Rubric Final Score			2.995

Student learning	3	10%	0.3
Goal	3	10%	0.3
Final Score			3.21

Professional Responsibilities: Does Not Meet (-1) Meets (0)
EXAMPLE 2.21 3.21

In the above example if the teacher met professionalism then the Final Score equals 3.21.

Teacher Evaluation Metrics

Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective	
1.0	1.75	2.5	3.5	4

Note: Borderline points round up

Scoring Requirement: 1 is the lowest score a teacher can receive in the evaluation system. If, after deducting a point from the teacher's final FTEM 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.

Teacher Remediation 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. The Professional Development Plan form is an optional form that can be used.

Ineffective Rating Conference Request

Any teacher who received a rating of Ineffective may request a private conference with the superintendent not later than 5 days after receiving notice that the teacher received the ineffective rating. The teacher may request this meeting either in writing or orally by contacting the superintendent.

Ineffective Teachers Two Consecutive Years

Culver Community Schools Corporation will work to keep students from being taught by ineffective teachers for two consecutive years. If this situation is unavoidable, the corporation will notify the parents of students involved that they are being taught by ineffective teachers for two consecutive years. This notification will be by letter. This rule pertains to teachers of core subject areas.

Teachers determined to have Negative Impact on Student Learning

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.

For classes that are not measured by statewide assessments, negative impact is determined by the teacher failing to meet the rigorous measures of effectiveness and student learning component of this plan. Negative impact is demonstrated by a significant number of students across a teacher's classes failing to demonstrate student learning or mastery of standards established by the state. This can be reflected in the teacher's gradebook, lesson plans, and/or analysis of student achievement on local assessments.

Teachers identified as having a negative impact will be Improvement Necessary and placed on an improvement plan.

Glossary of Terms

Achievement: Defined as meeting a uniform and predetermined level of mastery on subject or grade level standards. Achievement is a set point or "bar" that is the same for all students, regardless of where they begin.

Beginning-of-Year Conference: A conference in the fall during which a teacher and primary evaluator discuss the teacher's prior year performance, Professional Goals and Professional Development Plan (if applicable). A timeline for evaluation may be established at this time for the Pre-Conference and Post-Conference. In some cases, this conference may double as the "Summative Conference" as well.

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

Competency: There are forty-three competencies, or skills of an effective teacher, in the Culver Community Schools' FTEM Rubric. These competencies are split between the three/four domains. Each competency has a list of observable indicators for evaluators to look for during an observation.

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
 - 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

Corporation-Wide Assessment: A common assessment given to all schools in the corporation. This assessment may have either been created by teachers within the corporation or purchased from an assessment vendor. This may also be an optional state assessment that the corporation chooses to administer corporation-wide (ex. NWEA or approved local assessment).

Domain: Broad areas of instructional focus, included in the FTEM Rubric and summative score.

Effectiveness Rubric: Planning, Instruction, Learning, Leadership, Core Professionalism, and Goals. Under each domain, competencies describe the essential skills of effective instruction.

End-of-Course Assessment: An assessment given at the end of the course to measure mastery in a given content area. The state currently offers end-of-course assessments in Algebra I, English 10, and Biology I. However, many districts and schools have end-of-course assessments that they have created on their own.

End-of-Year Conference: A conference in the spring during which the teacher and evaluator discuss the teacher's performance on the iObservation™ Rubric. In some cases, this conference may double as the "Summative Conference" as well.

Evaluators: All evaluators will be Culver Community Schools Corporation administrators who have been trained in FTEM and through the DOE on evaluation.

Extended Observation: An observation lasting a minimum of 30 minutes. Extended observations can be announced or unannounced, and are accompanied by optional pre-conferences and

mandatory post-conferences including written feedback within five school days of the observation.

Growth: Improving skills required to achieve mastery on a subject or grade-level standard over a period of time. Growth differentiates mastery expectations based on baseline performance.

Focused Teacher Evaluation Model Rubric (FTEM): The FTEM Rubric was written by Learning Science International in conjunction with the Marzano Center.

Indicator: These are observable pieces of information for evaluators to look for during an observation. Indicators are listed under each competency in the FTEM Rubric.

Mid-Year Conference: An optional conference in the middle of the year in which the primary evaluator and teacher meet to discuss performance thus far.

Negative Impact: Negative impact on student learning shall be defined as follows:

(1) 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.

(2) 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 fails to demonstrate student learning or mastery of standards established by the state.

Post-Conference: A conference that takes place after an observation for one of the following reasons: Administrator request, Teacher request, Overall average score in any one domain totals improvement necessary or ineffective, Teacher receives a score of "1" on any of the individual competencies.

Pre-Conference: An planning conference that takes place before an extended (Long) observation during which the evaluator and teacher discuss important elements of the lesson or class that might be relevant to the observation.

Primary Evaluator: The person chiefly responsible for evaluating a teacher. This evaluator approves Professional Development Plans (when applicable) in the fall and assigns the summative rating in the spring. Each teacher has only one primary evaluator.

Professional Development Goals: These goals, identified through self-assessment and reviewing prior evaluation data, are the focus of the teacher's Professional Development Plan over the

course of the year. Each goal will be scored on a 1-4 point scale. S.M.A.R.T

Professional Development Plan: The individualized plan for educator professional development based on prior performance. Each plan consists of Professional Development Goals and clear action steps for how each goal will be met. The only teachers who must have a Professional Development Plan are those who received a rating of Improvement Necessary or Ineffective the previous year.

Professional Judgment: A primary evaluator's ability to look at information gathered and make an informed decision on a teacher's performance without a set calculation in place. Primary evaluators will be trained on using professional judgment to make decisions.

Professional Practice: Professional Practice is the first of two major components of the summative evaluation score (the other is Student Learning). This component consists of information gathered through observations using the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric and conferences during which evaluators and teachers may review additional materials.

School-Wide Assessment: A school-wide assessment is common to one school, but not given across schools. It is usually created by a team of teachers within the school, but may have been purchased from an outside vendor. It is administered to all students in a given grade or subject. For an assessment to be considered school-wide, it must be given by more than one teacher.

Secondary Evaluator: An evaluator whose observations, feedback, and information gathering informs the work of a primary evaluator.

Short Observation: An unannounced observation lasting a minimum of 10 minutes. There are no conferencing requirements for short observations. Feedback in writing must be delivered within two school days.

Statewide Assessment: A statewide assessment refers to any mandatory assessment offered by the state.

Student Learning: Student Learning is the second major component of the summative evaluation score (the first is Professional Practice). Student Learning is reflected in student achievement and growth measures aligned to lesson objectives and their mastery. These elements of student learning are weighted differently depending on the mix of classes a teacher teaches.

Summative Conference: A conference where the primary evaluator and teacher discuss performance from throughout the year leading to a summative rating. This may occur in the

spring if all data is available for scoring (coinciding with the End-of-Year Conference), or in the fall if pertinent data isn't available until the summer (coinciding with the Beginning-of-Year Conference).

Summative Rating: The final summative rating is a combination of a teacher's Professional Practice rating and the measures of Student Learning. The results of the final Summative Rating will be given to the teacher within 7 days of determining the score. These elements of the summative rating are weighted differently depending on the mix of classes a teacher teaches. The final score is mapped on to a point scale. The points correspond to the four summative ratings: Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Ineffective.

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.

Teacher-Created Assessment: A teacher-created assessment is an individual exam developed and administered by an individual teacher. Please note that a teacher-created assessment does not refer to an assessment created by and administered by groups of teachers (see school-wide assessment).

Appendix-B

Teacher Appreciation Grant Policy

The School Board shall adopt an annual policy concerning the distribution of teacher appreciation grants. This policy shall be submitted to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) along with the School Corporation's staff performance evaluation plan online as one (1) document by September 15th of each year.

Policy 3220.01

Appendix-C Scoring Summaries

Culver Community Schools Teacher Evaluation Summary

CCSC Teacher Effectiveness: This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the FTEM Rubric (90%) and 10% Educator Development Goals score. The Core Professionalism will deduct the score by -1 if the teacher doesn't meet professional expectations.

SCALE:

Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective	
1.0 Point	1.75 Points	2.5 Points	3.5 Points	4.0 Points
(Borderline points always round up)				

Teacher Signature _____
Date

Supervisor Signature _____
Date

Ratings have been discussed between supervisor and teacher. Signature indicates that the rating and evaluation has been shared and discussed, but does not necessarily indicate agreement.

Culver Community Schools Counselor Evaluation Summary

Professional School Counselor Effectiveness Rubric (90%) and Goals (10%). The Core Professionalism will deduct the score by -1 if the counselor doesn't meet professional expectations.

SCALE:

Ineffective	Improvement Necessary	Effective	Highly Effective
-------------	--------------------------	-----------	---------------------

1.0 Point	1.75 Points	2.5 Points	3.5 Points	4.0 Points
--------------	----------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

(Borderline points always round up)

Counselor Signature	Date
---------------------	------

Supervisor Signature	Date
----------------------	------

Ratings have been discussed between supervisor and counselor. Signature indicates that the rating and evaluation has been shared and discussed, but does not necessarily indicate agreement.

Culver Community Schools

Assistant Principal Evaluation Metrics

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL RUBRIC (90%) and Goals (10%):

Indiana Assistant Principal Effectiveness: The Core Professionalism will deduct the score by -1 if the Assistant Principal doesn't meet professional expectations.

Indiana Assistant Principal Rubric

SCALE:

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

(Borderline points always round up)

Employee Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Administrator Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Ratings have been discussed between administrator and assistant principal. Signature indicates that the rating and evaluation has been shared and discussed, but does not necessarily indicate agreement.

Culver Community Schools Principal Evaluation Metrics

PRINCIPAL RUBRIC (90%) and Goals (10%):

Indiana Principal Effectiveness Rubric:

The Core Professionalism will deduct the score by -1 if the Principal doesn't meet professional expectations.

SCALE:

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

(Borderline points always round up)

Employee Signature: _____

Date: _____

Administrator Signature: _____

Date: _____

Ratings have been discussed between superintendent and principal. Signature indicates that the rating and evaluation has been shared and discussed, but does not necessarily indicate agreement.

Culver Community Schools Superintendent Evaluation Metrics

SUPERINTENDENT RUBRIC (90%) and Goals (10%):

ISBA Superintendent Effectiveness Rubric

SCALE:

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

4.0
Points

(Borderline points always round up)

Employee Signature: _____

Date: _____

Administrator Signature: _____

Date: _____

Ratings have been discussed between the school board and superintendent. Signature indicates that the rating and evaluation has been shared and discussed, but does not necessarily indicate agreement.