
TIPTON COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORPORATION
MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of School Trustees

FROM: Kevin Emsweller, Superintendent

DATE: 07/18-2018

RE: **Teacher Evaluations**

The principals completed the evaluations of the certified staff at the end of the year, pending the ISTEP results that will be part of their summative evaluations.

At this time, for the 2017-2018 school year, a break-down of the ratings given to teachers, by building are:

	n=	HE #	HE %	E #	E %	NI #	NI %
Elementary	38	36	95%	2	5%	0	0%
Middle School	28	14	50%	14	50%	0	0%
High School	35	20	57%	15	43%	0	0%
Totals	101	70	69%	31	31%	0	0%

With a total of 101 teachers, 69% of TCSC teachers were rated as Highly Effective and 31% were rated as Effective this past year.

While we continue to work on consistency, more work needs to be done. In previous years, we have used “group observations” and videos to continue to provide ongoing training to principals on conducting observations. We’ve had, Tami Hicks, WVEC, “shadowed” each principal as they conducted an observation one year. Mr. Junco and I did shadow observations this year with each principal.

Having 69% of our staff rated as Highly Effective may be disproportionate, especially when looking at the elementary. TCSC is blessed with many outstanding, dedicated teachers. However, looking at the rubric used, it would be difficult for many good teachers to achieve an overall 3.5 - 4, or high effective, in all categories.

I have a continued concern at the elementary with the number of Highly Effective ratings being given. That will be one of my focus for the upcoming year – working with Miss Heaston and Mrs. Rayl to either 1) be more authentic in providing feedback, or 2) validate how they are currently rating teachers.

The overlying purpose of the evaluation plan is to provide feedback to teachers to help them improve and be the best professionals possible. This is something I discussed with individual principals as I met with them at the end of the year. What type of feedback do we provide to teachers? What are areas of improvement that we give them? From those discussions, and as I expected, this is something we are weak in and will work on during next year.

The Certified Personnel Appraisal Plan can be found on the TCSC web site – under Faculty, then Certified Appraisal Plan. A copy of the Executive Summary is attached.

Executive Summary

Teacher evaluations will be based on evidence collected in two areas: Professional Practice and Student Learning. In each area, the data collected is quantified into a 1 to 4 point scale with weights being given to each category within an area, and sometimes, where noted, within a category.

For the Professional Practice, a rubric will be used in assigning a value. This will be 70% of the overall evaluation. At least one extended classroom observation (at least 40 minutes) will be conducted before December 1, with a focus on Domain 2. Other observations composed of **ELEOT Observations (20 minutes in length)** -will be conducted with at least one done per **semester**. At least one additional extended observation will be conducted with probationary teachers, or those who receive a “Needs Improvement” or “Ineffective” rating on the first semester observations.

For evaluation purpose, teachers are divided into two groups: Group 1 is those teachers that will have Individual Growth Model (IGM) data (i.e. ISTEP+ scores) in grades 4 through 8 in mathematics or language arts. Group 2 is those teachers that do not have IGM data. This distinction is noted in the weights given in the Student Learning portion of the evaluation.

Professional Practice		Group 1	Group 2
Teacher Evaluation Rubric (TER)	Domain 1: Planning (10%) Domain 2: Instruction (75%) Domain 3: Leadership (15%) Domain 4: Core Professionalism	70%	70%

Student Learning		Group 1	Group 2
Individual Growth Model (IGM)	The IGM indicates a student’s academic progress over the course of a year based on the student’s ISTEP+ scores.	15%	N/A
School Wide Learning (SWL)	It is important for teachers to have a common mission of improving student achievement, all teachers will have a component of their evaluation score tied to school-wide student learning by aligning with Indiana’s new A – F accountability model.	5%	5%
Student Learning Objectives (SLO)	Teachers will select one (1) SLO based on a classroom objective.	10%	25%

All data will be quantified into a 4 point rating scale for the teacher.

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

Note: Borderline points always round up.