

Pike County School Corporation

211 South 12th Street

Petersburg, Indiana 47567

Evaluation Plan

2017-2018

Mission

The Mission of the Pike County School Corporation is to provide all students with a quality education that encourages them to become successful citizens.

Purpose

The purpose of the professional growth and evaluation model adopted by the Pike County School Corporation is to ensure quality instruction for all of our students and to foster growth and reflection among our teaching staff. The process is designed to support teachers and administrators as they work to provide quality instruction and educational experiences for our students.

It is the responsibility of our teaching staff to continually work toward improvement in instruction and the responsibility of our administrators to support and assist the teaching staff in that work. Professional growth is an ongoing process which includes collaboration with colleagues, goal setting, self-evaluation, and reflection.

Teachers Serving in Multiple Buildings

Principals in buildings sharing a teacher will determine the primary and secondary evaluator.

Training for Staff Responsible for Evaluation

Administrators responsible for conducting staff evaluations will attend the 4-part RISE training sponsored by the Indiana Department of Education for corporations using the RISE model. Ongoing training and support in evaluation skills will be provided so that administrators will have a clear sense of the competencies measured in each domain. Areas of training will include the following: observation skills, artifact and document analysis, conferencing and mentoring skills, professional growth plan development, and feedback skills. This training will be ongoing and will occur annually. Training will incorporate procedures needed to ensure validity, reliability, and consistency in collecting and using evidence to promote teacher growth. Principals will serve as primary and/or secondary evaluators for all certificated employees within their respective buildings. The superintendent will be the primary evaluator for all principals.

Understanding the Teacher Evaluation Plan

Training will take place with all certified staff. Teachers who are newly employed by the district will be provided the same training at either the building level or the corporation level. Documents necessary for the implementation of the evaluation process will be provided to new staff to ensure that they have a clear understanding of the process during that induction period.

Teacher Long-term Absence and RISE

Teachers may experience long-term absences due to extenuating circumstances during the school year. Teachers must be present in the classroom for 120 of the 180 student days during any given school year. If a teacher must be absent more than 60 days in a year, a summative rating will be based upon the measures that are available. A teacher in this situation will not receive a raise in pay based on the increment (years of teaching experience) factor. The teacher may receive an increase in pay if he/she is rated as effective or highly effective using the measures available.

If a teacher is absent the equivalent of an entire semester or more, the teacher's evaluation will be termed as "incomplete" and completed during the next school year. Teachers in this circumstance will not be considered for any increase in pay for the subsequent year after the absences.

Observations and conferences occur frequently throughout the school year.

Every teacher in the corporation will receive a minimum of one (1) planned, extended (minimum 40 minutes) classroom observation and one (1) unplanned, short (minimum of 10 minutes) classroom observation. Administration reserves the right to observe teachers more often if deemed necessary or if a teacher has been evaluated as needs improvement or ineffective. Teachers may also request additional observations. A teacher must receive written feedback following an observation. Feedback from a short observation must be provided within three (3) school days. Feedback from an extended observation must be provided within seven (7) school days.

Administrators may choose to visit classrooms much more frequently than the minimum requirement specified. A short observation, or "walk through", may be announced or unannounced. There are no conferencing requirements walk through, but a post-observation conference may be scheduled at the request of the evaluator or teacher.

An extended observation lasts a minimum of 40 minutes and may take place over one class or span two consecutive class periods. Pre-observation conferences are not mandatory unless the teacher or principal request it.

Approved by PCSC Board July 2017

Prior to the end of the school year, the administrator will look at information collected throughout the year and determine the summative rating. An end-of-year conference will be held with the teacher to discuss this final rating. The summative rating will be used to help determine the overall Performance Level Rating for the teacher. Following the collection of all observation data, the principal will score the Teacher Evaluation Rubric (TER). Point values for each indicator are based on a four point scale.

Highly Effective	3.5 – 4.0 Points
Effective	2.5 – 3.4 Points
Improvement Necessary	1.5 – 2.5 Points
Ineffective	0 – 1.4 Points

All teachers will be evaluated based on two major components:

Professional Practice - Assessment of instructional knowledge and skills that impact student learning, as measured by competencies set forth in the RISE Teacher Evaluation Rubric. All teachers will be evaluated in the domains of Purposeful Planning, Effective Instruction, Teacher Leadership, and Core Professionalism (Component 1).

Student Learning - Educator's contribution to student academic progress, assessed through multiple measures of student academic achievement and growth, including school-wide learning data as well as progress toward specific student learning objectives using state, district, or school-wide assessments (Component 2).

Point values will be totaled and averaged within each domain. Established weights for each domain will then be applied.

Domain 1: Purposeful Planning	10 percent
Domain 2: Effective Instruction	80 percent
Domain 3: Teacher Leadership	10 percent
Domain 4: Core Professionalism	Not meeting = 1 pt. Deduction

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 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 IDOE.

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 IDOE.

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 IDOE.

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 IDOE.

Teacher Status

All certified staff, defined by state law as a teacher, will be evaluated on a yearly basis.

Established

All teachers under contract in the Pike County School Corporation will begin the 2012-2013 school year as an established teacher.

Professional

Probationary teachers EARN professional status through a pattern of effectiveness (3 effective or highly effective ratings in any 5-year period).

Probationary

Teachers hired on or after July 1, 2012, have probationary status.

Changes in Professional Status Based on Performance Level Ratings

One ineffective or two consecutive improvement necessary ratings can lead to dismissal of a probationary teacher.

Professional status is lost with one ineffective rating. These teachers move to probationary status.

A contract with an established teacher may be cancelled if the teacher receives two consecutive ineffective ratings or if the teacher receives an ineffective or improvement necessary rating in three years of any five year period.

Table Relating Performance to Status Change

	Probationary	Professional	Established
Highly Effective	When rated <i>highly effective</i> or <i>effective</i> for three or five years, teacher will move to <i>professional</i> .	Remains at the <i>professional</i> level.	Remains at the <i>established</i> level.
Effective	When rated <i>highly effective</i> or <i>effective</i> for three of five years, teacher will move to <i>professional</i> .	Remains at the <i>professional</i> level.	Remains at the <i>established</i> level.
Improvement Necessary	Two consecutive may lead to dismissal	Remains at the <i>professional</i> level. Any combination of three <i>improvement necessary</i> or <i>ineffective</i> ratings within five years may lead to dismissal for incompetence.	Remains at the <i>established</i> level. Any combination of three <i>improvement necessary</i> or <i>ineffective</i> ratings within five years may lead to dismissal for incompetence
Ineffective	May be dismissed.	Moves back to <i>probationary</i> after one ineffective rating.	Remains at the <i>established</i> level. Any combination of three <i>improvement necessary</i> or <i>ineffective</i> ratings within five years may lead to dismissal. (Two consecutive ineffective ratings may also lead to dismissal.)

Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric: Overview

The PCSC Teacher Evaluation Rubric follows the RISE scoring rubric, consisting of three domains and corresponding subsections as follows:

Domain 1: Purposeful Planning

- 1.1 Utilize Assessment Data to Plan
- 1.2 Set Rigorous and Measurable Achievement Goals
- 1.3 Develop Standards-Based Plans and Assessments
- 1.4 Create Objective-Driven Lesson Plans and Assessments
- 1.5 Track Student Data and Analyze Progress

Domain 2: Effective Instruction

- 2.1 Develop Student Understanding and Mastery of Lesson Objectives
- 2.2 Demonstrate and Clearly Communicate Content Knowledge to Students
- 2.3 Engage Students in Academic Content
- 2.4 Check for Understanding
- 2.5 Modify Instruction as Needed
- 2.6 Develop Higher Level of Understanding through Rigorous Instruction and Work
- 2.7 Maximize Instructional Time
- 2.8 Create Classroom Culture of Respect and Collaboration
- 2.9 Set High Expectations for Academic Success

Domain 3: Professional Responsibilities

- 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

In addition to these three primary domains, the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric contains a fourth domain, referred to as Core Professionalism, which reflects the non-negotiable aspects of a teacher's job.

The Core Professionalism domain has four criteria:

- Attendance
- On-Time Arrival
- Policies and Procedures
- Respect

The PCSC teachers' presence in the classroom is essential to student academic achievement and growth. The teacher's rating for attendance will be based on the following chart:

Approved by PCSC Board July 2017

Indicator	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard
Attendance*	Individual has demonstrated a pattern of unexcused absences*	Individual has not demonstrated a pattern of unexcused absences*
On Time Arrival	Individual demonstrates a pattern of unexcused late arrivals (late arrivals that are in violation of procedures set forth by local school policy and by the relevant collective bargaining agreement)	Individual has not demonstrated a pattern of unexcused late arrivals (late arrivals that are in violation of procedures set forth by local school policy and by the relevant collective bargaining agreement)
Policies and Procedures	Individual demonstrates a pattern of failing to follow state, corporation, and school policies and procedures (e.g. procedures for submitting discipline referrals, policies for appropriate attire, etc.)	Individual demonstrates a pattern of following state, corporation, and school policies and procedures (e.g. procedures for submitting discipline referrals, policies for appropriate attire, etc.)
Respect	Individual demonstrates a pattern of failing to interact with students, colleagues, parents/guardians, and community members in a respectful manner	Individual demonstrates a pattern of interacting with students, colleagues, parents/guardians, and community members in a respectful manner

These indicators illustrate the minimum competencies expected in any profession. These are separate from the other sections in the rubric because they have little to do with teaching and learning and more to do with basic employment practice. Teachers are expected to meet these standards. If they do not, it will affect their overall rating negatively. **Teachers who do not meet these standards lose 1 point from their Teacher Evaluation Rubric level rating.** Administrators will notify teachers prior to the end-of-year meeting if they are at risk of losing 1 point. At least two of the categories noted above must be marked “does not meet standard” before a point can be deducted.

**Unexcused absence is an absence in violation of the agreed upon contract list of leaves and/or failure to appear.*

A total score for the Teacher Evaluation Rubric is then determined by multiplying the domain score by the assigned weight. Then, the sum of the weighted ratings becomes the final score for the teacher evaluation rubric.

Student Learning

According to IC 20-28-11.5, all teacher evaluation models must include three key components:

Be annual: Every teacher, regardless of experience, deserves meaningful feedback on his or her performance on an annual basis. All certificated staff at PCSC will be evaluated each year.

Include Four Rating Categories: To retain our best teachers and principals, we need a process that can fully 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.

Include Student Growth Data: Evaluations should be student-focused. First and foremost, an effective teacher helps students make academic progress. A thorough evaluation system includes multiple measures of teacher performance and growth data.

The measurement of student learning for the teacher performance level rating will be based on student growth, rather than basic achievement. As explained by the IDOE, “Achievement is defined as meeting a uniform and pre-determined level of mastery on subject or grade level standards. Growth is defined as improving skills required to achieve mastery on a subject or grade level standard over a period of time.” These measures will vary according to student level and subject.

As a part of the teacher performance level rating, student learning will be represented by school/district-wide learning and student classroom performance. School/district-wide learning growth scores will be based on AYP, state report card status, and standardized testing.

School/District-Wide Rating

Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
“A” Rating	“B” Rating	“C” Rating	“D” or “F” Rating

Review of Components

Each teacher's summative evaluation score will be based on the following components and measures:

1) Professional Practice – Assessment of Instructional Knowledge & Skills
Measure: Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER)
2) Student Learning – Contribution to Student Academic Progress
Measure: Individual Growth Model (IGM) <u>OR</u> Student Data Measure (SDM)
Measure: School-Wide Learning Measure (SWL)

*** IGM measure only applies to teachers of grades 4 through 8 who teach ELA or math.**

The method for scoring each measure individually has been explained in the sections above. This section will detail the process for combining all measures into a final, summative score. The School-wide Learning Measure is determined based upon the school's current grade as defined by the IDOE. If a teacher teaches at more than one building, the school's score that the teacher spends the majority of his/her day shall be used. If a teacher spends equal time in more than one building, the school's scores will be averaged. The following scale shall determine the amount of points awarded:


- A = 4
- B = 3
- C = 2
- D = 1
- F = 0

Information for Student Data Measure (SDM) will be obtained from an approved assessment. The teacher and evaluator will identify a score that determines content mastery and document the starting points of the students in the class. Possible assessments may include a standardized test, an end-of-course exam or final exam, or other reliable measure. The same measure will be used for all teachers of specific course or grade level as appropriate. If IGM data was used, this measure only applies to teachers of grades 4 through 8 who teach ELA or math. The method for scoring this measure would come from the IDOE. **This growth model data score must be included in the teacher summative score.**

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 two percentage groups:

- I. 80% Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER) – Observations
15% Student Growth Data (SGD) – District-approved assessment
5% School-wide Learning Measure Data (SWL) – DOE A-F rating by building
100% Summative Teacher Evaluation Score



- II. 80% Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER) – Observations
15% Individual Growth Model data (IGM)* – DOE data
5% School-wide Learning Measure Data (SWL) – DOE A-F rating by building
100% Summative Teacher Evaluation Score

**If Individual Growth Model data is not made available from the IDOE, all PCSC teacher evaluation scores will be calculated using Model 1.*



Once the weights are applied appropriately, an evaluator will have a final decimal number.

Component	Raw Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Teacher Effectiveness Rubric			
Individual Growth Model <u>or</u> Student Growth Data			
School-Wide Learning Measure			
Sum of the Weighted Scores			

*To get the final weighted score, simply sum the weighted scores from each component. This final weighted score is then translated into a rating on the following scale.

Point Value of Final Performance Score			
Highly Effective	Effective	Improvement Necessary	Ineffective
4 -----3.5	3.49 – 2.5	2.49----- 1.50	1.49 – 1.0

Professional Growth Plan & Professional Development

Feedback to all teachers will be immediate. Teachers with a “Needs Improvement” or an “Ineffective” summative rating or those in danger of receiving a “Needs Improvement” or an “Ineffective” rating will work with the principal to develop a personal Professional Growth Plan. Positive growth will be expected in no more than a 90-day period following the implementation of this plan. Professional Development will be tailored to the needed areas of improvement as stated in the teachers Professional Growth Plan. The Professional Growth and Development plans will be used as a requirement for license renewal for those teachers scoring “Needs Improvement” or “Ineffective.”

Professional Development will be available to all teachers. Professional Development will be determined by each teacher’s area(s) of need.

New and/or struggling teachers will have the opportunity for additional observations, mentoring by teachers determined to be effective or highly effective, and increased professional development to address their area(s) of need.

Evaluation of All Certificated Staff

All teachers and certificated staff will be evaluated annually. Certificated employees who teach individual children and do not teach in an entire class setting (e.g. speech pathologist, special education resource teachers, counselors, librarians) will create two targeted objectives instead of one class objective and one targeted objective. Specialized rubrics created by professional organizations representing each of these groups will be used to determine highly effective, effective, needs improvement, and ineffective in their professional practice. Pike County School Corporation has adopted the Indiana School Counselor’s Association (ISCA) model for school counselors in grades K-12 and the AISLE rubric for school librarians., The school’s A-F grade will also contribute 5% to their final summative rating. Targeted objectives will be based on student achievement results as assessed on mandatory statewide or end-of-course teacher-created assessments.

Fairness, Consistency, and Objectivity of System

Administrators will continually monitor the effectiveness of instruction as related to student achievement scores. Student achievement data will be compared to each teacher’s summative rating and the overall A to F determination for each school. If a positive correlation is not evident, teachers and principals will review instructional practices, student achievement data to determine areas of weakness, and professional development needs as determined by this

review. Professional development will be made available for teachers in areas of need and for principals in effective evaluation skills.

Teachers receiving an “Ineffective” in their final summative rating may request in writing a meeting with the superintendent within ten (10) days of receiving the “Ineffective” rating.

Tracking/Monitoring Documentation

Principals will use evaluation-designed software to collect documentation, track the data, and provide feedback to teachers and all certified staff. All student data will be accessible to staff through the use of a data warehousing system designed to provide the most effective, efficient interaction with said data.

Notification of Parents of Ineffective Teachers

Principals will not, when possible, place students in classrooms for two consecutive years with an “Ineffective” teacher. If this is not possible, parents will be notified in writing that their child(ren) has been placed for two consecutive years in a classroom with an “Ineffective” teacher.

Negative Impact

Negative impact on student learning shall be defined as follows (511 IAC 10-6-4):

Negative impact on student growth shall be defined where data shows a significant number of students across a teacher’s classes fail to demonstrate student learning or mastery of standards established by the state. Data will include, but not be limited to, grades, classroom assessments, ECAs, student performance, etc. This negative impact on student growth shall be determined by the primary evaluator.

A teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective.

ISCA School Counselor Rubric

Overview

The rubric is divided into four domains.

- Domain 1: Academic Achievement
- Domain 2: Student Assistant Services
- Domain 3: Career Development
- Domain 4: Professional Leadership

School Counselors will create two targeted objectives instead of one class objective and one targeted objective. Targeted objectives will be based on student achievement results as assessed on mandatory statewide or end-of-course teacher-created assessments.

The Indiana School Counselors Association rubric will be used to determine highly effective, effective, needs improvement, and ineffective in their professional practice. The school’s A-F grade will also contribute 5% to their final summative rating.

Overall Rating

Indicator	Maximum Score	Score
Academic Achievement	24	
Student Assistance Services	16	
Career Development	16	
Professional Leadership	24	

KEY	
72-80	Highly Effective
64-71	Effective
56-63	Improvement Necessary
0-55	Ineffective

Feedback and professional development for school counselors will follow the same guidelines for all certificated staff.

AISLE School Librarians Scoring Rubric

Overview

The rubric is divided into four domains.

- Domain 1: Purposeful Planning
- Domain 2: Effective Instruction
- Domain 3: Leadership
- Domain 4: Core Professionalism

School Librarians will create two targeted objectives instead of one class objective and one targeted objective. Targeted objectives will be based on student achievement results as assessed on mandatory statewide or end-of-course teacher-created assessments.

The Association for Indiana School Library Educators rubric will be used to determine highly effective, effective, needs improvement, and ineffective in their professional practice. The school's A-F grade will also contribute 5% to their final summative rating.

Feedback and professional development for school librarians will follow the same guidelines for all certificated staff.

RISE Principal Metrics and Summative Scoring

Components

Each principal's summative evaluation score will be based on the following components and measures.

1) Professional Practice – Assessment of Leadership Outcomes
Measure: Indiana Principal Effectiveness Rubric (PER)

2) Student learning – Contribution to Student Academic Progress
Measure: A-F Accountability Framework (A-F Grade)
Measure: Administrative Goals (as related to academics)

Weighting of Measures

The weights of each measure are provided in the table below.

Measures	Percentage
Indiana Principal's Effectiveness Rubric (PER)	80%
A – F Grade	10%
Administrative Goals	10%
Total Score	100%

RISE Principal Effectiveness Rubric (80%)

This score is obtained from the evaluation rating from the RISE Principal Effectiveness Rubric. The process for determining this is outlined in the rubric itself. It is weighted 50% of the principal's comprehensive rating.

The final professional practice rating for RISE will be calculated by the evaluation in a four step process:

1. Compile ratings and notes from multiple observations, drop-ins, and other sources of evidence.

At the end of the school year, evaluators should have collected a body of evidence representing professional practice from throughout the year. To aid in the collection of this evidence, regular bi-weekly walkthroughs and monthly conferences between leaders and their evaluators will occur. It is recommended that evaluators assess evidence mid-way through the year and then again at the end of the year.

2. Use Professional Judgment to Establish Final Ratings for Each Competency.

After collecting evidence, the evaluator must assess where the principal falls within each competency and use professional judgment to assign ratings. It is not recommended that the evaluator average competency scores to obtain the final domain score, but rather use good judgment to decide which competencies matter the most for leaders in different contexts and how leaders have evolved over the course of the year.

3. Use Professional Judgment to Establish Final Ratings in Principal Effectiveness and Leadership Actions.

After collecting evidence, the evaluator will assess where the principal falls within each in each of the two domains. How the scores correlate to the rating categories is as follows:

RISE Principal Effectiveness Rubric	Category	Points
	Highly Effective (HE)	4
	Effective (E)	3 or 3.5
	Improvement Necessary (I)	2 or 2.5
	Ineffective (IN)	1 or 1.5

4. Average Two Domain Ratings into One Final Practice Score.

At this point, each of the two final domain ratings is averaged together to form one score. The final rubric score feeds into a larger calculation for an overall summative rating including the student learning measures below.

A-F Accountability Grade (10%): The A-F Accountability Grade is obtained through its own rating process that incorporates growth and achievement. This rating will be provided by the DOE to evaluators to include in the evaluation. It is weighted 30% of the principal’s comprehensive rating.

A-F Grade	Category	Points
A	Highly Effective (HE)	4
B	Effective (E)	3
C	Improvement Necessary (I)	2
D or F	Ineffective (IN)	1

Administrative Goals (10%): This is an opportunity for administrators to focus on student learning beyond state mandated assessments. This component allows a principal to set two goals to suit local needs, focus on specific areas, or to emphasize growth if they are an underperforming school, etc.

Some possible student learning data sources or areas a principal may set goals around include the following: IREAD K-2, IREAD 3, LAS Links, IMAST, Acuity, mCLASS, common assessments in social studies or science, non-state mandated assessments (NWEA, etc.) AP data, the ACT suite of assessments, The College Board (SAT) suite of assessments, industry certification assessments, dual-credit achievement, or graduation rate. Others may be used so long as they allow for guidelines 1-7 to be met. Examples of data sources that are not considered as “student learning” measures: attendance rates, discipline referral rates, survey results, or anything not based specifically on student achievement or growth.

Examples of Administrative Goals:

- At least 20 out of 35 English Learner students in grades 3-5 will increase one or more proficiency levels on the LAS links assessment.
- The bottom 25% of grades 6-8 students, based on last year’s ISTEP+ scores, will increase their ISTEP ELA passing rates by 10%.
- 70% of K-2 students will score a proficient or above in IREAD-2.
- The graduation rate for the High School will raise at least 5%, reaching 80% graduation rate by the end of the school year.
- The percentage of AP students scoring a 3, 4, or 5 on any AP test will increase from 45% last year to 60% this year.
- The bottom 25% of 10th grade students will increase their average scores on the English 10 ECA by 10 points.

- Increase the number of career and technical students gaining career-ready certificates from 15 to 30 by the end of the year.

The alignment for goal achievement, rating category, and points is as follows:

Expectation	Category	Points
Exceeds both goals	Highly Effective (HE)	4
Meets both goals, may exceed one	Effective (E)	3
Meets only one goal	Improvement Necessary (I)	2
Meets neither goal	Ineffective (IN)	1

Rolling Up the Score

For summative scoring, once all three raw scores are determined, each score should be multiplied by its corresponding weight. Once each measure's score is calculated, all three scores are added together to create a final comprehensive Effectiveness Rating. The chart below provides a layout for calculating the final rating.

	Raw Score	x	Weight	Score
Rubric Rating			0.80	
A-F Accountability Grade (DOE)			0.10	
Admin. SLO Rating			0.10	
			Comprehensive Effectiveness Rating	

Category Ratings

Once the evaluator calculates the Comprehensive Effectiveness Rating, the rating should correlate with one of the four rating categories as seen below.

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

**1.0
Points**

**1.75
Points**

**2.5
Points**

**3.5
Points**

**4.0
Points**

***Note: Borderline points are always round up.**

ISBA/IAPSS SUPERINTENDENT METRICS AND SUMMATIVE SCORING

The superintendent's evaluation is formative in substance, identifying areas where job performance can be improved through intentional activities that support and enhance the superintendent's job performance. The evaluation is not simply a summative review of what did or did not happen according to plans. Some flexibility in the process is allowed in order to differentiate between those goals that can/are reasonably expected to be achieved and those goals that are more subject to circumstances beyond the superintendent's control.

The Indiana Superintendent Evaluation Process has three primary components:

1. The Evaluation Instrument (Rubric)
2. Superintendent Goals and/or Objectives (Minimum two per year)
3. The Corporation Accountability Grade

The evaluation metrics are critical to the process. The percentages represent the weight that is to be given to each of the three evaluation categories: the rubric, goals and/or objectives, and corporation accountability grade.

Metric Percentages	
School Year	2017-2018
Assessment Instrument	75%
Goals/Objectives	20%
Corporation Accountability Grade	5%
Total	100%

The Evaluation Rubric

The rubric consists of 25 questions distributed within the six primary categories reflected in "Indiana Content Standards for Educators: School Leader—District Level." Each of the six categories has between two and six indicators that describe a specific performance to be evaluated. Each descriptor will have four performance levels: Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, and Ineffective, which describe varying levels of performance. A copy of the rubric can be found in the Appendices.

Performance-Based Goals/Objectives

Superintendents will write two measurable goals/objectives based on student achievement and corporation needs. The goals/objectives should include a reasonable time-frame for completion. Some goals/objectives may be ongoing and require extended time beyond the evaluation period for

Approved by PCSC Board July 2017

completion. This should be noted by the board and the superintendent. These goals/objectives will constitute 20% of the superintendent's final summative evaluation.

Corporation Accountability Grade

The corporation's overall accountability grade will be assigned by the Indiana Department of Education. This grade will constitute 5% of the superintendent's final summative evaluation.