



Earlywood Educational Services Certified Personnel Evaluation Handbook

Revised February 2022

Section I:

Developing Our Tool

The Earlywood Employee Evaluation System (EES) was developed by administrators, special educators, psychologists, therapists, and other certified personnel with whom the system is used. The system is designed to improve teaching and learning and to ensure a level of accountability that links employee pay to performance. For the purpose of this document, the term “certified personnel” refers to all Earlywood employees evaluated by this system.

a. Legislation

Indiana legislation (IC20-28-11.5) was the catalyst for the development of the evaluation system for certificated employees. In the 2011 legislative session, the Indiana General Assembly passed Senate Enrolled Act 001 (SEA 1) which revamped several sections of Indiana code related to teacher evaluation (Title 20). SEA 1 was signed into law on April 30, 2011 and took effect on July 1, 2011. As a consequence of this legislation, all teacher evaluation systems in Indiana include the following provisions:

- 1) Every teacher must be evaluated annually;
- 2) Every system must include four performance categories: Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, and Ineffective; and
- 3) Every evaluation system must incorporate measures of student growth and achievement as a *significant* portion of a teacher’s evaluation.

All Indiana school corporations were required to include these three provisions in their evaluation plans by the start of the 2012-2013 school year, or as soon as current contractual obligations expire, and to submit the evaluation plan to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE).

In July 2020 Indiana legislation (IC20-28-11.5) was amended to remove the requirement for measuring the student growth component from the evaluation process. As a result, the Teacher Evaluation Committee conducted a vote within Earlywood employee groups to determine if the SLO component of the evaluation process could be removed. The employee groups agreed therefore the SLO component was removed. To maintain compliance with SBOE rule at 511 IAC 10-6-4(c) the evaluation process will assess student learning through the Professional Practice rubrics.

b. Resources

Shortly after the 2011 legislation was approved, the Indiana Department of Education issued guidelines to help schools implement the law which included a teacher effectiveness rubric called the RISE model. Earlywood adapted the RISE framework which is aligned closely with the standards, competencies and

indicators used in the state model. Different rubrics were developed and slight differences in procedures were necessary for the system to accommodate the unique needs of the Earlywood certified personnel.

The EES was developed using standards published by a variety of state and national professional organizations such as the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), the Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education (ICASE), the Indiana Association of School Psychologists (IASP) and the American Speech Language and Hearing Association (ASHA), as well as the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE). Five rubrics were designed that capture the essential nature of the various roles of Earlywood certified personnel.

The rubrics were designed to assist in evaluating the following groups of special educators:

1. Classroom and Itinerant Teachers
2. Program Support Teachers
3. Speech Language Pathologists & Speech Language Pathologist Assistants
4. Occupational and Physical Therapists & Assistants
5. School Psychologists
6. Special Education Administrators

c. Defining Terms

In developing the evaluation system it was important to begin by defining our terms. The federal definition of *an effective special educator* is “a special educator whose students achieve [at] acceptable rates.... A method for determining if a special educator is effective must include multiple measures, and effectiveness must be evaluated, in significant part, on the basis of student growth...” (Secretary’s Priorities for Discretionary Grant Priorities, 2010, p. 47288).

EES defines an **effective special educator** as follows:

- Effective special educators have high expectations for all students with disabilities and support student learning, as determined by assessment of growth on individual educational goals.
- Effective special educators contribute to positive academic, attitudinal and social outcomes for students.
- Effective special educators (1) use diverse resources to plan and structure engaging learning opportunities; (2) continuously monitor student progress, (3) adapt instruction as needed and (4) evaluate learning using multiple sources of evidence.
- Effective special educators contribute to the development of classrooms and schools that value diversity.
- Effective special educators collaborate with other special educators, general educators, administrators, parents and other professionals to ensure student success.

Data Collection Tool

The Employee Evaluation System Components

The following components were addressed in designing the evaluation system:

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| Component 1: | Evaluation System Purpose and Goals |
| Component 2: | Stakeholder Investment and Cultivating a Strategic Communication Plan |
| Component 3: | Measures of Performance |
| Component 4: | Structure of the Evaluation System |
| Component 5: | The Identification and Training of Evaluators |
| Component 6: | Data Integrity and Transparency |

- Component 7: Communicating and Evaluation Results
Component 8: Evaluating the System

Component 1: Evaluation System Purpose and Goals

Establishing a clear purpose and explicit, well-defined goals lays the foundation for a comprehensive, sustainable evaluation system. The purpose of this evaluation system is to improve instruction/treatment and learning for all students served by Earlywood certified personnel. A secondary purpose is to provide a sound basis for establishing personnel pay for performance. The primary goals of the evaluation system are as follows:

1. Certified Personnel will be held accountable for student academic and behavioral growth through the evaluation process;
2. Certified Personnel evaluation results will be used to improve practice; and
3. The evaluation process will differentiate between highly effective personnel, effective personnel, personnel who need improvement and personnel who are ineffective, and will use these rating for personnel and compensation decisions.

Component 2: Stakeholder Investment/Strategic Communication of the EES Plan

Evaluation systems are much more likely to be accepted, successfully implemented, and sustained if stakeholders are included in the design process (Goe, Holdheide, & Miller, 2011). When designing this evaluation system, representatives from all departments within the organization were included on committees and subcommittees. Special educator preparation programs were consulted as well as various professional organizations.

Throughout the development of the evaluation system, periodic communications were sent to all those who would participate in the EES. A meeting communicating the essential components of the plan was open to all staff and a vote was taken to verify their support of the plan in May 2012. 100% of those in attendance voted in favor of the plan.

This document will serve as an evaluation handbook. The handbook was submitted to the IDOE in the summer of 2012 as our modified plan. It is available on Earlywood website.

The evaluation process will be reviewed with employees at the beginning of each school year.

Ongoing feedback on the evaluation system will be gathered via the Teacher Evaluation Committee. Committee members include employee representatives from each rubric and the primary evaluators. Employee representatives must be part of the Association as Teacher Evaluation Committee meetings are a form of Discussions. The evaluation committee will examine the feedback and communicate any changes to the system through email, newsletters and website postings and/or general meetings when appropriate. The Board will approve the plan annually.

Component 3: Measures of Performance

The EES's purpose, goals and standards inform the types of outcomes and practices that will be assessed. The outcomes and practices dictate the methods and measures that will be used. As mandated by the evaluation legislation, multiple measures are required. According to Goe and Holdheide (2011), multiple measures strengthen special educator evaluation, contribute to special educators' professional growth, and set the stage for improved teaching and learning.

In keeping with the legislation, a variety of measures will be utilized as part of this evaluation system. The following measures may be used: Classroom/session observations; analysis of artifacts such as lesson plans, IEPs, evaluations and other reports; principal and colleague ratings; and self-reports.

Supplemental measures may also be utilized as agreed upon by the evaluator and the certified person being evaluated.

Professional Practice Component:

The Professional Practice Component assesses the educator’s instructional knowledge and skills that impact student learning, as measured by competencies set forth in the appropriate Effectiveness Rubric. This component is based mainly on observation of teacher performance, review of applicable artifacts and documents, and input from not only colleagues and others, but the educator’s self-assessment. Each rubric is divided into four domains: 1) Purposeful Planning and Preparation; 2) Effective Instruction, Treatment and Support; 3) Leadership and Professional Responsibilities; and 4) Core Professionalism. Within each domain, competencies are broken down into indicators and tailored to each of the five personnel categories.

Data Collection Procedures for the Effectiveness Rubric include:

1. **Classroom Observations**
2. **Document Review (IEPs, FBAs, BIPs, Evaluation Reports, etc.)**
3. **Review of Artifacts**
4. **Review of Attendance Records**
5. **Self-Assessments**
6. **Staff Conferences**
7. **Surveys**
8. **Others as agreed upon**

The weighted percentage for each component of Professional Practice will be as follows:

- Domain 1: Purposeful Planning- 40%,
- Domain 2: Effective Instruction, Treatment and/or Instructional Support-40%,
- Domain 3: Leadership and Professional Responsibilities- 20%

Employee Effectiveness Rubric (EER)

EXAMPLE with scores

	Rating	Weight	Weighted Rating
Domain 1: Purposeful Planning	3.50	x 0.40	1.40
Domain 2: Effective Instruction, Treatment and/or Instructional Support	3.00	x 0.40	1.20
Domain 3: Leadership and Professional Responsibilities	3.00	x 0.20	0.60
Domain 4: Core Professionalism			0.00
Final EER Score			3.20

Core Professionalism:

The Core Professionalism domain includes four indicators, each of which can detract from the overall performance on the teacher effectiveness rubric by 1 for any individual indicator. An employee may “not meet standards in more than one area, but only 1 point in total will be deducted from the overall effectiveness for deficits in core professionalism. It will be presumed that an employee is meeting the standards of this domain unless evidence is provided to the contrary.

Indicator	Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard
Attendance & On-Time Arrival	School Professional has demonstrated a pattern of consistent attendance and on-time arrivals and departures to work and all related functions.	School Professional has demonstrated a pattern of unexcused or inconsistent attendance and on-time arrivals and departures to work and all related functions.
Policies & Procedures	School Professional follows all local, state, & Federal laws related to school and the community and follows all locally established policies and procedures.	School Professional has not followed all local, state, & Federal laws either related to school or the community and/or has demonstrated a pattern of failing to follow locally established policies and procedures.
Respect	School Professional interacts with students, colleagues, administrators, parent/families and community members in a respectful manner.	School Professional has demonstrated a pattern of failing to interact with students, colleagues, administrators, parent/families and/or community members in a respectful manner.
Ethical	School Professional exhibits behavior in accordance with the established EES code of conduct and performs the function of the job in an ethical manner.	School Professional exhibits behavior contrary to the established EES code of conduct and/or has not performed the job in an ethical manner.

Negative Impact on Student Learning:

511 IAC 10-6-4 (c) 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.

Negative impact on student learning will be determined when the employee receives a rating of ineffective on their rubric.

IC 20-28-11.5-4 (c) (6) An employee who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective.

IC 20-28-11.5-7 Student instructed by teachers rated ineffective; notice to parents required

Sec. 7. (a) This section applies to any teacher instructing students in a content area and grade subject to IC 20-32-4-1(a)(1) and IC 20-32-5-2.

(b) A student may not be instructed for two (2) consecutive years by two (2) consecutive teachers, each of whom was rated as ineffective under this chapter in the school year immediately before the school year in which the student is placed in the respective teacher's class.

(c) If a teacher did not instruct students in the school year immediately before the school year in which students are placed in the teacher's class, the teacher's rating under this chapter for the most recent year in which the teacher instructed students, instead of for the school year immediately before the school year in which students are placed in the teacher's class, shall be used in determining whether subsection (b) applies to the teacher.

(d) If it is not possible for a school corporation to comply with this section, the school corporation must notify the parents of each applicable student indicating the student will be placed in a classroom of a teacher who has been rated ineffective under this chapter. The parent must be notified before the start of the second consecutive school year.

The parent will be notified via a letter from the Executive Director.

Overall Effectiveness Score:

In determining the overall effectiveness score, the four areas of the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric will be combined and overall percentages tabulated. The final score translates into an effectiveness category.

EXAMPLE with scores

Employee Effectiveness Rubric (EER)

	Rating	Weight	Weighted Rating
Domain 1: Purposeful Planning	4.00	x 0.40	1.60
Domain 2: Effective Instruction, Treatment and/or Instructional Support	4.00	x 0.40	1.60
Domain 3: Leadership and Professional Responsibilities	4.00	x 0.20	0.80
Domain 4: Core Professionalism			0.00
FINALIZATION	Highly Effective		4.00

Component 4: The Structure of the Evaluation System

Depending on the employee category, an effectiveness rubric will be identified as the primary tool for determining an overall performance rating.

Beginning of year meetings:

A meeting between the certified person being evaluated and the primary evaluator will be held before the end of August. This meeting may occur as part of an employee group meeting or may be held via a recorded screencast. Observation procedures will be discussed at that time. It is the responsibility of the employee being evaluated to seek clarification regarding the evaluation system.

Observations:

Observations may occur in classrooms, case conferences, parent conferences, meetings with principals and colleagues, MTSS meetings, small group/individual instruction settings, staff development presentations, other presentations, etc. Observations do not need to be scheduled or announced ahead of time. Observations can take place in person or through live virtual platforms. Written feedback will be provided within the SFS system within seven business days.

At least 1 extended and 2 short observations will occur throughout the school year for new employees and returning employees who received Needs Improvement or Ineffective the previous year. The extended observation must be at least 45 minutes and the short observation must be at least 15 minutes in length. Returning employees who received effective or Highly Effective will only be required to have 2 short observations of at least 15 minutes. Additional observations can be conducted at the employee or the evaluator's request.

The extended observation will be conducted by the formal evaluator (primary supervisor). Short observations will be conducted by the primary evaluator or a secondary evaluator. The secondary evaluator will be identified by the primary evaluator as defined in Component 5. For first and second year teachers and teachers who have been rated Needs Improvement or Ineffective, additional observations are encouraged. During the year, the person being evaluated is responsible for gathering various artifacts to provide to the evaluator.

Modified Evaluation for shortened contracts:

This evaluation system will be modified for any certified person who works 90-119 days in a school year. The modified evaluation will use the SFS system to collect data on the required number of observations for all staff. An employee who works less than 90 days in a school year may be evaluated on an individualized plan as determined by the supervisor.

Component 5: The Identification and Training of Evaluators

Every certified staff member will have a primary evaluator. This person will be selected based on their content knowledge, experience, and/or administrative responsibilities. In some cases, a secondary evaluator may conduct observations. The secondary evaluator will be approved by the Executive Director. The evaluators will be appropriately trained by attending evaluation training sessions prior to conducting employee observations and evaluations. Earlywood evaluators will meet twice a year to review practice and receive pertinent training.

Component 6: Data Integrity and Transparency

The evaluation scoring must be based on evidence provided by the certified person being evaluated, through observation and input by others knowledgeable about the person's performance.

Component 7: Using and Communicating Certified Personnel Evaluation Results

Certified Personnel will receive written feedback within seven business days after every observation within SFS.

End of year meeting:

All certified personnel will participate in a summative meeting with the formal evaluator upon completion of all observations and collection of all supporting data. The summative score and supporting documentation will be reviewed at this time. Other than this final conference, additional conferences may be requested by the evaluator or the person being evaluated.

Professional Development/Action Plans:

If, at any time during the school year, the evaluator develops a concern about the performance of a certified person being evaluated, the evaluator will schedule a conference to review these concerns and develop a plan for improvement. An action plan may be developed that includes professional development opportunities. A professional development plan will be agreed upon based on the data gathered. After the completion of the professional development plan, if not sooner, the primary evaluator will conference with the person being evaluated and will review the progress on the plan. Through the Action Plan the evaluator will determine appropriate professional development to address the employee deficits. The employee will be required to attend and furnish the Professional Growth Points as documentation of participation in the professional development.

Requesting a Meeting with the Superintendent's Designee:

If a certified staff person does not agree with their supervisor's assessment of performance, and a satisfactory resolution has been attempted through meetings with the supervisor, but a consensus between the two parties is not obtained, the certified staff person can request a meeting with the Superintendent's Designee. A request for such a meeting must be in writing to the Executive Director, and cc'd to the supervisor. The written request must specify which areas are in dispute, and why the assessment of performance is not thought to be accurate. Within 3 working days of the receipt of the written request, the Executive Director will arrange for a meeting with the certified staff person, and the supervisor. The Executive Director will review all relevant and available information, and discuss the situation with both parties. Within 3 working days after the meeting, the Executive Director will provide both parties with a written response to the disputed areas of evaluation.

For employees evaluated by the Executive Director, requests for such meetings may be made to the Governing Board President.

Component 8: Evaluating the System

As needed, but at least annually, the evaluation committee will meet to share feedback on the evaluation system. The committee will elicit feedback from EES certified personnel to ask for input on the evaluation

process. The evaluation system will be evaluated by reviewing the overall satisfaction of the teachers and administrators and their perceptions regarding the fairness and accuracy of the ratings, as well as the ability of the administrators and teachers to understand and implement the process. The evaluation system will be adjusted based on the feedback received.

The evaluation committee, made up of administrators and staff, will review the data to determine whether most certified personnel are identified as Effective and whether our evaluation rubrics discriminate adequately between Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement, and Ineffective. Whatever conclusions made from the analysis will be incorporated into modifications of rubrics and procedures for the following school year.

Professional Development/Remediation Plan

School District: _____

School Year: _____

Year: 1 2 3 4 5 or _____

Name: _____

Position/Subject Area: _____

School: _____

A. Professional Teaching Standards

Professional Standards Standard(s) To Be Addressed: 1. Purposeful Planning & Preparation 2. Effective Instruction, Treatment and/or Instructional Support 3. Leadership and Professional Responsibilities 4. Core Professionalism	Standard(s) to be Addressed: Element(s) to be Addressed:
--	---

#1

B. Teacher's Strategies

Goals for Elements	Activities/Actions	Expected Outcomes and Evidence of Completion	Resources Needed	Timeline
Goal #1		#2 and #3	#5 and #6	#7
Goal #2				

Teacher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Mentor's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Adm's/Evaluator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Professional Development Plan/Remediation Mid-Year Plan

A. Evidence of Progress toward Specific Standards and Elements to be Addressed/Enhanced

Teacher Completed: #4

--

B. Narrative

Teachers Comments:	Mentor's Comments	Adm/Evaluator's Comments
Teacher's Signature: Date:	Mentor's Signature: Date:	Adm/Evaluator's Signature: Date:

Professional Development/Remediation Plan – End of Year Review

C. Evidence of Progress Toward Specific Standards and Elements to be Addressed/Enhanced #4

--

D. Goals

Goal #1 was successfully completed? Yes or No
Goal #2 was successfully completed? Yes or No

E. Narrative

Teachers Comments:	Mentor's Comments	Adm/Evaluator's Comments
Teacher's Signature: Date:	Mentor's Signature: Date:	Adm/Evaluator's Signature: Date:

Appendix