TEACHER INFORMATION

Describe the LEA’s system used to evaluate the performance of your teachers:
IU5 Administration has worked cooperatively and collaboratively, with broad representation from the professional staff, to examine current research and best practices in the area of supervision and evaluation. From this thorough examination, we developed the Northwest Tri-County Intermediate Unit "Differentiated Supervision/Evaluation Plan for Professional Staff." The purpose of this Plan is to positively impact student learning and behavior through professional growth and development in Preparation, Technique (Instruction), Environment, and Professionalism, using a carefully tailored and clearly defined model of supervision and evaluation. Our Plan emphasizes two distinct and critical research-based approaches. The first approach is the differentiation of the supervision and evaluation of professional staff based on their individual needs. This concept is based on Allan Glatthorn's book, "Differentiated Supervision" (1997) which states: "Differentiated Supervision is an approach to supervision that provides teachers with options about the kinds of supervisory and evaluative services they receive...It is general; the differentiated model provides intensive development to non-tenured teachers and to tenured teachers with serious problems. The rest of the faculty receives options about how they foster their professional development." The second research-based approach came from the work of Charlotte Danielson in her book, "Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching" (1996). It outlines a framework for teaching in four domains—Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities. For each of these domains, Danielson identified components necessary for mastery. Each component within the domain was given a descriptive rubric of four levels. Danielson's definition of her framework for teaching is "the framework for teaching...identifies those aspects of a teacher's responsibilities that have been documented through empirical studies and theoretical research as promoting improved student learning...These responsibilities seek to define what teachers should know and be able to do in the exercise of their profession." We have developed individual rating rubric sets specific to various groups of professionals (teacher, therapist, transition support teacher, educational consultant), with each category of professionals represented in their development. IU5 believes that the use of a differentiated supervision and evaluation model, including the use of a rubric framework, provides our professional staff with research-based individualized professional growth and development. With improved professional skills, we positively impact the learning and behavior of the students we serve. Non-tenured and first-year teachers are evaluated once each semester, and all others are evaluated once at the end of the school year by Supervisors who hold appropriate supervisory/administrative certification.

Does the LEA use the results of the teacher evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:

a. Teacher Development? Yes

Part of IU5's Differentiated Supervision/Evaluation Plan includes an Action Plan which is completed each year. This Action Plan is developed by the teacher with their supervisor's approval; and goals relevant to professional development in specific areas may be included as deemed necessary according to the prior year's evaluation.

b. Teacher Compensation? No

NA

c. Teacher Promotions? Yes

Those who are consistently rated as Proficient and/or Distinguished are recommended and considered when needs arise to fill vacancies for Training and Consultation (TaC) Educational Consultant positions and supervisory/administrative positions.

d. Teacher Retention and Removal? Yes

If a teacher receives two "Unsatisfactory" ratings on the IU Alternative Rating Form, documented by the supervisor through observation(s), data collection, and/or documented and investigated report(s), regardless of when it occurs, said teacher will be recommended for termination. It is possible that a gross deficiency in a single category might be sufficiently serious to warrant a total rating of "Unsatisfactory" and immediate termination.

Does the LEA teacher evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion:

a. Student Achievement Outcomes? Yes

b. Student Growth Data? Yes

The student achievement outcomes and student growth data are used as criteria in the rating to the degree as specified in the Preparation rubric attached as relates to Instructional Design and Assessment Design/Progress Reporting.

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

a. New Teachers (Less than 3 Years)? Twice a year

b. Experienced Teachers (More than 3 Years)? Annually

Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide teacher evaluators?
Does the LEA publicly report teacher evaluation data by school?

a. Yes or No? (Web link provided if applicable.)
   No
   N/A

LEA Teacher Evaluations Summary:

Number Rated 170
Number Not Rated 4
Total Number Employed 174

LEA Teacher Evaluations Detail:

Alternate Approved Evaluation System:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employed</th>
<th>Not Rated</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Denominator)</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>(Numerator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating&gt;Title</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Distinguished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory&gt;Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Tri-County IU 5</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>4 2.3%</td>
<td>1 0.6%</td>
<td>9 5.2%</td>
<td>101 58%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 174 4 2.3% 1 0.6% 9 5.2% 101 58% 0 0% 0 0% 59 33.9% |

Note: - All Building percentages are the result of dividing the number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the building total (Denominator)
- All Total percentages are the result of dividing the total number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the overall total (Denominator)

*In order to ensure that individual ratings can not be deduced, we have not reported any Teacher or Principal information if building level or LEA level data is less than or equal to 5
Describe the LEA’s system used to evaluate the performance of your Principals:
NA

Does the LEA use the results of the principal evaluation system described above in decisions regarding:

- a. Principal Development? NA
- b. Principal Compensation? NA
- c. Principal Promotions? NA
- d. Principal Retention and Removal? NA

Does the LEA principal evaluation system described above include the following as evaluation criterion:

- a. Student Achievement Outcomes? NA
- b. Student Growth Data? NA

How often does the LEA formally evaluate:

- a. New Principals (Less than 3 Years)? Other
- b. Experienced Principals (More than 3 Years)? Other

Does the LEA use weighting formula(e) and/or rubric(s) to guide principal evaluators?

- a. Yes or No? If Yes, describe background and process. NA

Does the LEA publicly report principal evaluation data by school?

- a. Yes or No? (Web link provided if applicable.) NA

LEA Principal Evaluations Summary:

Rating System No
LEA Principal Evaluation Detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employed</th>
<th>Not Rated</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Denominator)</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
<td>(Numerator) %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RatingTitle

Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Satisfactory
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*%</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*%</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*%</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*%</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*%</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: All Total percentages are the result of dividing the total number of ratings at each level (Numerator) by the overall total (Denominator).

*In order to ensure that individual ratings can not be deduced, we have not reported any Teacher or Principal information if building level or LEA level data is less than or equal to 5.