Performance Evaluation Plan

Reviewed and Updated by PERA Committee on

May 19, 2017

This handbook serves as JAMP Special Education Joint Agreement performance evaluation plan for JEA Teachers and Support Specialists.

Joint Agreement Mission Statement: JAMP Special Education Joint Agreement, in active partnership with family and community, shall empower individuals to become responsible learners who are confident and capable of meaningfully participating in a changing society.

Possible Outcomes for Remediation Plans

Appendix...

Teacher Framework for Professional Growth.... ..... Appendix A

JAMP Special Education Joint Agreement Performance Evaluation Plan for Teachers and Support Specialists

Purpose

This JAMP Special Education (hereafter "JAMP") Joint Agreement Special Education Performance Evaluation Plan for Teachers (hereafter "Plan") establishes valid and reliable performance evaluation systems for certified employees that assure both professional competence or practice and student growth, as required by the School Code Article 24 A (105 ILCS 5/24A) and the implementing regulations of the Illinois State Board of Education, found at 23 III. Administrative Code 50. et seq.

Plan Applicability

This Plan:

1) Identifies the components of evaluation of teachers/support specialists, including those that address the use of data and indicators of student growth as a significant factor in rating performance, of a teacher/support specialist performance evaluation system; and,

2) Provides for the evaluation of teachers using data and indicators on student growth as a significant factor in rating teacher performance, no later than the PERA Implementation Date, September 1, 2016. [Source 23 III. Admin Code 50.10]

School Code Article 24A sections 2.5 through 15 (105 ILCS 5/24a 2–15) establish requirements for the implementation of performance evaluation systems, including both professional practice and data and indicators of student growth for principals, assistant principals and teachers. "Teachers"

is defined below. [Source 23 Ill. Admin Code 50.20]

Definitions

The words indicated in quotation marks below shall have the definition provided in 23 Ill. Administrative Code 50.30. Upon amendment or other modification of such words by statute or by regulation of the Illinois State Board of Education or other body of regulatory jurisdiction the definitions of the words shall be deemed modified to be the same as the statute or regulatory definition. For the convenience of the reader, the definitions current at the time of this writing are as follows:

"Adaptive conditional measurement model" means a measurement model used to analyze assessment data to determine student growth that consists of at least a collection of baseline that is used to determine student growth expectations for all students or for individual and/or groups of students and the recording of student outcomes in comparison to the growth expectations identified.

"Assessment" means any instrument that measures a student's acquisition of specific knowledge and skills. Assessments used in the evaluation of teachers, principals and assistant principals shall be aligned to one or more instructional areas articulated in the Illinois Learning Standards (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 1. Appendix D) or Illinois Early Learning and Development Standards - Children Age 3 to Kindergarten Enrollment Age (see 23 Ill. Adm. Code 235.Appendix A), as applicable. Assessments are defined as the following types.

"Type I assessment" means a reliable assessment that measures a certain group or subset of students in the same manner with the same potential assessment items, is scored by a non-district entity, and is administered either statewide or beyond Illinois. Examples include assessments available from the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA), Scantron Performance Series, Star Reading Enterprise, College Board's SAT, Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate examinations, or ACT's EPASR (i.e., Educational Planning and Assessment System).

"Qualified Evaluator" shall have the meaning set forth in Section 24A-2.5 or 24A-15 of the School Code and shall be an individual who has completed the prequalification process required under Section 24A-3 of the School Code or Subpart E of 23 ill Admin Code 50, as applicable, and successfully passed the State-developed assessments specific to evaluation of teachers, principals and assistant principals. Each qualified evaluator shall maintain his or her qualification by completing the retraining required under Section 24A-3 of the School Code or Subpart E of this part, as applicable.

"State performance evaluation model" means those components of an evaluation plan that address data and indicators of student growth that a school district is required to use in the event that its joint committee fails to reach agreement pursuant to Section 24A-4(b) of the School Code.

"Student growth" means a demonstrable change in a student's or group of students' knowledge or skills, as evidenced by gain and/or attainment on two or more assessments, between two or more points in time.

"Student learning objective process" or "SLO process" means a process for organizing evidence of student growth over a defined period of time that addresses learning goals that are measurable and specific to the skills or content being taught and the grade level of the students being assessed, and are used to inform and differentiate instruction to ensure student success.

"Student learning objective" or "SLO" consists of a learning goal, assessment and procedures to measure that goal, and growth expectation.

"Support specialist" includes School Psychologist, School Social Worker, Speech and Language Pathologist, Orientation and Mobility Specialist, Physical Therapist, Occupational Therapist and School Nurse.

"Teacher" means full-time or part-time professional employees of the school district who are required to hold a professional educator license endorsed for a teaching field issued in accordance with Article 21B of the School Code. For the purposes of the requirements specific to student growth outlined in

Article 24A of the School Code and this Part, "teacher" shall not include any individual who holds a professional educator license endorsed for school support personnel issued under Article 21B of the School Code and is assigned to an area designated as requiring this endorsement, including but not limited to school counselor, school psychologist, nonteaching school speech and language pathologist, school nurse, school social worker, or school marriage and family counselor.

(Source: Amended at 38 Ill. Reg. 23175, effective November 19, 2014)
Evaluation Cycle Explanation

Non-tenured teachers must complete the student growth and professional practice piece during an evaluation cycle. Student growth must contain two completed JAMP approved SLO templates. *Tenured teachers* will complete the student growth portion during the first year of your two year evaluation cycle and professional practice will be completed during the second year of the evaluation cycle. Student growth must contain two completed JAMP approved SLO templates or up to four templates if you choose to add SLOs during your professional practice year.

o During the 2016-2017 school year, if you are in your second year of the evaluation cycle you will complete

both pieces. *Non-tenured support specialists* must complete only the professional practice piece each year. *Tenured support specialists* will complete only the professional practice piece during YEAR 1 of the evaluation cycle. *Retiring support specialists/teachers* will not be evaluated during their retirement year of employment.

Timeline for Tenured Teachers in Year 1 of their Cycle

On or before September 15 On or before September 30 If denied, 5 school days 5 School Days from resubmitted SLO Date is determined in the SLO
Student Growth Component (30%)

2 SLOs (type 2 & 3 or two type 3) due to the evaluator. (ELEMENTS 1-3)

Evaluator approves, recommends revisions, or denies SLOS SLO revisions are made and resubmitted to evaluator Evaluator has to approve or draft the SLO for the teacher Teacher MUST check in with evaluator in written form midway through the SLO. This date is determined on the SLO template. If changes need to be made to the SLO, the teacher will meet with the evaluator to discuss possible changes. If no changes are needed, teacher will communicate no change needed to evaluator in writing. Finished SLO (ELEMENT 4).
On or before April 25

Timeline for Tenured Support Specialist in Year 2 and Non-tenured Support Specialist

Evaluation Summary Timeline: Student Growth Component and Professional Practice Component First Day of Student Attendance Provide written notice, electronic or paper, that the teacher is being evaluated that school year. Must provide an electronic copy of the evaluation plan as well as any other tools being used for evaluation. (Must be completed within 30 days for teachers hired after first day of student attendance.)

Professional Practice Component (100%) Formal Observations (Domain 2 and 3) O Pre-Observation Form (Appendix B) required from support specialists prior to Pre-Observation Meeting. o Pre-Observation Meeting o Observation. Minimum of 45 minutes, a complete lesson, or an entire class period Written (electronic or paper) feedback of observation will be provided to the support specialist by the qualified evaluator prior to support specialist evidence meeting. The support specialist shall submit a completed Reflections (Appendix D) form to the qualified evaluator within 3 school days of the formal observation. The qualified evaluator shall meet with the support specialist to discuss the evidence collected about the support specialist's professional practice within 10 school days of the formal observation. Informal Observations used for evidence of o No pre-observation form, notice, or meeting required professional practice (Domain 2 and 3) O Observation -

No minimum duration specified or required
0 Following an informal observation, the qualified evaluator shall provide feedback to the support specialist in writing (electronic or paper) within 10 school days. O With the written feedback, the support specialist shall be provided
with an opportunity to have an in-person discussion with the evaluator.

Final Summative Rating Prior to February 1
| Qualified evaluator will schedule an employee evidence interview to address domains 1 and 4 Final Summative Evaluation On or Before Summative Evaluation is from the following components: March 1
• Professional Practice Evaluation
Professional Practice

This section provides procedures and timelines regarding the JAMP Performance Evaluation Plan (Plan). Evaluation of teachers/support specialists is the responsibility of JAMP administrators. All teachers/support specialists have the responsibility to participate in JAMP's designed evaluation plan.

Should any conflict arise between the provisions of the Illinois School Code or the Rules and Regulations of the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) governing teacher/support specialist evaluations, professional development, remediation, dismissal and discharge of teachers/support specialists and the Plan, JAMP will reconvene the evaluation committee and attempt to reconcile any such conflict. Until the evaluation committee is able to reconcile the conflict between the JAMP Evaluation Plan and The School Code or ISBE's Rules and Regulations, The School Code and ISBE's Rules and Regulations shall supersede the provisions of the Plan.

Instructional Frameworks

JAMP believes that each of our teachers should be committed to lifelong learning and continuous professional improvement. This process should be

continuous, constructive, and should take place in an atmosphere of mutual trust, support, and respect. The process is a cooperative effort designed to encourage productive dialogue and action between and among staff and evaluators.

To create and maintain an atmosphere of mutual trust, support, and respect within JAMP, the Plan was developed to support the variety of teachers/support specialists which JAMP employs to meet the expectations for Proficient and Excellent. Throughout the year, support and assistance will be provided to the staff by the evaluator. The assistance could be in many forms, which may include but are not limited to observations and feedback, data collection, modeling, referrals to other sources of support, and/or conferencing. Each staff member is a unique individual. This evaluation process recognizes the individual differences of each person and utilizes an approach that provides maximum opportunities for improvement and growth. Achieving proficient or excellent performance levels remains the responsibility of the teacher.

For teachers/support specialists of specific populations, including but not limited to learning disability, emotionally disturbed, cognitively disabled, vision impaired, hearing impaired and autism "competency of subject matter taught" shall include knowledge of manner of effectively working with students with those disabilities.

As a special education joint agreement, JAMP employs a wide variety of teachers/support specialists. In order to address the distinct types of employees at JAMP, two instructional frameworks were created. The two instructional frameworks are: Teacher and Support Specialist. Below is a list of each teaching position JAMP employs. These positions have been placed under the instructional framework which will be used for evaluation of professional practice for that position.

Teacher:

Special Education Teacher (LBSI)

- CHOICES Program

Communication Development Program Emotional/Behavior Program REACH Program

• Special Needs Vision Teacher (Blind/Partially Sighted Endorsement) Early Childhood Special Education Teacher (ECH Endorsement)

Support Specialist School Psychologist School Social Worker Speech and Language Pathologist Orientation and Mobility Specialist Physical Therapist Occupational Therapist School Nurse

Needs Improvement Professional practice at the *Needs Improvement* Level shows evidence of knowledge and skills required to practice, but performance is inconsistent, which may be due to lack of experience, expertise, and/or commitment. *Needs Improvement* indicates performance that requires additional attention to ensure an acceptable level of proficiency. This level may be considered minimally competent for teachers/support specialists in their early careers. This level refers to teaching that has necessary knowledge and skills to be effective, but its application is inconsistent. The employee performs the criterion at a level which indicates improved performance is necessary to meet standards. The employee demonstrates many of the descriptors with minimal proficiency and/or the application of many of the descriptors reflects some inconsistency or error.

Proficient Professional practice at the *Proficient* Level shows evidence of thorough knowledge of all aspects of the profession. Performance consistently meets a high quality standard. Certified staff at this level thoroughly know their content, students, how their students learn best and how to engage them. They know and follow the standards and establish a class environment that functions smoothly with little or no waste of instructional time. Expectations for student learning are high. They reflect on their instruction and use assessment to drive planning. This level refers to successful, professional teaching that is consistently at a high level. The employee demonstrates many of the descriptors consistently and without significant error. This is professional level service that meets the cooperative expectations and is consistent with experience level of the employee. It would be expected that most experienced teachers would perform at this level.

Excellent Professional practice at the *Excellent* Level is that of a master professional whose practice operates at a qualitatively different level from those other professional peers. Performance consistently meets an extremely high quality standard. Practice is at the highest level of expertise and commitment and student learning. Excellent staff engages in extensive, reflective personal and collaborative professional development. Excellent refers to professional teaching that innovatively involves students in the learning process and creates a true community of learners. Teachers performing at this level are master teachers and leaders in the field, both inside and outside their school. The employee performs the criterion at a level which exceeds the district standards. Service exceeds the typical standard of normal service and is held in high regard by supervision and colleagues. The employee demonstrates most of the descriptors consistently, accurately, and efficiently.

Observations

Evidence of professional practice shall be collected through the use of multiple observations that include formal and informal observations. Formal observations shall allow the qualified evaluator to acquire evidence of the teacher's planning, instructional delivery, and classroom management skills and shall involve one of the following activities:

- an observation of the teacher in his or her classroom for a minimum of 45 minutes at a time; or
- an observation during a complete lesson; or
- an observation during an entire class period.

The qualified evaluator may designate another person to conduct the observation in situations in which he or she cannot complete all of the observations, or the observations cannot be completed in a timely manner, provided the individual so designated is a qualified evaluator, thus having completed the prequalification process and any retraining, as applicable, required under Section 24A-3 of the School Code. Before the designee conducts the observation, the teacher/support specialist will be notified by

the designee or assigned qualified evaluator.
1. or each tenured teacher/support specialist who received either an "excellent" or "proficient" performance evaluation
rating in his or her last performance evaluation, a minimum of two observations are required during the cycle in which the current evaluation is conducted, one of which must be a formal observation.

2. For each tenured teacher/support specialist who received a "needs improvement" or "unsatisfactory" performance evaluation rating in his or her last performance evaluation, a minimum of three observations shall be required in the

Rating Professional Practice

Each indicator of professional practice shall have relative weights as follows:

25% - Planning & Preparation 25% - Classroom Environment / Environment 25% - Instruction / Delivery of Service 25% - Professional Responsibilities

In situations where there is no evidence for a component, it will be recorded as "no evidence." The lack of evidence due to the component being not applicable will not result in a zero score.

Unsatisfactory (1) Needs Improvement (2)
Proficient (3)
Excellent (4)

1-1.49
1.5-2.49
2.5-3.49
3.5+

Domain 1 Results

Professional Practice Domain 2 Results Domain 3 Results

2a) 0

3a)

Domain 4 Results

4a)

Domain 1
Domain 2
Domain 3
Domain 4

Average
0.00
Average
0.00
Average
0.00
Average
0.00

0.00

0.00

Domain 1 - Planning and Preparation Domain 2 - Classroom Environment (or Environment) Domain 3 - Instruction (or Delivery of Service) Domain 4 - Professional Responsibilities **Professional Practice Rating:**

0.00

0.00

0.00

Unsatisfactory

70%

0.00

US
Pone
Student Growth Component student success. Teachers are encouraged, but not mandated, to work with their teaching teams to develop SLOs and work toward meeting SLOs collaboratively.
See Appendix H for Student Learning Objective Template

Each Student Learning Objective (from template) will include the following components:
Learning goal Assessment Growth Targets Outcome Teacher Ratings

Element 1: Learning Goal: The learning goal is the all-encompassing essential focus or concept for the SLO. This focus is based on the teacher's knowledge of the essential understandings and skills that students should come to know and accomplish/demonstrate throughout the duration of the course based on **agreed upon professional standards**. After collecting baseline data on the learning goal, the SLO can be individualized based on student need(s).

Description of the Learning Goals: Describe what the students will be able to accomplish/demonstrate at the end of the specific period of time aligned to the appropriate standard(s). Explain the BIG IDEA.

1. Standard(s): List standard or standards to support your learning goal. Examples include Common Core Standards,
Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), College, Career, and Civic Live (C3), National Art Standards, Early Learning
Standards, Essential Learning Standards, etc. 2. Population: Describe the students that you are testing. This section may include the majority of the students (entire
class or grade level), or it may include a number of students within the identified student population (student subgroup).

a. The final measurement of student growth for purposes of the teacher's

summative evaluation rating may only include:

i. Students who are in attendance for at least 70% of the available instructional time ii. Students that have been administered both the pre- and post- assessments where performance data is available. b. Exceptions to the above criteria may be allowed based upon evaluator approval prior to posttest assessment. **3. Instructional Strategies**: List the teaching strategies you will use to teach the learning goal. Examples include large group instruction, small group instruction, individual instruction, cooperative learning, hands on activities, etc.

Element 2: Assessment: In accordance with PERA Guidelines, student growth is defined as demonstrable change in student learning at two or more points in time, as measured using two or more types of assessment identified as Types I, II, or III.

1. All teachers MUST use as least one Type III assessment, plus one Type I or one Type II assessment to measure student growth. If no Type I or II assessments are available, then two Type III assessments may be identified collaboratively by the teacher and evaluator.

a. Type I and Type II Assessments identified by the TCSE Committee are considered pre-approved. (See Appendix F for a list of approved assessments) b. Type III assessments shall be reviewed and evaluated by the teacher and evaluator. C. If the teacher and evaluator are unable to collaboratively agree on Type III assessments, Type III assessments will be determined by the qualified evaluator as specified in the PERA Guidelines.

b. The qualified evaluator's response (approval, recommended revisions, or denial) shall be attained in writing on or before September 30th. C. If the evaluator recommends revisions or denies the SLO(s), the teacher shall have 5 school days to resubmit the

SLO(s) with revisions. Upon receipt of the revised SLO(s), the evaluator shall have **5 school days** to either approve
the revised SLO(s) or draft the SLO(s) for the teacher. d. If SLOs are submitted on or before the September 15th deadline, and an evaluator does not respond on or
before September 30th, the evaluator is approving the SLOs and the teacher or teacher team may proceed with
the SLOs approved as written. e. If a teacher does not submit the required two SLOs on or before the September 15th deadline then the Student Growth rating shall be Unsatisfactory. f. Any deviation from the mandated timeline MUST BE approved by the qualified evaluator (e.g. maternity leave,
death in the family, etc.)

Mid-Course Adjustment of Student Learning Objectives

a. The teacher or teaching team will set and monitor SLOs based on information gathered and analyzed at the
beginning and end of the stated interval of instructional time. During this time, it is recommended that a teacher collect a variety of formal and informal formative assessment data to document student progress toward the SLOS. Approximately midway through the designated interval of instructional time, the teacher or teaching team will analyze the formative assessment data and give consideration to student progress toward the SLOs, and submit a written mid-course communication (Appendix H) addressing progress of SLOs to the
evaluator. C. The teacher or teaching team and qualified evaluator may determine whether an adjustment of the SLOS
are warranted and should provide a rationale for any adjustments. If the teacher and evaluator are unable to collaboratively agree on the need for any adjustments, the ultimate need for adjustment will be
determined by the qualified evaluator. d. The data the teacher collects for the written mid-course communication shall not be used to determine the performance evaluation rating for student growth, but may be used as evidence of professional practice for several components.

Final Evaluation Rating for the Student Growth Component

a. At the end of the stated interval of instructional time, the teacher or teaching team will gather post
performance data from the assessment measures and types as specified in the SLOs. b. The teacher or teaching team will compare the pre- and post-performance data and determine the extent
to which the SLOs have met for each assessment measure used. C. After the teacher and qualified evaluator have agreed on the summative rating for the student growth
component, that rating will be factored into the overall Performance Evaluation Rating at 30%. d. If the teacher and qualified evaluator are unable to collaboratively agree on the SLO Summative Evaluation Rating, the SLO Summative Evaluation Rating will be determined by the qualified evaluator.

Din.

Performance Evaluation Rating
Performance Evaluation Rating for Support Specialists

The overall performance evaluation rating for support specialists shall take into consideration the Professional Practice rating.

Timeline The overall performance evaluation rating must be completed by March 1.

Weighing **the Performance Evaluation Rating Components** The overall performance evaluation rating shall be determined by weighing the components of the performance evaluation as follows:

Professional Practice
100%

Evaluation Rating The overall evaluation rating shall be determined by using the following scale:

Unsatisfactory
Needs Improvement
Proficient
Excellent

1.0-1.49
1.5-2.49
2.5-3.49
3.5-4.0

Scores falling at or above .05% will be rounded up to the nearest 1/100.

Summative Evaluation Formula

Professional Practice Score: **Summative Evaluation Rating**
Example

Professional Practice Score: **Summative Evaluation Rating**
2.*78* Proficient

Consistency and Inter-rater Reliability

All qualified evaluators will meet at least once per quarter for the specific purpose of building consistency and inter-rater reliability amongst all qualified evaluators regarding the entire PERA process.

PERA Committee Meeting

The PERA committee will meet as needed, at least once per semester.
3. A written copy of the evaluations and ratings, in which any deficiencies in performance and recommendations for
correction are identified, shall be provided to and discussed with the teacher within ten (10) school days after the date
of the evaluation. 4. Participants in the remediation plan shall include the tenured teacher deemed Unsatisfactory, a qualified evaluator or evaluators, and a consulting certificated staff member (selected by the qualified evaluator). a. The participation of the consulting certified staff member shall be voluntary. b. The qualified consulting certified staff member shall be one who:
i) is an employee of JAMP, and ii) has received a rating of Excellent on

his/her most recent evaluation, and iii) has a minimum of five years' experience in the field, and
iv) has reasonable familiarity to the assignment of the individual under remediation. C. If no teachers meet these criteria within JAMP, JAMP shall request that the Regional Office of Education supply an
individual who meets the above criteria. d. The Association may, if it so chooses, supply a roster of qualified teachers from whom the consulting teacher is to be
selected. That roster shall, however, contain the names of at least 5 teachers, each of whom meets the criteria for consulting teacher with regards to the teacher being evaluated, or the names of all teachers who qualified if that
number is less than 5. In the event of a dispute as to qualification, the State Board shall determine qualification. e. If the consulting certified staff member becomes unavailable during the course of a remediation plan, a new
consulting certified staff member shall be selected in the same manner as the initial consulting staff member. f. The consulting certified staff member shall provide advice to the individual rated Unsatisfactory on how to improve
teaching skills and to successfully complete the remediation plan. g. The consulting certified staff member shall participate in developing the remediation plan, but shall not participate
in any of the required evaluations, nor be engaged to evaluate the performance of the individual under remediation. h. The consulting certified staff member shall be informed of the results of the evaluations in order to continue to
provide assistance to the individual under a remediation plan. This shall include at least a mid-point review and summative evaluation.

Possible Outcomes of the Remediation Plan Evaluations at the conclusion of the remediation process shall be separate and distinct from the required annual evaluations of teachers and shall not be subject to the guidelines and procedures relating to those annual evaluations. The qualified evaluator may, but is not required to use any of the forms found within this

evaluation plan.

1. If the teacher has corrected the performance areas and receives a rating of Proficient or Excellent, he or she will be
evaluated the following school year and then be reinstated to the regular evaluation schedule provided that evaluation results in a Proficient or Excellent rating.

2. If the tenured teacher fails to complete the remediation plan with a rating of Excellent or Proficient he or she shall be
dismissed in accordance with The Illinois School Code (105 ILCS 5/34-85c].
a. All evaluation data will be collected and controlled by the qualified evaluator. b. If a certificated staff member feels that a summative rating of Unsatisfactory is inaccurate or unjust, he or she
may submit a written response to the Director. The Director will make a final and binding decision regarding the rating after consultation with all parties concerned.
Evidence of Teaching Certified Teacher
JAMP SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES
Certified Teacher EVALUATION INSTRUMENT
Certified Staff
School Year:
Years' experience (including current year):

_
__Years in District:
Tenured:
Non-Tenured:
Teacher Attendance: (current year)
Evaluation Dates: Pre-conference
Classroom Visitation
Postconference
Evaluator Name & Status:
Evaluation Process: (Procedures used in evaluating staff):
Pre-conference meeting is held. Date and time established for evaluation.

Both parties agree to date and time and sign. Bargaining
Timeline is followed or employee can waive timeline. Employee is given a copy of evaluation instrument prior to evaluation.
Evaluation observation is completed
Evaluation feedback is given according to bargaining agreement timeline.
Remediation Activities are listed if teacher is **found unsatisfactory.**
Evidence of Teaching Certified Teacher
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation
Component *Ta: Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy*
Unsatisfactory(1) Tcacher's plans and practice display littlc knowledge of the content, prcrequisite relationships bclween different aspects of the content, or of the instructional practices specific to that discipline.
Needs Improvement(2), Teacher's plans and practice reflect some awareness of the important concepts in the disciplinc, prerequisite relations between them and of the instructional practices specific to that discipline
Proficient(3) Teacher's plans and practice reflect solid knowledge of the content, prerequisite relations between important concepts and of the instructional practices specific to that discipline
Excellent(4) Teacher's plans and practice reflect extensive knowlcdge of the content and of the structure of the discipline. Teacher actively builds on knowledge of prerequisitcs and misconceptions when describing instruction or sceking causes for student misunderstanding
Evidence: *Tb: Demonstrating knowledge of students*
Teacher demonstrates little or no knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special neds, and does not seek such understanding
Teacher indicates the importance of understanding students backgrounds, culturcs, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special nccds, and attains this knowledge for the class as a whole.
Teacher actively seeks knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficicncy, interests, and special needs, and attains this knowledge for groups of students.
Teacher actively sccks knowledge of students' backgrounds, cultures, skills, language proficiency, interests, and special nceds from a variety of sources, and attains this knowledge for individual students.

Evidence: *Ic: Serring instructional QUIIComes*
Instruclional outcomes are unsuitable for students, represent trivial or low-level learning, or arc stated only as activities. They do not permit viablc incthods of assessinent.
Instructional outcomes are of moderate rigor and are suitable for some students, but consist of a combination of activities and goals, some of which permit viablc niethods of assessment. They reflect more than one type of Icarning, but teacher makes no attempt at coordination or integralion.
Instructional outcomes are stated as goals reflecting high-level learning and curriculum standards. They arc suitable for most students in the class, represent different types of Icarning, and are capable of **asse**ssment. The outcomes reflect opportunities for coordination.
Instructional outcomes arc stated as goals that can be assessed, rcflccting rigorous Icarning and curriculum standards. They represent different lypes of content, offer opportunities for both coordination and integration, and takc account of the needs of individual students.
Evidence
Evidence of Teaching Certified Teacher
Component *Id: Demonstrating knowledge of I'csources*
Unsatisfactory(1) Tcachcr dcmonstrates littlc or no familiarity with resources to cnhance own knowledge, to use in teaching, or for students who need them. Tcacher does not scek such knowlcdge
Needs Improvement(2) Tcacher demonstrates some familiarity with resources available through the school or district lo cnhancc own knowledgc, lo usc in lcaching, or for students who nccd them. Tcacher does not scck to extend such knowledge
Proficient(3) Teacher is fully aware of the resources available through the school or district to enhance own knowledge, to use in tcaching, or for students who need thein.
Excellent(4) Teacher seeks out resources in and beyond the school or district in professional organizations, on the Internct, and in the community lo cnhance own knowlėdgc, lo usc in teaching, and for students who need them.
Evidence

1 *le: Designing*
coherent | instruction
The series of learning experiences arc poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes and do not represent a cohcrcnt structure. They arc suitable for only some students.
The series of learning experiences demonstrates partial alignment with instructional outcomes, some of which are likely to cngage students in significant Icarning. The lesson or unit has a recognizablc structurc and reflects partial knowledge of students and resources.
Tcacher coordinates knowledge of content, of students, and or resources, to design a serics of Icarning experiences aligned to instructional outcoincs and suitable to groups of students. The Icsson or unit has a clear structure and is likely to engage students in significant learning
Teacher coordinates knowledge of conlcnt, of students, and of resources, to design a scrics of learning cxperiences aligned to instructional outcomes, differentiated where appropriate to make them suitablc to all students and likely lo cngage them in significant Icarning. The lesson or unit's structure is clcar and allows for disfcrcnt pathways according to student nccds.
Evidence
lfi Designing student assessment
Teacher's plan for assessing student learning contains no clcar criteria or standards, is poorly aligned with the instructional outcomcs, or is inappropriatc to many students. Thc results of asscssment have minimal impact on the design of future instruction
Teacher's plan for student assessment is partially aligned with the instructional outcomes, without clcar criteria, and inappropriate for al Icast some students. Teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for futurc instruction for the class as a wholc.
Tcacher's plan for student assessment is aligncd with the | instructional outcomes, using clear
criteria, is appropriate to the needs of students. Teacher intends to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for groups of students.
Teacher's plan for student assessment is fully aligned with the instructional outcomes, with clear criteria and standards that show cvidence of student contribution lo their development. Assessment methodologics may have

been adapted for individuals, and the teacher intends to use assessment results to plan future instruction for individual students.
Evidence
Evidence of Teaching Certified Teacher
Domain 2: The Classroom Environment
Component *2a: Crealing an environment of respect and rapport*
Unsatisfactory(1) Classroom interactions, both between the tcacher and students and among students, arc ncgative, inappropriate, or insensitive to students' cultural backgrounds, and characlcrized by sarcasm, pul-downs, or consici.
Needs Improvement(2) Classroom interactions, both bctween the teacher and students and among students, arc gcncrally appropriate and free from conflict but may be characterized by occasional displays of inscnsitivity or lack of responsiveness to cultural or developmental diffcrcnccs among students.
Proficient(3) Classroom interactions, between tcacher and students and among students are politc and respectful, rcflccting gencral warmth and caring, and are appropriate to the cultural and developmental differences among groups of students.
Excellent(4) Classroom interactions among the tcacher and individual students arc highly respectful, reflecting genuine warmth and caring and sensitivity to students' cultures and levels of development. Students themselves ensure high levels of civility among members of the class.
Evidence:
2b: Establishing a culture for learning
The classroom environment conveys a negative culture for lcarning, characterized by low teacher commitment to the subject, low expectations for student achicvement, and little or no sludent pride in work.
Teacher's attempt to creato a culture for lcarning are partially successful, with little teacher comınilinent to the subjeci, modcst expectations for student achievement, and little student pride in work. Both tcacher and students appear to be only "going through the motions."
The classroom culture is characterized by high cxpectations for most students, genuinc commitment to the subject by both teacher and students, with students demonstrating pride in their work.

High levels of student energy and Icacher passion for the subject crcatc a culture for Icarning in which cveryone sharcs a belied in the importance of the subject, and all students hold themselves to high standards of performance, for cxamplc by initiating improvements to their work.
Evidence
2c: Managing classroom procedures
Much instructional timc is lost cluc lo inefficient classroom routines and procedures, for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional dulics.
Sonc instructional timc is lost due to only partially effective classroom routines and procedures, for transitions, handling of supplics, and performance of non-instructional dulics.
Little instructional time is lost due to Students contribute to the seamless classroom routines and procedures operation of classroom routincs and for transitions, handling of supplies, | procedures, for transitions, handling and performance of non-instructional of supplies, and performance of non dutics, which occur smoothly.
instructional dutics.
Evidence
Evidence of Teaching Certified Teacher
Component *2d: Managing student behavior*
Unsatisfactory(1) There is no evidence thal standards of conduct have been cstablished, and little or no Icacher monitoring of student behavior. Rcsponse lo student misbehavior is repressive, or disrespectful of student dignity
Needs Improvement(2) It appears that the teacher has made an cffort lo cstablish standards of conduct for students. Tcacher trics, with uncven results, to nionilor student behavior and respond to student misbchavior.
Proficient(3) Standards of conduct appcar to be clcar to students, and the teacher monitors student behavior against
those standards. Teacher response to | student misbchavior is appropriate and respects the students' dignity.
Excellent(4) Standards of conduct arc clear, with cvidcncc of student participation in setting them. Teacher's monitoring of student bchavior is subtle and preventive, and teacher's response lo student misbchavior is

sensitive to individual student needs. Students lake an active role in monitoring the standards of behavior.
Evidence
2e: Organizing physical space
The physical cnvironment is unsafc, or some students don't have access to learning. There is poor alignment between the physical arrangement and the lcsson activities.
The classroom is safe, and cssential lcarning is accessiblc to most students, and the lcacher's usc of physical resources, including computer icchnology, is moderately effective. Teacher may attempi lo modify the physical arrangement to suit lcarning activitics, with partial
The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; teacher cnsures that thc physical arrangement is appropriatc to the learning activities. Teacher makes effective use of physical resources, including computer technology
The classroom is safe, and the physical environment cnsures the lcarning of all students, including those with special nccds. Students contribute to the use or adaptation of the physical environment to advance lcarning. Technology is used skillfully, as appropriate to the lesson.
SUCCESS.
Evidence:
Evidence of Teaching Certified Teacher
Domain 3: Instruction
Component *3a: Communicating Clearly and Accurately*
Unsatisfactory(1) The instructional purposes of the lcsson is unclear lo students, and the directions and procedures arc confusing. Thc tcacher's vocabulary is inappropriate, vague, or used incorrectly, lcaving students confused.
Needs Improvement(2) The lcacher's attempt to explain thc instructional purpose has only limited success, and/or directions and procedures must bc clarificd after initial student confusion. The lcacher's cxplanation of the content may contain minor errors; some portions are clear, other portions are difficult to follow.
Proficient(3) The teacher clearly communicates instructional purpose of the lcsson. Explains procedures and directions cicarly. Teacher's spoken and

written language is clear and correct and uscs vocabulary appropriate to the students' ages and intcrest. During thc cxplanation of content, the teacher invitcs sludcnt intcllectual engagement.

Excellent(4) The tcacher links the instructional purposc of the lesson lo student interests; the directions and proccdurcs arc clcar and anticipate possible student misunderstanding. Thc tcacher's spokcn and written language is expressive, and the tcacher finds opportunitics to cxtend students' vocabularics.

Evidence:

3h: Questioning and Discussion Tecluriques

Tcacher's questions are of low cognitive challenge, rcquircs single correct responses and arc asked in rapid succession. A few students dominate the discussion. Interaction between teacher and students is predominantly recitation style with tcacher mediating all questions and **answers.**

| Teacher's questions lead student through a single path of inquiry, with answers sccmingly determined in advance. The lcacher attempts to frame some questions designed to promote student thinking and understanding, but only a few students are involved. Teacher atteinpts to engage all students in the discussion and to encourage them to respond to onc another, but with uncven results.

The tcacher uses somnc low-level questions that arc dcsigncd to promolc thinking and understanding. Teachcr crcatcs a genuinc discussion among students, providing adequate time for students to respond and stepping aside when appropriate. Teacher successfully engages most students in the discussion, employing a range of strategies to ensure that most students arc hcard.

Teacher uscs a scrics of questions or prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high level thinking and discoursc, and promouc mctacognition. Students formulate many qucstions, initiatc topics, and makc unsolicited contributions. Students thicinselvcs cnsurc that all voices arc hcard in the discussion.

Evidence 3*c: Engaging Students in Learning*

Thc lcarning tasks and activitics, matcrials, resources, instructional groups arc poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes or rcquirc only rolc responses. The pacc of thc lcsson is too slow or too rushed. Few students

are intellcctually cngaged,

The learning tasks and activitics arc partially aligned with thc instructional outcomes but require only minimal thinking by students, allowing most to be passivc. The pacing of the lcsson may not provide students the timc necded to be intellectually cngaged.

| The learning tasks and activities are aligned with the instructional outcomes and designed to challenge student thinking, the result being that most students display active intellectual cngagement with important and challenging content and arc supported in that cngagement by tcacher scaffolding. Thc pacing of the lesion is appropriale, providing most students the time needed to be intellectually engaged.

Virtually all students are intellectually engaged in challenging content through well-designed learning tasks and suitable scaffolding by the tcacher and fully aligned with the instructional outcomes. In addition, there is cvidencc of some student initiation of inquiry and of student contribution to the exploration of important content. Thc pacing of thc lesson provides students the time needed to intcllcctually cngage with and reflect upon their learning and to consolidate their understanding. Students have some choice in how they completc tasks and may serve as resources for one another.

Evidence:

Evidence of Teaching Certified Teacher

3d: Using Assessment in Instruction

Assessment is not used in instruction, cither through students' awareness of the assessment criteria, monitoring of progress by teacher or students, or through feedback to students.

Assessment is occasionally used in instruction, through some monitoring of progress of learning by leacher and/or students. Feedback to students is uncven, and students are aware of only some of the assessment criteria used to evaluate their work

Assessment is regularly uscd in instruction, through self-assessment by students, monitoring of progress of lcarning by teacher and/or students, and through high quality feedback to students. Students are sully aware of the assessment criteria used to evalualc thcir work.

Assessment is used in a sophisticated manner in instruction, through student involvement in establishing the assessment criteria, self assessment by students and monitoring of progress by both students and teachers, and high quality feedback to students from a varicty of sources.
Evidence:

3e: Demonstrating Nexibility, and responsiveness

Tcacher adheres to the instruction plan, even when a change would improve the lesson or of students lack of interest. Tcacher brushes asidc student questions; when students cxpcricncc difficully, the cacher blames thic sludents or thcir loinc cnvironment.

Teacher allempls to modify the lesson when nccded and to respond to student questions, with moderate success. Teacher accepts responsibility for student success, but has only a limited repertoire of strategies to draw upon.

Teacher promotes the successful lcarning of all students, making adjustments as needed to instruction plans and accommodating student questions, nceds and interests.

Tcacher scizes an opportunity to cnhance learning, building on a spontancous cvcnt or student intcrests. Tcacher ensures the success of all students, using an extensive repertoire of instructional strategies.
Evidence
Evidence of Teaching Certified Teacher
Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities
Component *4a: Reflecting on Teaching*
Unsatisfactory(1) Tcacher does not accurately a**ssess** thc cffectiveness of the lcsson, and has no icicas about how the lesson could bc improved.
Needs Improvement(2) Tcacher provides a partially accurate and objective description of the lesson, but docs not cite specific cvidence. Tcacher makes only general suggestions as to how thc lesson might be improved.
Proficient(3) Teacher provides an accurate and objective description of the lesson, ciling specific cvidcncc. Teacher makes some specific suggestions as to how the lesson might be improved
Excellent(4) Teacher's reflection on the lesson is thoughtful and accurate, citing specific evidence. Teacher draws on an extensive repertoire to suggest alternative stratcgics and predicting thc likely success of each.

Evidence

itt: Maintaining ilccurate Records

Teacher's systems for maintaining both instructional and non instructional records are either non cxistcnt or in disarray, resulting in crrors and consusion.

Teacher's systems for maintaining both instructional and non instructional records are rudimentary and only partially successful.

Teacher's systems for maintaining both instructional and non instructional records are accurate, efficient and successful.

Students contribute to the maintenance of the systems for maintaining both instructional and non-instructional records, which are accurale, efficient and successful.

Evidence

40:Communicating with Families

Tcacher communication with families, about the instructional program, or about individual students, is sporadic or culturally inappropriate. Teacher makes no allempl to engage families in the instructional program.

Teacher adheres to school procedures for communicating with families and makes modcst attempts to engage families in the instructional program. But communications are not always appropriaic to the cullurcs of those families.

Teacher communicates frequently with families and successfully engages them in the instructional program. Information to families about individual students is conveyed in a culturally appropriatc manner.

Tcacher's communication with families is frequent and sensitive to cultural traditions; sludents participate in the communication. Tcacher successfully cngages familics in the instructional program; as appropriate.

Evidence

Evidence of Teaching Certified Teacher

Component *4d: Participating in a Professional Community*

Unsatisfactory(1) Teacher avoids participating in a professional community or in school and district events and projccis; relationships with colleagues are negative or sellscrving

Needs Improvement(2) Teacher becomes involved in the professional community and in school and district cvents and projects when specifically askcd; relationships with collcagues are cordial.

Proficient(3) Tcacher participates actively thc professional community, and in school and district cvents and projects, and maintains positive and productive relationships with collcagucs.

Excellent(4) Teacher makcs a substantial contribution to the professional community, to school and district events and projects, and assumes a leadership rolc among the faculty.

Evidence

4e: Growing and Developing Professionally

Teacher docs not participate in professional development activities, and makes no effort to share knowledge with colleagues. Teacher is resistant to fccdback from supervisors or collcagucs.

'Tcacher participates in professional development activitics that are convenient or are required, and makes limited contributions to the profession. Teacher accepts, with some reluctance, feedback from supervisors and colleagues

Teacher sceks out opportunities for professional development based on an individual assessment of need, and actively sharcs expertise with others. Teacher welcomes feedback from supervisors and colleagues.

Teacher actively pursues professional development opporlunities, and initiates activitics to contribute to the profession. In addilion, teacher sccks out feedback from supervisors and colleagues.

Evidence

4f: Demonstrating Professionalism

Teacher has little sense of cthics and professionalism, and contributes to practiccs that are self-serving or harinful to students. Tcacher fails to comply with school and district rcgulations and timelincs

Teacher is honest and well intentioned in serving students and contributing to decisions in the school, but teacher's altempts to serve students arc limited. Teacher complies minimally with school and district regulations, doing just enough to "get by."

Teacher displays a high level of cthics and professionalism in dealings with both students and collcagucs, and complics fully and voluntarily with school and district regulations. Tcacher complies fully with school and district regulations.

| Teaclicr is proactive and assumes a

Icadership role in cnsuring the highcst cthical standards, and sccing that school practices and procedures ensure that all students, particularly those traditionally underserved, are honored in the school. Teacher takes a Icadership role in sccing that collcagucs comply with school and district regulations.

Evidence
Evidence of Teaching Certified Teacher
Evaluation Summary Page
Teacher's name:
School year:
School:
Subject area:
Evaluator:
Position:
RATINGS ON INDIVIDUAL RUBRICS:
A. Planning and Preparation (total)
Unsatisfactory
Needs Improvement
Proficient
Excellent
B. Classroom Environment (total)
Needs Improvement
Proficient
Excellent
Unsatisfactory C. Instruction (total)
Unsatisfactory
Needs Improvement
Proficient
Excellent
D. Professional Responsibilities (total)
Unsatisfactory
Needs Improvement
Proficient
Excellent
Evaluator's signature:

Date:
Teacher's signature:
Date:
OR
TAUP SPIDUAL IDDICATION SERVICES Teacher Evaluation Plan
panason Bate Dom Teacher Name
Position Evaluator
Date of Eval. School Year: Observation Dates:

Professional Practice Results
Student Growth

Domain 1 Domain 2 Domain 3 Domain 4
# of students in Assessment # 1 # of students in Assessment #2
Total # of Students
1a)
2a)
3a)
4a).
1b)
2b)
3b)
40
1c).
2c)
3c).
2d).
3*d*)
ze)
4e)
# of students who met Assessment # 1 target # of students who met Assessment #2 target
Total # of student who met targets
2f)

3e). 3f). 3g)__
2g)

_
4g)
Percentage of students that met targets
Domain Averages Domain 2 Domain 3
Domain 1
Domain 4
Domain 1 - Planning and Preparation Domain 2 - Classroom Environment
Domain 3 - Instruction Domain 4 - Professional Responsibilities
Professional Practice Rating Student Growth Rating
Professional Practice Rating Scale

Unsatisfactory = 1.0-1.49 Needs Improvement = 1.5-2.49

Proficient = 2.5-3.49 Excellent = 3.5-4.0

Professional Practice Rating X.70 =. Student Growth Rating X.30 =
Professional Practice + Student Growth = Overzi! Paluecon scora, Overal valueden Rating

Student Growth Rating Much Less Than Target = 1

Less than Target = 2 At or Slightly Above Target = 3

Much Above Target = 4

PERA Joint Committee/Evaluation Requirements Summary

Performance Evaluation Reform Act

Patrick Durley - durleyp@roe17.org

Part 50 Rules - ISBE 23 ILLINOIS ADMINISTRATIVE CODE 50
8/31 Joint Statement - IASA, IPA, IEA, IFT
9/21 ISBE Update

PERA Part 50 Rules establish the minimum requirements for the establishment of valid and reliable performance evaluation systems for employees who hold a professional educator license endorsed in a teaching or administrative field and are serving as a teacher, principal or assistant principal. The PERA Joint Committee is the decision-making vehicle.

PERA Joint Committee

Charged with the development of, and continual assessment and modification (if necessary) of the District Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan

"Joint committee" means a committee *composed of equal representation selected by the district and its teachers or, when applicable, the exclusive bargaining representative of its teachers*, which shall have the duties set forth in this Part regarding the **establishment of a performance evaluation plan** that *incorporates data and indicators of student growth as a significant factor in rating teacher performance*. (Section 24A-4 of the School Code)

Determine if your PERA Joint Committee Agreement/Teacher Performance Evaluation Plan is connected to your CBA (Collective Bargaining Agreement). This can impact the ease or difficulty of making changes.

Know your PERA Joint Committee Agreement inside and out!! If it says you must, or cannot, do something… then follow that. If it doesn't say you can't, then determine what is acceptable based on situational need and school/district culture/expectation.

Regardless of the CBA connection, some elements might still need to be collectively bargained.

Must meet annually - Public Act 100-768, Effective 1-1-19

HB0018 (Eff. 9/1/22) - Tenured Prof & Excellent may go 3 years between Evaluations - Informal Ob w/in 2 years, Informal Observation Plan, Still do Growth

New Tenure Law – Pritzger Signed Aug. 4: Public Act 103-0500 (SB1872)

Any plan requirement in PERA Part 50 Rules that cannot be agreed upon by the PERA Joint Committee will default to the State Model

Teacher Evaluation Student Growth

Establish/determine Student Growth assessments and/or processes (minimum 30% of summative evaluation rating and at least 2 assessments)

- Type I and a Type III **OR**
- Type II and a Type III **OR**
- Two Type III (a Type I or II may be considered a Type III if it aligns directly with curriculum being taught and measures student learning in that subject area (see Section 50.110(b)(2)).

The joint committee shall identify a measurement model for each type of assessment and shall employ multiple data points. Assessments used for each data point (Ex. pre/post) in a measurement model may be different provided that they address the same instructional content.

The **joint committee shall identify the specific Type I or Type II** assessment to be used for each category of teacher.

The evaluation plan shall require that at least one Type III assessment be used for each category of teacher. If the Joint Committee determines that neither a Type I nor a Type II assessment can be identified, then the evaluation plan shall require that at least two Type III assessments be used.

- The plan shall state the **general nature of any Type III** assessment chosen (e.g., teacher-created assessments, assessments designed by textbook publishers, student work samples or portfolios, assessments of student performance, and assessments designed by staff who are subject or grade-level experts that are administered commonly across a given grade or subject area in a school) and describe the process and criteria the qualified evaluator and teacher will use to identify or develop the specific Type III assessment to be used.

Midpoint Conference for Student Growth (must be held/offered)

- Joint Committee identifies a uniform process to occur at the middle of the evaluation cycle
    - The data the teacher collects shall not be used to determine the evaluation rating - discussion and adjustment purposes
    - The teacher should use the data to assess his or her progress and adjust instruction if necessary

- JC shall consider how certain student characteristics shall be used for each model chosen - ensure that they best measure the impact a teacher, school, and district have on students' academic achievement

Minimum Teacher Evaluation Plan requirements:

- Tenured (Continual Contractual Service) Teacher
  - Excellent or Proficient Rating
    - At least 1 formal and 1 informal observation every 2 years (***or 3 if PERA JC changing by Sept 1, 2022 - HB0018***)
  - Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory Rating
    - Evaluated in the next year
    - At least 2 formal and 1 informal observation
- Non-tenured (Probationary/Non-Continual Contractual Service) Teacher
  - At least 2 formal and 1 informal observation every year
- Formal Observations
  - ***Require*** a pre-conference
    - Written lesson/unit plan or other evidence of planning for evaluator focus in advance of the conference
    - Discussion of the lesson plan or unit plan or instructional planning
  - After the formal observation, meet to discuss evidence, provide feedback
- Informal Observations
  - Evaluator provides oral or written feedback
  - If written, evaluator provides the opportunity to discuss in-person
- If written feedback and in-person discussion takes place
  - Teacher reflection w/ additional information if appropriate
  - Evaluator feedback about professional practice
  - **IF evidence collected to date may lead to NI or Unsatisfactory Performance Evaluation Rating (*summative*), evaluator MUST notify the teacher of that**
  - Teacher must work w/ evaluator or others, according to the PERA Joint Committee agreement, to identify areas for improvement
  - Informal Observation evidence may be considered for the performance evaluation rating IF documented in writing

NOTIFICATION REMINDER: Start of the School Year (1st day of student attendance)

- the school district shall provide a written notice (either electronic or paper) that a performance evaluation will be conducted in that school term to each teacher affected or, if the affected teacher is hired after the start of the school term, then no later than 30 days after the contract is executed. The written notice shall include:

  1) a copy of the rubric to be used to rate the teacher against identified standards and goals and other tools to be used to determine a performance

evaluation rating;

2) a summary of the manner in which measures of student growth and professional practice to be used in the evaluation relate to the performance evaluation ratings of "excellent", "proficient", "needs improvement", and "unsatisfactory" as set forth in Sections 24A-5(e) and 34-85c of the School Code; and

3) a summary of the district's procedures related to the provision of professional development in the event a teacher receives a "needs improvement" or remediation in the event a teacher receives an "unsatisfactory" rating to include evaluation tools to be used during the remediation period.

4) Any professional development provided as part of a professional development or remediation plan under Section 24A-5 of the School Code shall align to **Standards for Professional Learning (2022) published by Learning Forward**, 504 South Locust Street, Oxford, Ohio 45056 and posted at http://www.learningforward.org/standards/index.cfm.

Principal/Asst. Principal Evaluation

When do I have to evaluate Principals and Assistant Principals?
105 ILCS 5/24A-15 - **Effective 5/6/22**

- **Single Year Contract:** Must evaluate by March 1st each year.
- **Multi-year Contract:** Must evaluate by March 1st of the final year of the contract.

The evaluation plan shall consider/identify

- The Principal's or Assistant Principal's specific duties, responsibilities, management and competence in those positions
- Performance Goals
- Who will evaluate the Principal/Asst.
- For a Superintendent/Principal - evaluator is chosen by the Board (and can't be that person - duh)
- No later than March 1 for completion

Student Growth - at least 30%

Notification of Evaluation to the Principal

- 1st Day of student attendance
- If hired after the start of school, must be within 30 days of the contract signing
- Must include:
    - Rubric used to rate student growth and professional practice
    - Summary (rubric) of how student growth and professional practice

relate to Excellent, Proficient, NI, and U

Meet by Oct. 1 each year and...

- Set student growth models and targets
  - If you can't agree, the evaluator sets them
- Set professional growth goals
  - Based on the previous year's performance eval
  - If you can't agree, the evaluator sets them
- Inform the Principal/Asst. Principal of the assessments, measurement models, and targets for Student Growth
  - 2 Assessments from Type I or II that meet the definition of student growth
  - May use two Type III **only** if majority of students don't take a Type I or II
  - Individual assessment results will be used in the model of any student if 2 points in time were measured - **BUT** like for teachers, the district considers how certain student characteristics shall be used for each assessment and target chosen
  - End point is is the most recent assessment administration
- Asst. Principal Growth
  - May use measures aligned with their duties - Ex:
    - Attendance
    - Discipline
    - Etc.

No later than February 1

- Principal/Asst. Principal completes a self-assessment
  - Aligned to the rubric
  - Shall be used as one input for determining Professional Practice rating

When complete, **no later than March 1**, meet and

- Inform them of the ratings for student growth and professional practice components and also the final rating
- Discuss evidence used to make the determination
- Discuss strengths and areas of growth

Professional Practice for Principals/Asst. Principals

- Minimum 50% of the summative rating
- Instrument must align to the Illinois Standards for Principals
- Minimum 2 formal observations (no limit on informal)
  - Directly observe the administrators interactions and activities during the work day - any day in which the principal or assistant principal is contractually obligated to work, regardless of whether students are present.
  - Observation scheduled in advance and have at least 1 objective

- Written feedback no later than 10 work days after formal observation
- Share other evidence/information that could negatively impact the rating (Ex. parent complaints)

- Must inform them how evidence will be used to establish Prof. Practice rating

Definitions

"Performance evaluation plan" means a plan to evaluate a teacher, principal, or assistant principal that includes data and indicators on student growth as a significant factor in judging performance, measures the individual's professional practice, and meets the requirements of Article 24A of the School Code and this Part.

Type I	Type II	Type III
An assessment that measures a certain group of students in the same manner with the same potential assessment items, is scored by a non-district entity, and is widely administered beyond Illinois	An assessment developed or adopted and approved by the school district and used on a district-wide basis that is given by <u>all teachers in a given grade or subject area</u>	An assessment that is rigorous, aligned with the course's curriculum, and that the evaluator and teacher determine measures student learning
Examples: Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) MAP tests, Scantron Performance Series	*Examples: Collaboratively developed common assessments, curriculum tests, assessments designed by textbook publishers*	*Examples: teacher-created assessments, assessments of student performance*

A Type I or Type II assessment may qualify as a Type III assessment if it aligns to the curriculum being taught and measures student learning in that subject area

- <u>Student Learning Objective (SLO) consists of</u>
  - Learning goal
  - Assessment and procedures to measure that goal
  - Growth expectation

"Student growth" means a demonstrable change in a student's or group of

students' knowledge or skills, as evidenced by gain and/or attainment on two or more assessments, between two or more points in time.

"Formal observation" means a specific window of time that is scheduled with the teacher, principal, or assistant principal for the qualified evaluator, at any point during that window of time, to directly observe professional practices in the classroom or in the school. (Also see Sections 50.120(c) and 50.320(c).)

"Informal observation" means observations of a teacher, principal, or assistant principal by a qualified evaluator that are not announced in advance of the observation and not subject to a minimum time requirement.

Links:

Part 50 Rules
Tenured Teacher Dismissal Requirements - 105 ILCS 5/24-16.5.
Evaluation Plan Development - Code Citation
ISBE PERA/PEAC Page
8/31 Joint Statement - IASA, IPA, IEA, IFT
9/21 ISBE Update

JAMP SPECIAL EDUCATION JOINT COMMITTEE PERTAINING TO EVALUATION APPEALS

Public Act 101-591 (Senate Bill 1213) requires the Performance Evaluation Reform Act ("PERA") Joint Committee composed of equal representation selected by the school board and its teachers or, if applicable, the exclusive bargaining representative of its teachers, annually, and at least once during the 2021-2022 school year to address the requirement that the joint committee shall determine the criteria for successful appeals of unsatisfactory evaluations.

The law, at 24A-5.5 of the *Illinois School Code* (105 ILCS 24A-5.5) requires the following:

> Beginning with the first school year following the effective date of this amendatory Act of the 101st General Assembly, each school district shall, in good faith cooperation with its teachers or, if applicable, through good faith bargaining with the exclusive bargaining representative of its teachers, develop and implement an appeals process for "unsatisfactory" ratings under Section 24A-5 that includes, but is not limited to, an assessment of the original rating by a panel of qualified evaluators agreed to by the joint committee referred to in subsection (b) of Section 24A-4 [the PERA Joint Committee] that has the power to revoke the "unsatisfactory" rating it deems to be erroneous. The joint committee shall determine the criteria for successful appeals; however, the issuance of a rating to replace an "unsatisfactory" rating must be determined through bargaining between the exclusive bargaining representative, if any, and the school district.

The Joint Committee established by JAMP Special Education is composed of the following members appointed by the Executive Board:

Kim Clayton, Dr.Greg Frehner

and the following members appointed by the SAMPLE Education Association:

Heather Jones, Karen Cox, Lynn Graves, and Cindy Parmley

The Committee met on the following dates(s):

September 24, 2021

The Joint Committee has addressed the following matters as set forth in the statute:

The membership of the panel of qualified evaluators ("POQE") for appeal of a summative evaluation rating of unsatisfactory*:

JAMP Director

JAMP Supervisor

JAMP Dean of Students

***Note:** The statute is silent about the number of qualified evaluators that need to be on the committee – all lines need *not* be filled. The Joint Committee may wish to establish *position titles* rather than persons for this purpose (because if the committee establishes names only, this committee will have to meet again at least annually to re-establish roles). Members of the POQE must be qualified evaluators as defined by Section 24A-3 of the *Illinois School Code*.

The criteria for successful appeals of unsatisfactory evaluations:

The POQE shall apply the criteria determined by the PERA Joint Committee for teacher evaluations in the District, including both professional practice and student growth components; and the POQE shall have the power to revoke an "Unsatisfactory" rating it deems erroneous. If the POQE revokes an "Unsatisfactory" rating, the rating shall be replaced with a "Needs Improvement" rating unless the POQE unanimously finds that another rating is appropriate. (standard of review).

The statute (105 ILCS 5/24A-5.5) also requires the development and implementation of an appeals process, which process must be collectively bargained with the collective bargaining committee. The bargaining committee established by JAMP Special Education is composed of the following members appointed by the Board:

Dr.Greg Frehner, Brad Misner, Joe Nighswander, and Kim Clayton

---

and the following members appointed by the SAMPLE Education Association:

Heather Jones, Karen Cox, Anthony Davison, and Eric Jones

The Committee met on the following dates(s):

___September 24, 2021___.

The following is hereby established by the bargaining committee as the process for appeals of Unsatisfactory Summative Evaluation ratings:

1. Appeal of Unsatisfactory evaluation shall be filed within 10 days of issuance of a summative rating of Unsatisfactory. Appeals not timely filed are waived.

2. The Appeal of Unsatisfactory evaluation shall be delivered to the Superintendent in writing.

3. The Appeal of Unsatisfactory evaluation shall be accompanied by the following documentation:

- A letter identifying the evaluation summative rating of Unsatisfactory is being appealed.
- A copy of the evaluation.
- A copy of any prior evaluation the evaluatee wishes to be considered.
- A copy of any additional evidence the evaluate wishes to be considered.

4. The POQE shall convene at least once not later than 30 days (not more than 30 days) of receipt of the appeal of the evaluation summative rating of Unsatisfactory.

5. The POQE shall have the power, exercised or not-exercised at the POQE's exclusive discretion, to revoke the "unsatisfactory" rating it deems to be erroneous, and shall have the following power (but not responsibility), which the POQE may choose to or not to use in the exclusive discretion of the POQE, without limitation:

- To collect, review, and command provision of additional evidence as it deems necessary to complete its task;

- To require additional evaluation, with or without specific directives to the evaluator;
- The decision of the POQE shall be final.

6. Upon its decision, the POQE shall issue a written decision evidencing its ruling.

7. The issuance of a rating to replace an "unsatisfactory" rating must be determined through bargaining between the exclusive bargaining representative, if any, and the school district. The Bargaining Committee has determined that *if the POQE revokes an "Unsatisfactory" rating, the rating shall be replaced with a "Needs Improvement" rating unless the POQE unanimously finds that another rating is appropriate*. The parties agree that this agreement meets the requirement to collectively bargain the determination of any replacement rating..

8. The time for the development of a remediation plan shall be tolled from the date the appeal is filed with the Superintendent until the date the PQOE issues its written decision.

The members of the PERA Joint Committee agree that the foregoing is an accurate description of the types of discussions of the Committee and reflects any agreements which have been reached by the Committee.

Name	Date
Name	Date
Name	Date
Name	Date

The members of the Collective Bargaining Committee agree that the foregoing is an accurate description of the types of discussions of the Committee and reflects any agreements which have been reached by the Committee.

Name	Date
Name	Date