



# Sheridan Community Schools Professional Staff Evaluation Plan (S-PSEP)

## Selected Plan

Sheridan Community Schools (SCS) has chosen to adopt the RISE 3.0 State Evaluation Model as our professional staff evaluation plan.

## Sheridan Community Schools Model on Teacher Evaluation

A committee of Sheridan teachers and administrators spent the 2012-2013 school year working through the RISE model and made meaningful changes that made this evaluation system considered a local model that was adapted from the RISE evaluation system. The committee met again throughout the 2015-2016 school year to revisit the plan. Based on feedback and collaborative discussions, revisions were made to the 2012-2013 locally adaptive RISE plan to meet state law. The revisions resulted in the 2016-2017 Sheridan Profession Staff Evaluation Plan being a locally modified RISE model. With the introduction of the State Evaluation Model RISE 3.0 in the summer of 2020, SCS administrators met and reviewed the State's revised model. The administrative team in discussion with the teachers' association leadership representatives, agreed to adopt the State Evaluation Model 3.0 plan without modifications, and utilize the option 2 weighted measures for summative teacher evaluation rating. The decision to adopt the State Evaluation Model RISE 3.0 aligns with our district goals with the intent to make this evaluation process as effective, impactful, and equitable on our staff so that outstanding teaching can result in outstanding learning.

The Sheridan Professional Staff Evaluation Plan is posted on the district website and submitted to the IDOE annually, where it is posted on the IDOE website with several supporting resources for teachers and evaluators. The plan is reviewed annually by administrators and discussed with the association's teacher representatives for possible changes for the following year. It was agreed upon that SCS would continue with the RISE 3.0 S-PSEP v.2020 for the current school year. Following discussions with the teachers' representatives and review with professional staff at beginning of this school year, the plan was explained to the Sheridan Board of Trustees in a public hearing as per IC 20-28-11.5-4 (e) (1) and (2) held on September 12, 2022.

## Section 1: Basic Evaluation Procedures

### Evaluated Staff Members

- 1.1 SCS will evaluate all certificated employees, including teachers, administrators, counselors, etc. annually. The SCS professional staff evaluation process applies to all the following:
  - classroom teachers (SPED teachers use TER with SPED additions)
  - counselors, certified media specialist, technology integration specialist, technology director, athletic director, curriculum director, (use specialized rubrics)
  - principals/assistant principals (use principal rubric and assistant principal rubric without optional competencies)
  - superintendent (evaluated by Board using the legally compliant ISBA/IAPSS superintendent master rubric)
- 1.2 SCS Athletic Director administers extra-curricular activities and will evaluate all head coaches and conduct

a performance review with each annually. Under the direction of the athletic director, head coaches will conduct performance reviews for their assistance coaches. Coaching performance reviews are not eligible for performance pay under IC 20-28-9.

- 1.3 Technology network personnel, clerical staff, instructional assistants, elementary and middle school media specialists, are not required to hold a teaching license for their positions (although they may happen to hold one). They are not evaluated using SCS Professional Staff Evaluation Plan, nor eligible for performance pay under IC 20-28-9. These employees' direct supervisors will conduct performance reviews annually using the paraprofessional evaluation form.
- 1.4 Substitute teachers, including those with licenses covering long-term leaves, serve on a per diem basis. They are not evaluated using SCS Professional Staff Evaluation Plan nor eligible for performance pay under IC 20-28-9.

## Evaluators

- 1.5 The established evaluators are the superintendent, building level administrators, principals, assistant principals, and the special education director all of whom have completed the Wabash Valley Educational Center (WVEC), Standard for Success (SFS) Evaluator training, or from an evaluation trainer appointed by the district superintendent. All evaluators have attended district evaluation orientation.
- 1.6 Each administrator will act as the sole primary evaluator; however, in certain circumstances a secondary evaluator may conduct one of the two short observation. The evaluator staff assignments will be determined annually by rotating staff between the principal and assistant principal where applicable. For staff having shared duties among buildings, a primary and secondary evaluator from each building will be assigned. An employee may have the same evaluator for two or more consecutive years. Evaluating team members will have a balanced caseload when at all possible.

**SCS Trained Evaluators:** Mary Roberson, Superintendent; Rick Davis, Principal; Melissa Hampton, Dean of Students (Asst. Principal); Kent Davis, Principal; Dean Welbaum, Principal; Valerie Roberts, Asst. Principal; Steve Dollahan, Director of Student Services and Special Education

## Evaluation Process and Procedures

- 1.7 All certificated evaluated employees will be in a one common category
  - Common Category 1 - Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring
    - 100% EER (Employee Effectiveness Rubric)
- 1.8 Each employee will be assigned a primary evaluator that will be collecting evidence on his/her work and professional practice. The primary evaluator will conduct at least one extended observation and two short observations (one per semester). If a secondary evaluator is assigned to an employee, the secondary evaluator will conduct one of the two short observations. Evaluators will provide feedback as shown below:
  - Short observation - *minimum* of 10 minutes by evaluator, maybe announced or unannounced, written feedback uploaded within two school days of observation
  - Extended observations - 40+ minutes by evaluator, written feedback uploaded, and conference held within five school days after observation. Either the Primary evaluator or the teacher may request additional observations as needed



- Administrator walk-throughs - may take place but will not be calculated in a staff member’s finalized summative rating
- 1.9 Evidence collected during observations will be recorded and linked to indicators on the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric using SCS’s adopted evaluation software tool (Standard for Success) and uploaded to the employee’s account for viewing. Evidence for an observation will consist of script, coded rubric sections applicable to scripted evidence, and comments offering additional actionable feedback or coaching specific to any area coded as needing improvement or ineffective. Artifacts may also be uploaded by either a staff member or administrator and tied to the rubric. Prior to the extended observation, the teacher will upload the lesson plan the evaluator will be observing as an artifact in SFS prior to the agreed upon time.
- NOTE: Evaluators have been trained to add the following information in the Comment section of the observation report after coding the script to the TER:
- During this observation I noticed the following strengths... (tied to rubric indicators)
  - During this observation I noticed you can improve upon (1-2 development areas tied to rubric indicators)
  - The proposed action steps for improvement are... (1-2 specific and measurable action steps per development area)
  - We will follow up on this by... (timeline/next steps) ... (might state that in the next observation you’d like to see signs of X in the script but might offer further conversation, support, etc.)
- 1.10 In accordance with guidance from the Indiana Department of Education, certain employee groups (i.e. those who are not classroom teachers) have allowable modifications to either the rubric being used for their evaluations or the procedures for gathering student learning measures or observation evidence. The procedures for those unique employee groups are detailed in the chart in APPENDIX C.
- 1.11 The proposed timeline for the SCS evaluation process for this school year is included in APPENDIX D.

## Section 2: Summative Evaluation Procedures and Human Resources Procedures

- 2.1 At the end of the school year, each primary evaluator will examine evidence from observations with the EER. Considering mode and trends in the evidence collected for each indicator, the evaluator will use his/her judgment to assign a final score for each domain on the rubric, weight according to the rubric domain weights subtract .25 for each Core Professionalism standard not met, and determine a final score for the EER of the summative evaluation. The final score will place the employee in one of four categories: 4-3.5 Highly Effective | 3.49 – 2.50 Effective | 2.49 – 1.75 Improvement Necessary | <1.75 Ineffective
- 2.2 Final summative ratings can be modified if the teacher is determined to have had a negative impact on student achievement as determined by SCS’s local definition for negative impact on student achievement.

### Negative Impact Defined

- 2.3 *SCS is waiting for further guidance from the IDOE concerning the RISE 3.0 model and Negative Impact*
- Locally Defined Negative Impact for all Teachers  
 Negative Impact is characterized by a teacher achieving an EER summative rating at or below Improvement Necessary two consecutive years.
- 2.4 Finalized performance ratings for each employee will be recorded and archived on the summary evaluation

form in the SFS software. District analysis of these ratings can be done using the software to disaggregate data across schools, evaluators, and other data fields, and data can be compared across school years.

- 2.5 Summative final rating will be discussed in the EOY conference. Each employee receives an email notice whenever his/her SFS account changes, so he/she can review the final performance data and summary rating and schedule a follow-up meeting with his/her primary evaluator if desired.
- 2.6 If a certificated employee receives a rating of ineffective or improvement necessary, the evaluator and the certificated employee shall develop a remediation plan of not more than ninety (90) school days in length at the start of the next school year to correct the deficiencies noted in the certificated employee's evaluation using locally-developed forms to document the plan and progress monitoring. The plan will include options for professional development including, but not limited to, district workshops, observing effective teachers, web-based and print resources, printed resources and selected sample video clips, help from a literacy or STEM coach to co-plan/co-teach, additional formative observations with coaching, and use of license renewal credits for additional training.
- 2.7 Also, a teacher who receives a rating of ineffective may file a request in writing for a private conference with the superintendent or the superintendent's designee not later than five (5) days after receiving notice that the teacher received a rating of ineffective. The teacher is entitled to a private conference with the superintendent or superintendent's designee.
- 2.8 SCS will do everything possible so that a student will not be assigned to a teacher that has been identified as an ineffective teacher for two consecutive years. If it is not possible to avoid such an assignment, parents will be notified by letter (after review of such letter by SCS legal counsel) notifying them of this unavoidable assignment.

### **Teachers on Extended Absence**

- 2.9 SCS teachers that will be on an extended leave will be evaluated according to a mutually agreed upon plan between the teacher and the primary evaluator.

### **Teacher with a Student Teacher**

- 2.10 Teachers with a student teacher will still be accountable and will continue to adhere to the same teacher evaluation plan laid out without adjustments. SCS will communicate to universities placing student teachers that they should know that a student teacher will not be "fully responsible" for instruction during a SCS placement as we expect our staff to remain involved in their classrooms and their students' learning during that apprenticeship. The model we are seeking is really one of "co-teaching" with the SCS teacher fully in charge and the student teacher serving as a co-teaching apprentice. Our guidance to teachers who are mentoring student teachers is to ask that the student teacher use them as one would a highly trained volunteer during instructional time and that they exercise oversight of planning, instruction, and assessment to ensure continued student progress while a student teacher experience is occurring. Keep in mind the evaluator has the right to use professional judgement when assigning the summative rating when finalizing the end of school year's staff evaluation.

### **Teacher Appreciation Grant Policy**

- 2.11 Definitions: For purposes of this policy, the following definitions apply:

The term "teacher" means a professional person whose position with the Corporation requires a license (as defined in I.C. 20-28-1-7) and whose primary responsibility is the instruction of students.

The term "license" refers to a document issued by the IDOE that grants permission to serve as a particular kind of teacher. The term includes any certificate or permit issued by the IDOE.

#### **Distribution of Annual Teacher Appreciation Grants:**

Teacher appreciation grant funds received by the Corporation shall be distributed to licensed teachers who meet the following criteria:

- A. employed in the classroom (including providing instruction in a virtual classroom setting);
- B. rated as Effective or Highly Effective on their most recent performance evaluation; and
- C. employed by the Corporation as of December 1st of the year in which the teacher appreciation grant funds are received by the Corporation.

The Corporation shall distribute the teacher appreciation grant funds as follows:

The Corporation shall not allocate a percentage of the Teacher Appreciation Grant funds received to provide a supplemental award to each teacher with less than five (5) years of service who is rated as highly effective or effective on the most recent performance evaluation.

A cash stipend as determined by the Superintendent shall be distributed to all teachers in the Corporation who are rated as Effective or Highly Effective.

- A. The total amount of the Teacher Appreciation Grant will be divided among the three schools based on their percentage of teachers in the corporation
- B. Each of the three buildings amounts will be divided among its teachers, with teachers rated Highly Effective receiving twenty-five (25%) more than teachers rated Effective.

If the Corporation is the local educational agency (LEA) or lead school corporation that administers a special education cooperative or joint services program or a career and technical education program, including programs managed under I.C. 20-26-10, 20-35-5, 20- 37, or I.C. 36-1-7, then it shall award teacher appreciation grant stipends to and carry out the other responsibilities of an employing school corporation under this section for the teachers in the special education program or career and technical education program with respect to the teacher appreciation grant funds it receives on behalf of those teachers.

A stipend to an individual teacher in a particular year is not subject to collective bargaining but is discussable and is in addition to the minimum salary or increases in the salary set under I.C. 20-28-9-1.5.

The Corporation shall distribute all stipends from a teacher appreciation grant to individual teachers within twenty (20) business days of the date the IDOE distributes the teacher appreciation grant funds to the Corporation.

This policy shall be reviewed annually by the Board and shall be submitted to the IDOE annually by the Superintendent as indicated above.

**APPENDIX B:  
SHERIDAN COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROFESSIONAL STAFF EVALUATION PLAN (S-PSEP) --TEACHER  
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The checklist below is a guide for each teacher to use, and to confirm via a signature, that he or she is familiar with the elements of the Sheridan Community School Professional Staff Evaluation Plan.

- Overview of S-PSEP Process including such areas as: Rubric, Weighting of various components  
For the summative evaluation for teacher groups and number of observations
- Review of the Employee Evaluation Rubric (EER) Identification of Primary Evaluator
- Log-in process for Standards for Success (evaluation software)
- Notification that Domain 3 form (summary, rating, and justification) and pertinent artifacts included should be shared with Primary Evaluator by uploading the documents in SFS by **April 30.**
- Notice that presence of a student teacher will not affect teacher evaluation. The teacher will be fully in charge of the classroom. The role of the student teacher will be that of a “co-teacher.”
- Plan for an extended leave and evaluation: a teacher on an extended leave will follow an evaluation plan that is mutually agreed upon by the primary evaluator and the teacher.
- Teacher is responsible when notified of concerns to address and seek resources to improve performance.
- Teacher final evaluation determination is based upon primary evaluator’s “judgment” and not an average of scores on rubric observations.

**The SCS Professional Staff Evaluation Plan has been explained to me, including the above items.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Teacher Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **APPENDIX C: PLANS FOR EVALUATING UNIQUE EMPLOYEE GROUPS**

DOE Evaluation Guidance: Modifying RISE (January 2012) states “A corporation may choose to adopt alternative methods of evaluating specialists such as instructional coaches, interventionists, media specialists, etc. Alternative ways of evaluating these positions is acceptable.... Any modification is allowable as long as the requirements under IC 20-28-11.5 are met.” (p. 8)

IC 20-28-11.5 requires each school corporation to “develop a plan for annual performance evaluations for each certificated employee” and to implement the plan beginning with the 2012-2013 school year. “Certificated employee” is defined such that the new staff performance evaluation plan must include not only classroom teachers but every “person whose contract with the school corporation requires that the person hold a license or permit from the division of professional standards of the IDOE.”

Any evaluation plan must contain these components:

- Every certificated employee must be evaluated at least annually
- Objective measures of student achievement and growth must significantly inform the evaluation
- Rigorous measures of teaching effectiveness that include observations and other performance indicators
- Annual designation for each teacher in only one of four state rating categories: highly effective, effective, improvement necessary, ineffective
- Evaluator must explain recommendations for improvement and the time period in which expected improvement is to occur
- A teacher who negatively affects student achievement/growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective

## **Evaluation Procedures for Special Certified Staff**

(see chart on next page)

TYPE OF TEACHER	CATEGORY/WEIGHTS FOR SUMMATIVE EVALUATION	RUBRIC TO USE FOR EVALUATION and weight % of Domains	OTHER NOTES (i.e. Observations, etc.)
Superintendent	EER 100%	IAPSS/ISBA Superintendent Evaluation Tool Domain weights: 1.66% each	SCS Board of Trustees will evaluate, provide feedback & upload any pertinent artifacts in SFS
Principals and Assistant Principals	EER 100%	Principal Effectiveness Rubric (v.2016) Domain weights 17%-17%-16%-17%-17%-16% Assistant Principal Rubric without Optional Competencies	Primary Evaluator for principals will be the superintendent, Primary Evaluator for assistant principals will be principals
Curriculum Director	EER 100%	Curriculum Director Effectiveness Rubric (v.2016) Domain weights .09% -.28% - .09% - .09% - .09% - .09% - .09% - .09%	Evaluator is the superintendent. scripted "observations" are optional as evaluators have multiple modes to see CD in action.
School Counselors	EER 100%	Sheridan Professional School Counselor Effectiveness Rubric (v.2016) Domain Weights 25% - 25% - 25% - 25%	Primary Evaluator will be the school principals, scripted "observations" are optional as evaluators have multiple modes to see counselors in action.
Certified Media Specialists	EER 100%	Media Specialist Effectiveness Rubric (v.2016) Domain weights 10% - 10% - 65% - 15%	Primary Evaluator will be the building principal. Same observation schedule as with classroom teachers
Special Education Director	EER 100%	Sheridan Special Education Administrator (v.2016) Domain Weights 40% - 40% - 20%	Evaluator is the superintendent, optional scripted "observations" as there are multiple modes to see director in action.
Special Education	EER 100%	Special Education Teacher -ICASE (v.2016) with added SPED competencies Domains weights 10% - 75% - 15%	Primary Evaluator will be the building principal. Secondary Evaluator will be the special education director. Same schedule as with classroom teachers
Speech Pathologists	EER 100%	Speech Language Pathologists Effectiveness Rubric - Sheridan (v.2016) Domains weights 10% - 75% - 15%	Primary Evaluator will be the building principal. Secondary Evaluator will be the special education director. Same schedule as with classroom teachers
Athletic Director	EER 100%	NIAAA Athletic Director Effectiveness Rubric (v.2016) Domains weights 30% - 30% - 40%	Evaluator will be the building principal, scripted "observations" are optional as evaluators have multiple modes to see AD in action.
Technology Integration Specialist	EER 100%	Technology Integration Specialist (v.2016) Effectiveness Rubric Domains weights 10% - 25% - 65%	Assigned to a district evaluator, optional scripted "observations" as evaluators have multiple modes TIS in action
Teachers on extended leave or situations such as FMLA	EER 100%	Use appropriate rubric	Evaluated according to a mutually agreed upon plan between the teacher and evaluator.



## APPENDIX D:

### Basic Timeline for Annual Evaluation Process--(Primary Evaluator Schedule)

Month	TO DO'S	Document
<p align="center"><b>August Thru September</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review teacher data from previous school year</li> <li>▪ Ensure that each certified employee has been assigned a primary and secondary evaluator</li> <li>▪ Plan schedule for meetings/observations for first semester</li> <li>▪ Note teachers on an improvement plan</li> <li>▪ Enter new teachers in SFS software (Cheri)</li> <li>▪ Consider necessary notification to parents if students will be scheduled with Ineffective teachers two years consecutively</li> <li>▪ Preview the evaluation process for the year with staff in back-to-school meeting/training for new staff. Have all staff sign S-PSEP Acknowledgement Form. Collect and turn in to front office by <b>September 30</b></li> <li>▪ Schedule and conduct BOY meetings with each teacher</li> <li>▪ Walk-throughs begin</li> <li>▪ SPED evaluators begin review of IEPs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ S-PSEP Teacher Acknowledgement Form</li> <li>▪ 90 Day Improvement Plan as needed</li> <li>▪ SPED IEP checklist</li> </ul>
<p align="center"><b>October</b> Short observations begin</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ May begin optional short observations by primary (10+ minutes) and document in SFS (script/code/comments) within 2 school days</li> <li>▪ Schedule the window for extended (40+ minute) observations for Nov-Feb with each teacher and schedule pre /post-conference times</li> <li>▪ Conduct additional short observations with actionable feedback for teachers on performance plan, new teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pre-observation Conference form in SFS</li> </ul>
<p align="center"><b>November</b> Extended observations begin</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continue October's to-dos</li> <li>▪ Begin conducting scheduled extended observations with optional pre and post conferences for the teachers on your caseload (feedback in SFS within 5 school days - script/code/comment)</li> </ul>	
<p align="center"><b>December</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conclude all short observations by <b>December 20</b></li> <li>▪ Offer optional mid-year check-ins for all teachers (required for any teachers with performance concerns/90-day plans)</li> </ul>	
<p align="center"><b>January</b> Begin 2nd Short Observation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Begin second round of short observations</li> </ul>	
<p align="center"><b>February</b> Conclude Extended Observations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conclude all extended observations</li> <li>▪ Continue short observations</li> </ul>	
<p align="center"><b>March</b> Conclude 2<sup>nd</sup> Short Observations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conclude all 2<sup>nd</sup> short observations</li> </ul>	

<p><b>April</b> Conclude Extended Observations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conclude all extended observations and short observations and send to staff in the appropriate timeframe</li> <li>▪ Conduct any additional short observations as needed</li> <li>▪ Domain 3 Artifacts due by <b>April 30</b></li> </ul>	
<p><b>May</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review collected evidence for each teacher and mark summative teacher rating on SFS Finalization Worksheets</li> <li>▪ Review professional goals with teachers who are on a Performance Plan</li> </ul> <p>*Make all available data viewable by teachers within 10 days of the last contracted teacher day</p>	
<p><b>June</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Finalize all summative ratings as data becomes available</li> <li>▪ Admin team meet to review all staff summative ratings</li> <li>▪ Notify teachers of final summative rating in SFS</li> <li>▪ Conduct meetings with teachers who request them over the summer to discuss summative rating changes due to data</li> <li>▪ Create Performance Plan specifics for teachers rated Ineffective</li> <li>▪ Contact teachers rated Ineffective or Needs Improvement more formally to explain ramifications for further employment/compensation</li> <li>▪ Review teacher data and school data with leadership team, discuss process, fine-tune for next year</li> </ul>	

\*Final summative ratings will be calculated and sent to teachers after the end of the school year via SFS. It is not necessary to schedule an additional conference with teachers, but it is certainly possible for teachers to request time at administrator's convenience during administrator contract time in June for such meetings if desired.

\*Discussion of the prior year's summative score could also take place at the first meeting for the new school year.

**APPENDIX E:**  
**SCS Professional Staff Evaluation Rubrics**

- IAPSS/ISBA Superintendent Evaluation Tool (v.2016)
- RISE 2.0 Principal Effectiveness Rubric (v.2016)
- Rise 2.0 Assistant Principals without Optional Competencies (v.2016)
- Rise 2.0 Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (v.2016)
- Curriculum Director Effectiveness Rubric (v.2016)
- Sheridan Professional School Counselor Effectiveness Rubric (v.2016)
- Media Specialist Effectiveness Rubric (v.2016)
- Special Education Administrator Rubric (v.2022)
- Special Education Teacher – ICASE (v.2016)
- Speech Pathologist Effectiveness Rubric – Sheridan (v.2016)
- NIAAA Athletic Director Effectiveness Modified (v.2016)