

Stephanie Kofler
1-23-12
472 Bond ✓



Indiana Department of Education
**Indiana Teacher
Effectiveness Rubric**

DRAFT VERSION – June 7, 2011

Table of Contents

I.	Overview	3
II.	Effectiveness Rubric	5
	a. Domain 1: Planning	5
	b. Domain 2: Instruction	7
	c. Domain 3: Leadership	16
	d. Domain 4: Core Professionalism	18

DRAFT – 6/07/2011

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corpora; ons in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the "high level" of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to evaluate this model to support local corporations in creating the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

Overview

What is the purpose of the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric?

The Teacher Effectiveness Rubric was developed for three key purposes:

- To shine a spotlight on great teaching: The rubric is designed to assist principals and teachers in their efforts to increase teacher effectiveness and ensure differentiated distribution of great teachers across the state.
- To provide clear expectations for teachers: The rubric defines and prioritizes the actions that effective teachers use to achieve gains in student achievement.
- To support a fair and transparent evaluation of effectiveness: The rubric provides a foundation for accurately assessing teacher effectiveness along four discrete ratings, in addition to growth data.

Who developed the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric?

A representative group of teachers and leaders from across the state, along with staff from IDOE and The New Teacher Project (TNP), contributed to the development of the rubric.

What research and evidence support the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric?

While drafting the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric, the development team examined teaching frameworks from numerous sources, including:

- Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teachers*
- Iowa's *A Model Framework*

- KIPP Academy's *Teacher Evaluation Rubric*
- Robert Marzano's *Classroom Instruction that Works*
- Massachusetts' *Principles for Effective Teaching*
- Kim Marshall's *Teacher Evaluation Rubrics*
- National Board's *Professional Teaching Standards*
- North Carolina's *Teacher Evaluation Process*
- Doug Reeves' *Unwrapping the Standards*
- Research for *Better Teaching's Skilled Teacher*
- Teach For America's *Teaching as Leadership Rubric*
- Texas' *TeBess Framework*
- Washington DC's *IMPACT Performance Assessment*
- Wiggins & McTighe's *Understanding by Design*

How is the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric organized?

The rubric is divided into four domains:

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

Discrete indicators within each domain target specific areas that effective teachers must focus upon.

DRAFT – 6/07/2011

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the BISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share the DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop this model to support local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

How did we weigh different parts of the framework?

In reviewing the current research during the development of the teacher effectiveness rubric, the goal was not to create a teacher evaluation tool that would try to be all things to all people. Rather, the rubric focuses on evaluating the teacher's role as the driver of student growth and achievement. As such, the rubric focuses on evaluating the effectiveness of instruction, specifically through observable actions in the classroom.

This is not to say that teachers should not be evaluated in other areas. In fact, schools and districts that elect to utilize the rubric are encouraged to add or develop additional indicators or tools. However, any additions should supplement, not supplant, the indicators already outlined in the rubric.

How do I ensure the effective implementation of the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric?

The devil is in the details. Even the best teacher evaluation tool can be undermined by poor implementation. Successful implementation of the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric will require a focus on four core principles¹:

1. Training and Support: Administrators responsible for the evaluation of teachers must receive rigorous training and ongoing support so that they can make fair and consistent assessments of performance and provide constructive feedback and differentiated support. Not every item on the rubric will be applicable for all teachers or all settings, and we must train principals to use professional judgment and a certain degree of flexibility when using the rubric to evaluate teachers.

2. Accountability: The differentiation of teacher effectiveness must be a priority for district administrators and one for which they are held accountable. Even the best evaluation tool will fail if the information it produces is of no consequence.

3. Credible distribution: If the rubric is implemented effectively, ineffective ratings will not be anomalous, surprising, or without clear justification. The performance distribution of teachers must be closely monitored and a vehicle established to declare evaluations invalid if results are inflated.

4. Decision-making: Results from the teacher evaluation must be fully integrated with other district systems and policies and a primary factor in decisions such as which teachers receive tenure, how teachers are assigned and retained, compensated and advanced, what professional development they receive, and when and how teachers are dismissed.

¹ Informed by The New Teacher Project's *The Widget Effect* (2009)

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to support local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

DOMAIN 1: PURPOSEFUL PLANNING

Teachers use Indiana content area standards to develop a rigorous curriculum relevant for all students, building meaningful units of study, continuous assessments and a system for tracking student progress as well as plans for accommodations and changes in response to a lack of student progress.

Indicator	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
1.1 Utilize Assessment Data to Plan <i>NA</i>	At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally: - incorporates differentiated instructional strategies in planning to teach every student at his/her level of understanding	Teacher uses prior assessment data to formulate: - Achievement Goals, unit plans, AND lesson plans	Teacher uses prior assessment data to formulate: - Achievement Goals, unit plans, OR lesson plans, but not all of the above	Teacher rarely or never uses prior assessment data when planning
1.2 Set Ambitious and Measurable Achievement Goals <i>NA</i>	At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally: - plans an ambitious annual student achievement goal	Teacher develops an annual student achievement goal that is: - Measurable; - Aligned to content standards AND - Includes benchmarks to help monitor learning and inform interventions throughout the year	Teacher develops an annual student achievement goal that is: - Measurable - The goal may not: - Align to content standards; OR - Include benchmarks to help monitor learning and inform interventions throughout the year	Teacher rarely or never develops achievement goal for the class OR goals are developed, but are extremely general and not helpful for planning purposes
1.3 Develop Standards-Based Unit Plans and Assessments <i>NA</i>	At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally: - Creates well-designed unit assessments that align with an end of year summative assessment (either state, district, or teacher created) - Anticipates student reaction to content, allocation of time per unit is flexible and/or reflects level of difficulty of each unit	Based on achievement goal, teacher plans units by: - Identifying content standards that students will master in each unit - Creating assessments before each unit begins for backwards planning - Allocating an instructionally appropriate amount of time for each unit	Based on achievement goal, teacher plans units by: - Identifying content standards that students will master in each unit Teacher may not: - Create assessments before each unit begins for backwards planning - Allocate an instructionally appropriate amount of time for each unit	Teacher rarely or never plans units by identifying content standards that students will master in each unit OR there is little to no evidence that teacher plans units at all
1.4 Create Objective-Driven Lesson Plans and Assessments 3	At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally: - Plans for a variety of differentiated instructional strategies, anticipating where there will be needed to enhance instruction - Incorporates a variety of informal assessments/checks for understanding as well as summative assessments where necessary and uses all assessments to directly inform instruction	Based on unit plan, teacher plans daily lessons by: - Identifying lesson objectives that are aligned to state content standards - Matching instructional strategies, as well as meaningful and relevant activities/assignments to the lesson objectives - Designing formative assessments that measure progress towards mastery and inform instruction	Based on unit plan, teacher plans daily lessons by: - Identifying lesson objectives that are aligned to state content standards - Matching instructional strategies and activities/assignments to the lesson objectives Teacher may not: - Design assignments that are meaningful or relevant - Plan formative assessments to measure progress towards mastery or inform instruction	Teacher rarely or never plans daily lessons OR daily lessons are planned, but are thrown together at the last minute, thus lacking meaningful objectives, instructional strategies, or assignments

DRAFT - 6/07/2011

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the ISEL pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share the DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is, if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop the model to support local corporations in creating the next draft. Evaluation rubric 2 to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

1.5	Track Student Data and Analyze Progress	<p><i>NA</i></p> <p>At level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for level 3 and additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Uses daily checks for understanding for additional data points - Updates tracking system daily - Uses data analysis of student progress to drive lesson planning for the following day 	<p>Teacher uses an effective data tracking system for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recording student assessment/progress data - Analyzing student progress towards mastery and planning future lesson/unit accordingly - Maintaining a grading system aligned to student learning goals 	<p>Teacher uses an effective data tracking system for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recording student assessment/progress data - Maintaining a Grading system <p>Teacher may not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use data to analyze student progress towards mastery or to plan future lesson/unit - Have grading system that appropriately aligns with student learning goals 	<p>Teacher rarely or never uses a data tracking system to record student assessment/progress data and/or has no discernable grading system.</p>
-----	---	--	---	---	---

DRAFT

DRAFT – 6/07/2011

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the NISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluation, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop this model to support local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals... IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

DOMAIN 2: EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION

Teachers facilitate student academic practice so that all students are participating and have the opportunity to gain mastery of the objectives in a classroom environment that fosters a climate of urgency and expectation around achievement, excellence and respect.

Indicators	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.1:</p> <p>Develop student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives</p> <p>For Level 4, all of the evidence listed under Level 3 is present, or well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students can explain what they are learning and why it is important, beyond repeating the stated objective - Teacher effectively engages prior knowledge of students in connecting to lesson. Students demonstrate through work or comments that they understand this connection 	<p>Teacher is effective at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lesson objective is specific, measurable, and aligned to standards. It connects what students are learning and what they will be able to do by the end of the lesson - Objective is written in a student-friendly manner and/or explained to students in easy-to-understand terms - Importance of the objective is explained so that students understand why they are learning what they are learning - Lesson builds on students' prior knowledge of key concepts and skills and makes this connection evident to students - Lesson is well differentiated to move students towards mastery of the objective 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lesson objective conveys what students are learning and what they will be able to do by the end of the lesson, but may not be aligned to standards or measurable - Objective is stated, but not in student-friendly manner that leads to understanding - Teacher attempts explanation of importance of objective, but students fail to understand - Lesson generally does not build on prior knowledge of students or students fail to make this connection - Organization of the lesson may not always be connected to mastery of the objective 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at developing student understanding and mastery of lesson objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lesson objective is missing more than one component. It may not be clear about what students are learning or will be able to do by the end of the lesson. - There may not be a clear connection between the objective and lesson, or teacher may fail to make this connection for students - Teacher may fail to discuss importance of objective or there may not be a clear understanding amongst students as to why the objective is important. - There may be no effort to connect objective to prior knowledge of students - Lesson is disorganized and does not lead to mastery of objective.

Notes:

1. One way in which an observer could effectively gather information to score this standard is through one-on-one conversations with students (when appropriate).

2. In some situations, it may not be appropriate to state the objective for the lesson (multiple objectives for various "centers", early-childhood inquiry-based lesson, etc). In these situations, the observer should assess whether or not students are engaged in activities that will lead them towards mastery of an objective, even if it is not stated.

DRAFT - 6/07/2011

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

Indicator 2: Competency 2.2:	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Demonstrate and Clearly Communicate Content Knowledge to Students</p>	<p>For Level 4, all of the evidence listed under Level 3 is present, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher fully explains concepts in as direct and efficient a manner as possible, while still achieving student understanding - Teacher effectively connects content to other content areas, students' experiences and interests, or current events in order to make content relevant and build interest - Explanations span student excitement and interest in the content - Students participate in each other's learning of content through collaboration during the lesson - Students ask higher-order questions and make connections independently, demonstrating that they understand the content at a higher level 	<p>Teacher demonstrates content knowledge and delivers content that is factually correct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Content is clear, concise and well-organized - Teacher restates and rephrases instruction in multiple ways to increase understanding - Teacher emphasizes key points or main ideas in content - Teacher uses developmentally appropriate language and explanations - Teacher implements relevant instructional strategies learned via professional development 	<p>Teacher needs improvement in demonstrating and clearly communicating content knowledge to students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher delivers content that is factually correct - Content occasionally lacks clarity and is not as well organized as it could be - Teacher may fail to restate or rephrase instruction in multiple ways to increase understanding - Teacher does not adequately emphasize main ideas, and students are sometimes confused about key takeaways - Explanations sometimes lack developmentally appropriate language - Teacher does not always implement new and improved instructional strategies learned via professional development 	<p>Teacher may deliver content that is factually incorrect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explanations may be unclear or incoherent and fail to build student understanding of key concepts - Teacher continues with planned instruction, even when it is obvious that students are not understanding content - Teacher does not emphasize main ideas, and students are often confused about content - Teacher fails to use developmentally appropriate language

NOTES:

1. Content may be communicated by either direct instruction or guided inquiry depending on the content of the classroom or lesson.
2. If the teacher presents information with any mistake that would leave students with a significant misunderstanding at the end of the lesson, the teacher should be scored a Level 1 for this competency.
3. Instructional strategies learned via professional development may include information learned during "optional" coaching sessions as well as mandatory or optional school or district-wide PD sessions.

DRAFT – 6/07/2011

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluation, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop this model to support local corporations in calling the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

Indicators	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.3:</p> <p>Engage students in academic content</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at engaging students in academic content</p> <p>For Level 4, all of the evidence listed under Level 3 is present, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher provides ways to engage with content that significantly promotes student mastery of the objective Teacher provides differentiated ways of engaging with content specific to individual student needs The lesson progresses at an appropriate pace so that students are never disengaged, and students who finish early have something else meaningful to do Teacher effectively integrates technology as a tool to engage students in academic content 	<p>Teacher is effective at engaging students in academic content</p> <p>3/4 or more of students are actively engaged in content at all times and not off-task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher provides multiple ways, as appropriate, of engaging with content. All aligned to the lesson objective Teacher sustains the alignment of the class by maintaining a dynamic presence Ways of engaging with content reflect different learning modalities or intelligences Teacher adjusts lesson according to accommodate for student prerequisite skills and knowledge so that all students are engaged ELL and IEP students have the appropriate accommodations to be engaged in content Students work hard and are deeply engaged rather than passive/checked out (noter below for specific evidence of engagement) 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at engaging students in academic content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer than 3/4 of students are engaged in content and many are off-task Teacher may provide multiple ways of engaging students, but perhaps not aligned to lesson objective or mastery of content Teacher may miss opportunities to provide ways of differentiating content for student engagement Some students may not have the prerequisite skills necessary to fully engage in content and teacher's attempt to modify instruction for these students is limited or not always effective Students may appear to actively listen, but when it comes time for participation are disinterested in engaging 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at engaging students in academic content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer than 1/2 of students are engaged in content and many are off-task Teacher may only provide one way of engaging with content OR teacher may provide multiple ways of engaging students that are not aligned to the lesson objective or mastery of content Teacher does not differentiate instruction to target different learning modalities Most students do not have the prerequisite skills necessary to fully engage in content and teacher makes no effort to adjust instruction for these students ELL and IEP students are not provided with the necessary accommodations to engage in content

- NOTES:
- The most important indicator of success here is that students are actively engaged in the content. For a teacher to receive credit for providing students a way of engaging with content, students must be engaged in that part of the lesson.
 - Presence can best be represented by using engaging, confident, and attentive body language, eye volume, and proximity.
 - Some observable evidence of engagement may include (but is not limited to): (a) raising of hands, (b) asking questions as well as to share ideas, (c) active listening (nod of head) during lesson, or (d) active participation in hands-on tasks/activities.
 - Teachers may provide multiple ways of engaging with content via different learning modalities (auditory, visual, kinesthetic/tactile) or via multiple intelligences (spatial, linguistic, musical, interpersonal, logical-mathematical, etc.). It may also be effective to engage students via two or more strategies targeting the same modality.

DRAFT - 6/07/2011

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM. The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as it if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

Indicators	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.4:</p> <p>Check for Understanding</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at checking for understanding</p> <p>For level 4, all of the evidence listed under level 3 is present, or well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher checks for understanding at higher levels by asking pertinent, scaffold questions that push thinking; accepts only high quality student responses (those that reveal understanding or lack thereof) - Teacher uses open-ended questions to surface common misunderstandings; and assists student mastery of material at a range of both lower and higher-order thinking 	<p>Teacher is effective at checking for understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher checks for understanding at almost all key moments (when checking is necessary to inform instruction going forward) and gets an accurate "pulse" of the class's understanding - Teacher gains enough information during checks for understanding to modify the lesson and respond accordingly - Teacher uses a variety of methods to check for understanding - Teacher uses wait time effectively, soliciting a question and before helping students think through a response - Teacher frequently allows students to "opt-out" of checks for understanding and cycles back to these students - Teacher systematically assists every student's mastery of learning objectives at the end of each lesson through formal or informal assessments (see note for examples) 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at checking for understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher sometimes checks for understanding of content, but misses level of key components - Teacher mostly gets an accurate "pulse" of the class's understanding, but may not gain enough information to modify the lesson accordingly - Teacher may not use a variety of methods to check for understanding when doing so would be beneficial - Teacher may not provide enough wait time after posing a question for students to think and respond before helping with an answer or moving forward with content - Teacher sometimes allows students to "opt-out" of checks for understanding without cycling back to these students - Teacher may assess student mastery at the end of the lesson through formal or informal assessments, but may not use this information to drive subsequent lesson planning 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at checking for understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher rarely or never checks for understanding of content, or misses nearly all key moments - Teacher rarely or never gets an accurate "pulse" of the class's understanding from checks and therefore cannot gain enough information to modify the lesson - Teacher frequently moves on with content before students have a chance to respond to questions or frequently gets students the answer rather than helping them think through the answer. - Teacher frequently allows students to "opt-out" of checks for understanding and does not cycle back to these students - Teacher rarely or never assists for mastery at the end of the lesson

Notes:

1. Examples of times when checking for understanding may be useful are before moving on to the next step of the lesson, or partner through independent practice.
2. Examples of how the teacher may assist student understanding and mastery of objectives:
 - Checks for Understanding: thumbs up/down, cold-calling
 - Do Now's
 - Turn and Tally/Pair Share
 - Guided or Independent Practice
 - Exit Slips

DRAFT – 6/07/2013

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as-is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to support local corporations, including the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

Indicators	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.5:</p> <p>Modify Instruction As Needed</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at modifying instruction as needed</p> <p>For level 4, all of the evidence listed under level 3 is present, or well or same of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher anticipates student misunderstandings and proactively addresses them - Teacher is able to modify instruction to respond to misunderstandings without taking away from the flow of the lesson or losing engagement 	<p>Teacher is effective at modifying instruction as needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher makes adjustments to instruction based on checks for understanding that lead to increased understanding for most students - Teacher differentiates delivery of instruction based on checks for understanding and assessment data to meet diverse student needs - Teacher responds to misunderstandings with effective scaffolding techniques - Teacher doesn't give up, but continues to try to address misunderstandings with different techniques if the first try is not successful 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at modifying instruction as needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher may attempt to make adjustments to instruction based on checks for understanding, but these attempts may be misguided and may not increase understanding for all students - Teacher may primarily respond to misunderstandings by using teacher-driven scaffolding techniques (for example, re-explaining a concept), when student-driven techniques could have been more effective - Teacher may persist in using a particular technique for responding to a misunderstanding, even when it is not succeeding 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at modifying instruction as needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher rarely or never attempts to adjust instruction based on checks for understanding, and any attempts at doing so frequently fail to increase understanding for students - Teacher only responds to misunderstandings by using teacher-driven scaffolding techniques - Teacher repeatedly uses the same technique to respond to misunderstandings, even when it is not succeeding

NOTE:

1. In order to be effective at this competency, a teacher must have at least scored a 3 on competencies 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, 2.17, 2.18, 2.19, 2.20, 2.21, 2.22, 2.23, 2.24, 2.25, 2.26, 2.27, 2.28, 2.29, 2.30, 2.31, 2.32, 2.33, 2.34, 2.35, 2.36, 2.37, 2.38, 2.39, 2.40, 2.41, 2.42, 2.43, 2.44, 2.45, 2.46, 2.47, 2.48, 2.49, 2.50, 2.51, 2.52, 2.53, 2.54, 2.55, 2.56, 2.57, 2.58, 2.59, 2.60, 2.61, 2.62, 2.63, 2.64, 2.65, 2.66, 2.67, 2.68, 2.69, 2.70, 2.71, 2.72, 2.73, 2.74, 2.75, 2.76, 2.77, 2.78, 2.79, 2.80, 2.81, 2.82, 2.83, 2.84, 2.85, 2.86, 2.87, 2.88, 2.89, 2.90, 2.91, 2.92, 2.93, 2.94, 2.95, 2.96, 2.97, 2.98, 2.99, 3.00.

2. A teacher can respond to misunderstandings using "scaffolding" techniques such as activating background knowledge, asking leading questions, breaking the task into small parts, using mnemonic devices or analogies, using manipulatives or hands-on model, using "think alouds", providing visual cues, etc.

DRAFT - 6/07/2011

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the NISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop this model to support local corporations in calling the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

Indicators	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.6: Develop Higher Level of Understanding through Rigorous Instruction and Work</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work</p> <p>For level 4, all of the evidence listed under level 3 is present, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lesson is accessible and challenging to all students - Students are able to answer higher-level questions with meaningful responses - Students pose higher-level questions to the teacher and to each other - Teacher highlights examples of recent student work that meets high expectations; insists and motivates students to do it again if not great - Teacher encourages students' interest in learning by providing students with additional opportunities to apply and build skills beyond expected lesson elements (e.g. extra credit or enrichment assignments) 	<p>Teacher is effective at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lesson is accessible and challenging to almost all students - Teacher frequently develops higher-level understanding through effective questioning - Lesson pushes almost all students forward due to differentiation of instruction based on each student's level of understanding - Students have opportunities to meaningfully practice, apply, and demonstrate that they are learning - Teacher shows patience and helps students to work hard toward mastering the objectives and to persist even when faced with difficult tasks 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lesson is not always accessible or challenging for students - Some questions used may not be effective in developing higher-level understanding (too complex or confusing) - Teacher may not always use questioning as an effective tool to increase understanding - While students may have some opportunity to meaningfully practice and apply concepts, instruction is more teacher-directed than appropriate - Teacher may encourage students to work hard, but may not persist in efforts to have students/persist trying 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at developing a higher level of understanding through rigorous instruction and work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lesson is not aligned with developmental level of students (may be too challenging or too easy) - Teacher may not use questioning as an effective tool to increase understanding; students only show a surface understanding of concepts - Lesson is almost always teacher directed - Students have few opportunities to meaningfully practice or apply concepts - Teacher gives up on students early and does not encourage them to persist through difficult tasks

Notes:

1. Examples of types of questions that can develop higher-level understanding
2. Activating higher levels of inquiry on Bloom's taxonomy (using words such as "analyze," "classify," "compare," "decide," "evaluate," "explain," or "represent")
3. Asking students to explain why they are learning something or to summarize the main idea
4. Asking students to apply a new skill or concept in a different context
5. Asking a question that increases the rigor of the lesson content
6. Prompting students to make connections to previous material or prior knowledge
7. Higher-level questioning should result in higher-level student understanding. If it does not, credit should not be given.
8. Challenging tasks rather than questions may be used to create a higher-level of understanding, and if successful, should be credited in this competency
9. The frequency with which a teacher should use questions to develop higher-level understanding will vary depending on the topic and type of lesson.

DRAFT - 6/07/2013

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2013-2014 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to support local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.


Indicators	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
Competency 2.7: Maximize Instructional Time	<p>Teacher is highly effective at maximizing instructional time</p> <p>For Level 4, all of the evidence listed under Level 3 is present, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Routines, transitions, and procedures are well-executed. Students know what they are supposed to be doing and when without prompting from the teacher. - Students are always engaged in meaningful work while waiting for the teacher (for example, during attendance). - Students share responsibility for operations and routines and work well together to accomplish these tasks. - All students are on-task and follow instructions of teacher without much prompting. - Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations are rare. When they occur, they are always addressed without major interruption to the lesson. 	<p>Teacher is effective at maximizing instructional time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students arrive on-time and late arrivals are of the consequences of arriving late (unexcused). - Class starts on-time. - Routines, transitions, and procedures are well-structured. Students know what they are supposed to be doing and when with minimal prompting from the teacher. - Students are only ever not engaged in meaningful work for brief periods of time (for example, during attendance). - Teacher delegates time between parts of the lesson appropriately so as best to lead students toward mastery of objective. - Almost all students are on-task and follow instructions of teacher without much prompting. - Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations are rare, when they occur, they are almost always addressed without major interruption to the lesson. 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at maximizing instructional time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some students consistently arrive late (unexcused) for class without consequences. - Class may consistently start a few minutes late. - Routines, transitions, and procedures are in place, but require teacher direction or prompting to be followed. - There is more than a brief period of time when students are left without meaningful work to keep them engaged. - Teacher may delegate lesson time inappropriately between parts of the lesson. - Significant prompting from the teacher is necessary for students to follow instructions and remain on-task. - Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations sometimes occur; they may not be addressed in the most effective manner and teacher may have to stop the lesson frequently to address the problem. 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at maximizing instructional time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students may frequently arrive late (unexcused) for class without consequences. - Teacher may frequently start class late. - There are few or no evident routines or procedures in place. Students are unclear about what they should be doing and require significant direction from the teacher at all times. - There are significant periods of time in which students are not engaged in meaningful work. - Even with significant prompting, students frequently do not follow directions and are off-task. - Disruptive behaviors and off-task conversations are common and frequently cause the teacher to have to make adjustments to the lesson. - Classroom management is generally poor and wastes instructional time.

NOTES:
 1. The overall indicator of success here is that operationally, the classroom runs smoothly so that time can be spent on valuable instruction rather than logistics and discipline.
 2. It should be understood that a teacher can have disruptive students no matter how effective he/she may be. However, an effective teacher should be able to minimize disruptions amongst these students and when they do occur, handle them without detriment to the learning of other students.

DRAFT - 6/07/2013
 PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2013-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop this model to support local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

Indicators	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.8: Create Classroom Culture of Respect and Collaboration</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration</p> <p>For level 4, all of the evidence listed under level 3 is present, or well or some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are invested in the academic success of their peers as evidenced by uncomplimented collaboration and assistance Students reinforce positive character and behavior and discourage negative behavior amongst themselves 	<p>Teacher is effective at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are respectful of their teacher and peers Students are given opportunities to collaborate and support each other in the learning process Teacher reinforces positive character and behavior and uses consequences appropriately to discourage negative behavior Teacher has a good rapport with students and shows a genuine interest in their thoughts and opinions 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are generally respectful of their teacher and peers, but may occasionally act out or need to be reminded of classroom norms Students are given opportunities to collaborate, but may not always be supportive of each other or may need significant assistance from the teacher to work together Teacher may praise positive behavior OR enforce consequences for negative behavior, but not both Teacher may focus on the behavior of a few students, while ignoring the behavior (positive or negative) of others 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at creating a classroom culture of respect and collaboration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are frequently disrespectful of teacher or peers as evidenced by discouraging remarks or disruptive behavior Students are not given many opportunities to collaborate OR during these times do not work well together even with teacher intervention Teacher rarely or never praises positive behavior Teacher rarely or never addresses negative behavior

3



Notes:
 1. If there is one or more instances of disrespect by the teacher toward students, the teacher should be scored a level 1 for this standard
 2. Elementary school teachers more frequently will, and are sometimes required to have, expectations, rewards, and consequences posted visibly in the classroom. Whether or not there are visibly posted, it should be evident within the culture of the classroom that students understand and abide by a set of established expectations and are aware of the rewards and consequences of their actions.

DRAFT – 6/07/2011
 PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISc pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluation, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop this model to support local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the final version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

Indicators	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
<p>Competency 2.9:</p> <p>Set High Expectations for Academic Success</p>	<p>Teacher is highly effective at setting high expectations for academic success.</p> <p>For level 4, all of the evidence listed under level 3 is present, as well as some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Students participate in forming academic goals for themselves and analyzing their progress - Students demonstrate high academic expectations for themselves - Student comments and actions demonstrate that they are excited about their work and understand why it is important 	<p>Teacher is effective at setting high expectations for academic success.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher sets high expectations for students of all levels - Students are invested in their work and value academic success as evidenced by their effort and quality of their work - The classroom is a safe place to take on challenges and risk failure (students do not feel shy about asking questions or bad about answering incorrectly) - Teacher celebrates and displays high quality academic work 	<p>Teacher needs improvement at setting high expectations for academic success.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher may set high expectations for some, but not others - Students are generally invested in their work, but may occasionally spend time off task or give up when work is challenging - Some students may be afraid to take on challenges and risk failure (hesitant to ask for help when needed or give-up easily) - High quality work of a few, but not all students, may be displayed in the classroom 	<p>Teacher is ineffective at setting high expectations for student success.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teacher rarely or never sets high expectations for students - Students may demonstrate disinterest or lack of investment in their work. For example, students might be unfocused, off-task, or refuse to attempt assignments - Students are generally afraid to take on challenges and risk failure due to frequently discouraging comments from the teacher or peers - Teacher rarely or never praises academic work or good behavior - High quality work is rarely or never displayed in the classroom

3

Note: 1. There are several ways for a teacher to demonstrate high expectations - through encouraging comments, higher-level questioning, appropriate, rigorous assignments, expectations written and posted in the classroom, individual student work plans, etc

DRAFT - 6/07/2011

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as it if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop this model to support local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals... IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

DOMAIN 3: Teacher Leadership

Teachers develop and sustain the intense energy and leadership within their school community to ensure the achievement of all students.

Indicator	Highly Effective (4)	Effective (3)	Improvement Necessary (2)	Ineffective (1)
3.1 Contribute to School Culture	At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally may: - Seek out leadership roles. - Go above and beyond in dedicating time for students and peers outside of class.	Teacher will: - Contribute ideas and expertise to further the school's mission and initiatives. - Dedicate time efficiently, when needed, to helping students and peers outside of class.	Teacher will: - Contribute occasional ideas and expertise to further the school's mission and initiatives. - Frequently dedicates time to help students and peers efficiently outside of class.	Teacher rarely or never contributes ideas aimed at improving school efforts. Teacher dedicates little or no time outside of class towards helping students and peers.
3.2 Collaborate with Peers	At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally may: - Go above and beyond in seeking out opportunities to collaborate. - Coach peers through difficult situations. - Take on leadership roles within collaborative groups such as Professional Learning Communities.	Teacher will: - Seek out and participate in regular opportunities to work with and learn from others. - Act for assistance when needed and provide assistance to others in need.	Teacher will: - Participate in occasional opportunities to work with and team from others. - Act for assistance when needed OR - Regularly seek out opportunities to work with others.	Teacher rarely or never participates in opportunities to work with others. Teacher works in isolation and is not a team player.
3.3 Seek Professional Skills and Knowledge	At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally may: - Regularly share newly learned knowledge and practices with others. - Seek out opportunities to lead professional development sessions.	Teacher will: - Actively pursue opportunities to improve knowledge and practice. - Seek out ways to implement new practices into instruction, where applicable. - Welcome constructive feedback to improve practice.	Teacher will: - Attend all mandatory professional development opportunities. - Actively pursue optional professional development opportunities. - Seek out ways to implement new practices into instruction. - Accept constructive feedback well.	Teacher rarely or never attends professional development opportunities. Teacher shows little or no interest in new ideas, programs, or courses to improve teaching and learning.
3.4 Advocate for Student Success	At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally may: - Display commitment to the education of all students in the school. - Make changes and take risks to ensure student success.	Teacher will: - Display commitment to the education of all student. - Attempt to remedy outstanding student achievement. - Advocate for students' individualized needs.	Teacher will: - Display commitment to the education of all his/her students. - Advocate for students' needs.	Teacher rarely or never displays commitment to the education of his/her students. Teacher accepts failure as par for the course and does not advocate for students' needs.

DRAFT - 6/07/2011
PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop this model to support local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

<p>3.5 Engage Families in Student Learning</p>	<p>At Level 4, a teacher fulfills the criteria for Level 3 and additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strives to form relationships in which parents are given ample opportunity to participate in student learning - Is available to address concerns in a timely and positive manner, when necessary, outside of required outreach events 	<p>Teacher will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proactively reach out to parents in a variety of ways to engage them in student learning - Respond promptly to contact from parents - Engage in all forms of parent outreach required by the school 	<p>Teacher will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respond to contact from parents - Engage in all forms of parent outreach required by the school <p>Teacher may note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proactively reach out to parents to engage them in student learning 	<p>Teacher rarely or never reaches out to parents and/or frequently does not respond to contacts from parents.</p>
--	---	--	--	--

DRAFT

DRAFT – 6/07/2011

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop this model to support local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

Core Professionalism Rubric

These indicators illustrate the minimum competencies expected in any profession. These are separate from the other sections in the rubric because they have little to do with teaching and learning and more to do with basic employment practice. Teachers are expected to meet these standards. If they do not, it will affect their overall rating negatively.


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

DRAFT - 6/07/2011
 PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluation, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as it if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop this model to support local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

SUMMARY AND RATING

At the end of the year, evaluators may want to determine a final professional practice rating. PLEASE NOTE: The rating described here only refers to professional practice and does not include measures of student learning. Per Senate Bill 3, a teacher's summative evaluation rating must include measures of student learning. For the RISE model, the rating obtained here will feed into a larger calculation for the summative score which involves multiple measures of student learning. Information regarding this scoring system for RISE will be released no later than January 31, 2012.

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



DRAFT – 6/07/2011

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop this model to support local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

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

At the end of the school year, evaluators should have collected a body of evidence representing teacher practice from throughout the year. Not all of this evidence necessarily came from the same evaluator, but it is the responsibility of the assigned primary evaluator (usually the principal), to gather evidence from every person that observed the teacher during that year. In addition to notes from observations and conferences, evaluators may also have access to evidence provided by the teacher, such as lesson plans, student work, parent/teacher conference notes, etc. To aid in the collection of this evidence, schools should consider having files for teachers containing evaluation evidence, and when possible, house this information electronically.

Because of the volume of evidence that may exist for each teacher, some evaluators may choose to assess evidence mid-way through the year and then again at the end of the year. A mid-year conference can help give teachers an idea of where they stand half-way through the year as well as serve as a midway point for evaluators to assess evidence they have collected thus far.

2 Use professional judgment to establish three, final ratings in Planning, Instruction, and Leadership.

After collecting evidence, the summative evaluator must assess where the teacher falls within each competency and use professional judgment to assign teacher ratings in each of the first three domains. It is not recommended that the evaluator average competency scores to obtain the final domain score, but rather use good judgment to decide which competencies matter the most for teachers in different contexts and how teachers have evolved over the course of the year. The final, three domain ratings should reflect the body of evidence available to the evaluator. In the summative conference, the evaluator should discuss the ratings with the teacher, using evidence to support the final decision.

At this point, each primary evaluator should have ratings in the first three domains that range from 1 (Ineffective) to 4 (Highly Effective).

	D1: Planning	D2: Instruction	D3: Leadership
Final Rating	3 (E)	2 (IN)	3 (E)

Scoring Requirement: Planning and Instruction go hand-in-hand. Therefore, if a teacher scores a 1 (I) or 2 (IN) in Instruction, he or she cannot receive a rating of 4 (HE) in Planning.

DRAFT - 6/07/2011

PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the RISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we elected to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use this or any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop this model to support local corporations in creating the best possible evaluation rubric to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

3 Use established weights to roll-up three domain ratings into one rating for domains 1-3

At this point, each of the three final domain ratings is weighted according to importance and summed together to form one rating for domains 1-3. As described earlier, the creation and design of the rubric stresses the importance of observable teacher and student actions. These are reflected in Domain 2: Instruction. The belief is that good instruction and classroom environment matters more than anything else a teacher can do to improve student outcomes. As such, the Instruction Domain is weighted significantly higher than the others, at 75%. Planning (10%) and Leadership (15%) are then weighted accordingly to complete the calculation.

	Rating (1-4)	Weight	Weighted Rating
Domain 1: Planning	3	10%	0.3
Domain 2: Instruction	2	75%	1.5
Domain 3: Leadership	3	15%	0.45
Final Score			2.3

Note: The calculation here is as follows: 1) Rating * Weight = Weighted Rating; 2) Sum of Weighted Ratings = Final Score

4 Incorporate Core Professionalism

At this point, the teacher practice rating is close to completion. Evaluators now look at the fourth domain: Core Professionalism. As described earlier, this domain represents "non-negotiable" aspects of the teaching profession, such as on-time arrival to school and respect for colleagues. This domain only has two rating levels: Does Not Meet Standard and Meets Standard. The evaluator here uses professional judgment to decide if a teacher has met the standards for any of the four indicators. If a teacher has met standards in each of the four indicators, the score does not change from the result of step 3 above. If the teacher did not meet standards in any one or more of the four indicators, he or she automatically has a 1 point deduction from the final score in step 3.

Outcome 1: Teacher meets all Core Professionalism standards. Final Practice Score = 2.3

Outcome 2: Teacher does not meet all Core Professionalism standards. Final Practice Score (2.3 - 1) = 1.3

The final practice score then feeds in to a larger calculation for an overall summative rating including measures of student learning.

DRAFT – 6/07/2011
PLEASE NOTE: THIS MODEL EVALUATION RUBRIC IS STILL IN DRAFT FORM! The rubric will be tested in the AISE pilot corporations in 2011-2012 and modified based on feedback. However, because IDOE understands the high level of interest across the state with regard to evaluations, we wanted to share this DRAFT to give educators an in-depth look at the basic components of what an evaluation rubric can look like. The IDOE will not require any Indiana school to use any specific evaluation tool. While local leaders may adopt this model rubric as is if they so choose, IDOE recruited educators from across the state to develop the model to support local corporations in crafting the best possible evaluation tool to meet the needs of both students and professionals. IDOE will release the FINAL version of this model rubric when collaboration with teachers, administrators, and other education stakeholders is complete.

11:04 Presentation on study abroad (Spain)

slow start - host teacher
very late start of class

- what to cover video
- explanation of purpose of presentation
 - tie to her JMS experience as a student
- get the impression that host teacher is very loose w/ mgmt
 - very positive environment, though → students feel

Comfortable

- small screen - tough to see (not her fault, but does impact engagement)

→ handled talking student w/ indirect mgmt - good, js

- writing types of language on board & elaborated

→ direct mgmt w/ off-task students

- students asking questions, showing legitimate interest
- good job w/ analogies and ties to personal environment

- Don Anijote

- pics of other sites

→ question - related to picture (war)

- wonder about working more Q's in, but maybe they haven't covered enough of the material(?)

* Good info and well-organized, but very

long and students are struggling to hang

in there. Not a typical lesson.

- Teacher asked for this, was tough to teach a full lesson due to planning issues of host teacher

★ Handled immature male student (in front) pretty well

- lots of indirect mgmt

→ command of material evident

Hand Count e
11:20
19/23 engaged

Hand Count e
11:44
17/23

11:50