NAFCS

Performance Management System

High School Business Teacher 9-12

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Who dares to teach must never cease to learn"

Robert Marzano

NAFCS PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Rationale
The New Albany Floyd County Schools performance management system was developed during the 2011-2012 school year. Its intent is to reinforce organizational clarity via feedback and professional development. It is about each one of us in the organization trying to improve our craft, which in turn will improve the academic success of our students. The system was born out of two compelling works: Patrick Lencioni's *The Advantage: Why Organizational Health Trumps Everything Else in Business* and *Revisiting Professional Learning Communities at Work: New Insights for Improving Schools* by Richard DuFour, Rebecca DuFour, and Robert Eaker.

Healthy Organization
Lencioni (2012) describes the characteristics of a healthy organization's performance management system with the following:

> Essentially *performance management* is the series of activities that ensures that managers provide employees with clarity about what is expected of them, as well as regular feedback about whether or not they are adequately meeting those expectations. That may be a bit simple, but that's the heart of the idea, and it really ought to be simple...Healthy organizations believe that performance management is almost exclusively about eliminating confusion. They realize that most of their employees want to succeed, and that the best way to allow them to do that is to give them clear direction, regular information about how they're doing, and access to the coaching they need...Above all else, they are designed to stimulate the right kinds of conversations around the right topics. (pp. 162-164)

Professional Learning Community
DuFour, DuFour, and Eaker (2008) contend that as a professional learning community we make the following commitments:

1. Accept learning as the fundamental purpose of our district and therefore are willing to examine all practices in light of their impact on learning.

2. Commit to working together to achieve our collective purpose by cultivating a collaborative culture through development of high-performing teams.

3. Assess our effectiveness on the basis of results rather than intentions. Individuals, teams, and schools seek relevant data and information and use that information to promote continuous improvement.

COMPETENCIES OVERVIEW

Core Competencies

The Core Competencies will be used for all teachers and administrators throughout our district. The three Core Competencies: Learning, Collaboration, and Results are based on the three "Big Ideas" of a Professional Learning Community. As we continue to build a *systems thinking* School Corporation, we will continue to embed and emphasize the importance of learning as the fundamental purpose in our district. We are committed to working interdependently to achieve our effectiveness on the basis of results rather than intentions. We will continue to hold high expectations for ourselves, our teams, our schools, and our district. Evaluators are asked to clarify the behavior indicators for each core competency based on the individual's role in the organization.

Role Competencies

The first three Role Competencies of Instruction, Assessment and Interventions are based on the four "Essential Questions" of a Professional Learning Community:
- What do all students need to know and be able to do?
- How will we know if they have learned it?
- How will we respond when some students do not learn?
- How will we enrich and extend the learning for students who are already proficient?

The fourth competency of *technology* is based on the Common Core Literacy Standards. <u>A fifth competency called *Learning Environment* was added in the spring of 2022 to identify the key components for creating a classroom conducive to learning</u>

All Role Competencies will be reviewed and revised at the end of the school year as we try to make each of them a more specific and precise representation of our responsibilities.

Professional Competencies

As employees of the New Albany Floyd County School Corporation, we view the Professional Competencies as the minimum expectations in our profession. The Professional Competencies was changed in the spring of 2022 to be scored as like the other competencies on a zero (0) to three (3) scale. It is our expectation that all teachers and administrators meet all indicators of the Professional Competencies.

Performance Indicators
The Indiana Department of Education requires all certified employees to be evaluated annually on their performance. A teacher's performance evaluation consists of multiple measures that include observations, objective measures for student achievement and performance indicators.

Our school corporation has identified three (3) performance indicators for each certified teaching position and four (4) performance indicators for each administrator position. Each indicator is scored on a zero (0) to three (3) scale.

SCORING COMPETENCIES SUMMARY

The *Performance Management System* consists of four components: Professional Competencies, Core Competencies, Role Competencies and Performance Indicators. Points per competency / indicator are listed below.

Points per Competency / Indicator	
0 to 3 points	Professional Competencies
0 – 9 points (0-3 per competency)	Core Competencies
0 – 15 points (0-3 per competency)	Role Competencies
0 – 9 points (0-3 per indicator)	Performance Indicators

The *Professional Competencies* are assigned a score of a three (3) to zero (0) base on the evaluator's rating of meeting the behavior indicators. **A significant violation of any of the Professional Behavior indicators will result in a zero (0) rating for this competency**

Competency rating	Competency Definition
3 = Consistently Exceeded	Met all 4 Professional Behavior Indicators
2 = Achieved/Occasionally Exceeded	Met 3 of the Professional Behavior Indicators
1 = Partially Met	Met 2 of the Professional Behavior indicators
0 = Did Not Meet	Met 1 or none of the Professional Behavior Indicators

The *Core and Role Competencies* are assigned a score of a three (3) **to** zero (0) based on the *Behavior Indicator* rating given by the evaluator. Listed below are the ratings with definitions that evaluators will use for each behavior indicator.

Behavior Indicator Rating	Behavior Indicator Definition
E= Exceeded	Surpassed the behavior indicator
A= Achieved	Met the behavior indicator
PM= Partially Met	Partially met the behavior indicator
DM= Did not meet	Did not meet the behavior indicator

The rating of the *Behavior Indicators* will lead to a score on each of the competencies. Listed below are the ratings with definitions that evaluators will use for each competency.

Competency rating	Competency Definition
3 = Consistently Exceeded	Consistently ***surpassed*** the majority of behavior indicators and met other behavior indicators in the Competency Area
2 = Achieved/Occasionally Exceeded	Consistently ***met all*** behavior indicators and may occasionally exceed some but not the majority in the Competency Area
1 = Partially Met	Met the ***majority, but not all*** behavior indicators in the Competency Area
0 = Did Not Meet	***Did not meet the majority*** of behavior indicators in the Competency Area

Listed below are the final *Performance Evaluation* ratings with definitions.

Total Points	Performance Evaluation ratings
36-31 Points	Highly Effective
30-24 Points	Effective
20- 23 Points	Needs Improvement
19 points and below	Ineffective

6

CORE COMPETENCIES
DISTRICT -WIDE

Evaluators will clarify the behavior indicators for each core competency based on the individual's role in the organization.

Learning
We accept *learning* as the fundamental purpose of our district and therefore are willing to examine all practices in light of their impact on learning.

- Embraces and models life-long learning
- Pursues continuous professional improvement through self-reflection and modifications
- Accepts feedback as means to improvement
- Engages in professional development activities
- Creates an environment conducive to learning

Collaboration
We are committed to working interdependently to achieve our collective purpose through the implementation of *systems thinking*. We cultivate a *collaborative culture* through the development of high-performing teams.

- Embraces role as a team player and makes decisions that maintain a cohesive PLC
- Give honest, open feedback and communicates in a positive manner
- Shares best practice and proactively seeks information from others to be effective
- Maintains a professional presence during meetings
- Resolves challenges in a respectful manner

Results
We assess our effectiveness on the basis of *results* rather than intentions. We demonstrate high expectations of individuals, teams, schools, and district leaders. We seek relevant data and information and use that information to promote continuous improvement.

- Addresses challenges with analysis and development of solutions
- Uses data as feedback for celebration, commitment to success, or change
- Establishes an on-going cycle of goal setting, practice, and self-evaluation

ROLE COMPETENCIES
HIGH SCHOOL BUSINESS 9-12

Evaluators will clarify the behavior indicators for each core competency based on the individual's role in the organization.

Learning environment
Teacher creates an environment conducive to learning.

- Maintains classroom/ lab arrangement, materials, and displays (physical and/or digital) to maximize student learning of all material.
- Is fair and respectful to all students by ensuring they have equal access to classroom discussions, activities, resources and fosters positive relationships.
- Teaches routines / procedures, models appropriate behavior and maintains high expectations for all students.
- Maximizes academic learning time by managing pacing, transitions and checking for understanding,
- Create a classroom environment of respect and rapport through positive student collaboration

Instruction
Teachers will clarify what students must learn and the strategies for learning.

- Follows Indiana Academic / Content Literacy Standards and District Pacing Guides
- Implements engaging and rigorous lessons
- Vertically aligns curriculum
- Introduces and builds the reading of complex texts with in-depth discussion and writing tasks

Assessment
Teachers monitor learning.

- Uses the school's common formative assessments and District Benchmark exams

- Uses authentic assessments and performance tasks to monitor student progress

- Checks for understanding on a daily basis

- Includes open-ended items that require written explanation

Interventions

Teachers respond to students.

- Provides additional support for students who are not proficient

- Provides extended learning opportunities for students who are proficient/advanced

- Supports and utilizes the school-wide system of interventions

- Maintains effective communication with parents

Technology

Teachers use available technology as a learning tool for students.

- Integrates the District adopted media sources and diverse formats: for example, Learning Management System (Google Classroom, etc.) School Information System (Power School etc.), into instruction and tasks

- Requires students to use digital tools (Some examples may include, but not limited to, Google Classroom, Kami, Pear Deck) to evaluate, collaborate, create and problem-solve

- Digital citizenship (appropriate use of devices) is taught and modeled appropriately to support student learning.

PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES
DISTRICT-WIDE

Evaluators will clarify the Professional Competencies based on the individual's role in the organization.

- Maintain a consistently positive and professional presence in person and online
- Being on time and meeting deadlines consistently

- Complying with attendance guidelines relating to sick and personal days not to exceed 10 days 94.6%

    Exemptions include FMLA, professional, bereavement, military, civic, and association leave days. Other circumstances may be submitted for approval by the Director of Human Resources.
- Dressing appropriately for educational setting according to the teacher handbook

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

RATING	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR
	WRITING
3 =	Evidence of 4 or more writing pieces per student per semester
2 =	Evidence of 3 writing pieces per student per
1 =	Evidence of one writing piece per student per
0 =	No evidence of writing
	CHECKING for UNDERSTANDING
3 =	Consistent observation of teacher checking for understanding using multiple techniques
2 =	Consistent observation of teacher checking for understanding; differing techniques could be
1 =	Inconsistent observation of teacher checking for understanding; differing techniques could be
0 =	No observation of teacher using checking for understanding
	PERFORMANCE TASKS
3 =	Surpassing the expectation by using 4 or more Performance Tasks during the semester as evidenced by artifacts of student work
2 =	Use of at least 3 performance tasks during the semester as evidenced by artifacts of student work
1 =	Use of at least 1 performance tasks during the semester as evidenced by artifacts of student work
0 =	No use of performance tasks

GUIDE FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<u>Writing</u>

The Indiana State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies Science, and Technical Subjects lay out a vision of what literate students must know and be able to do in the 21st century. The K12 ELA standards represent a rigorous, cumulative progression of expectations in the area of writing. In order for students to meet the expectations represented in the standards, high levels of critical thinking are required for student writing, It is essential that our students have an understanding of logical arguments and are able to provide evidence to support their conclusions and judgments in writing.

Doug Reeves wrote recently that every school district should implement more nonfiction writing across the curriculum. Reeves argued that schools must make a substantial commitment to increase the amount of informational writing pieces at every grade level. "Every teacher in every subject is responsible for helping students think critically, and writing is the best way to master that skill." (Reeves, 2011)

Writing Assignments at the high school level will cover one of the following text types and purposes:

- Argumentative (grades 9-12) writing pieces (Standard 1)

- Persuasive (writing pieces (Standard 1)

- Informative/Explanatory writing pieces (Standard 2)

- Narrative writing pieces, (Standard 3)

It is not necessary to cover all text types and purposes in a subject area. Although it is not recommended, a teacher may elect to focus on one text type and purpose.

13

It is recommended when students are asked to write, it may be a combination of "on-demand" essays / (writing over a class period or two), practice assignments done at home, short answers on tests, and/or writing for extended periods of time (over days, or weeks). In math classes this can be demonstrated in DMR error analysis, reflective statements and in Poster Math explanation of problem. In addition, it is encouraged to have students use technology (when possible) to produce and publish their pieces and to in corporate research-based writing pieces/ project in which students rely on information from several sources when applicable.

Checking for Understanding

Teachers continually check for students' understanding throughout instruction using various techniques. Here are just a few examples:

- *Questioning Strategies* – students answer questions posed by the teacher as a whole group or as individuals

- *Think-Pair-Share* – teacher circulates and listens to students sharing in pairs & answering each other's questions on content

- *Mini-white boards* – individual students have a board and teacher uses them for ongoing assessment during a lesson

- *Entrance/Exit Tickets* – students answer a brief question or two or write a brief summary of their learning for the day

- *Thumbs Up/Thumbs Down* – Teachers use a quick and easy way to check for understanding

- *Red/Green/Yellow Cards or Popsicle Sticks* – students indicate their level of understanding by holding up their selected color

- *Three/Two/One* – students indicate their level of understanding by holding up fingers

- *4/3/2/1 Scoring Scale* – teachers use a posted scale that can be used either as a quick check with hand or numerical value for students to self-assess on a written assignment

- *ABCD Whisper* – students get in groups of four where one student is A, the next is B, etc. Each student will be asked to reflect on a concept and draw a visual of his/her interpretation.

- *Circle/Triangle/Square* – students will "circle" something on their notes that is still going around in their heads, "triangle" something pointed that stood out in their minds from the lesson, and "square" something that they agreed with in their thinking

- *Decisions/Decisions* – given a prompt, class goes to the side of room that corresponds to their opinion on the topics; sides share reasoning; students may change sides after discussion

- *Clickers/CPS* – students use electronic surveying devices that give instant feedback and data

- *Fill in Your Thoughts* – students fill in the blanks for a written check for understanding (Another term for rate of change is _____ or _____.)

- *Give One/Get One* – students write a response to a prompt, meet up with another student and share ideas so that each leaves with something to add to his/her list

- *Inner/Outer Circles* – students form an inner and outer circle facing a partner. Teacher asks a question and the students respond to partner. Outside observers relay information. Circle shifts to new partners for each question

- *Bubble Wrap Pop* – students write what they want to know about a topic on a dot sticker. Place dots on bubble wrap. When a topic is covered, the student pops the bubble.

- *Take and Pass* – students write a response than pass to the right, then add their response to next paper. Continue until students get their paper back, then the group debriefs.

- *Summary Writing* – students write a one-sentence summary of the most essential information from several days of instruction

- *Value Line-up* – teacher poses question where students must select answer 1, 2 or 3. Students line up according to selected choice. Students give reasoning. Students can then shift.

- *Three-minute Buzz* – teacher poses a question and selected students must give every bit of information they can for three minutes. Student listen, analyze and give feedback for essential concepts

Performance Tasks / Problem Based Learning

Performance Tasks / Problem Based Learning (PBL) allow students the opportunity to engage in incremental learning experiences that are designed to help them make their own connections to the standards while developing both conceptual understanding (concepts) and procedural understanding (skills). Performance tasks often scaffold from one task to the next in terms of the cognitive demand they place on students, building from foundational concepts and skills to the more rigorous skills of application, synthesis, evaluation, and creativity. Other times they require students to exercise the full range of thinking skills within one task alone. In doing so, students have the opportunity to demonstrate more than just one isolated procedural skill.

Performance Tasks / (PBL) provide the "what" teachers will use to give their students truly engaging learning experiences within a unit of study. Performance tasks can also incorporate project-based learning and inquiry-based learning, two powerful learning approaches often absent from more traditional curricula. These active modes of learning do much to promote student discovery of the Big Ideas and Essential Questions of each unit.

Performance Tasks / (PBL) (both collaborative and individual) should reflect these key attributes

- Authentic

- Rigorous

- Relevant to life situations and contexts

- Interdisciplinary

- Highly motivational

- Mentally stimulating, thought-provoking

- Deep reasoning, application, analysis, synthesis

SUMMARY EVALUATION SHEET

Each teacher will be observed once a semester and will receive a written evaluation based on these observations. The following is an example of the summary evaluation:

Teacher Name_____   **School year** _____

Competencies / Indicators	Rating	Score
Professional Competencies	0 - 3	
Core Competencies		
Learning	0 – 3	
Collaboration	0 – 3	
Results	0 – 3	
Role Competencies		
Learning	0 – 3	
Instruction	0 – 3	
Assessment	0 – 3	
Interventions	0 – 3	
Technology	0 – 3	
Performance Indicators		
Writing	0 – 3	
Checking for Understanding	0 – 3	
Performance Tasks	0 – 3	
Overall Rating (total points)	0 – 36	

Based on the above rating, I have evaluated this teacher as:

_____   Highly Effective   _____   Effective
_____   Improvement Necessary   _____   Ineffective

Evaluator's Narrative Summary
Strengths:

Improvement areas:

Suggestions for growth:

Administrator _____ Date _____ Teacher _____ Date _____

The teacher's signature shall not be construed to indicate agreement or disagreement with statements contained on this form. The teacher has a right to offer a written response to this evaluation. The response shall be attached to this form.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN GUIDELINES

Our goal is for every teacher to receive an "Effective" or *"Highly Effective"* rating each year. However, if during the observation process an evaluator has identified deficiencies (*Needs Improvement or Ineffective Rating*) in a teacher's performance, a *Professional Growth Plan* shall be implemented. Listed below are the guidelines for implementation of the *Professional Growth Plan:*

- The *Professional Growth Plan* should be prepared jointly whenever possible. If the administrator(s) and the teacher cannot jointly establish the plan, the administrator(s) will prepare the plan, and the teacher may prepare a rebuttal statement.
- The administration assumes the responsibility to identify needed improvements and provide assistance as appropriate, but the plan clearly states that the staff member is responsible for his or her own improvement and professional growth.
- A single area of deficiency may be the basis for placing a teacher on a *Professional Growth Plan.*
- The *Professional Growth Plan* will contain a specific goal, which may be short or long term, and will include expected outcomes, a plan of action toward the outcomes, resources needed and the method of evaluating/monitoring performance.
- The *Professional Growth Plan* **form** is designed to have the teacher work with the administrator(s) to prepare a plan to address each goal (a separate form is used for each goal). The *Professional Growth Plan* must be completed and agreed upon by the teacher and the administrator(s) within ten (10) days.
- The remediation plan must require the use of the teacher's license renewal credits in professional development activities intended to help the teacher achieve an effective rating on the next performance evaluation.
- The timeline established requires a follow-up conference to assess the teacher's progress in achieving the goal(s) which will be conducted before the final annual evaluation.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN

Goal # _____   _____ School Year

Name: Assignment:

Date Teacher Received form: _____

   1. Identify Goal:

   2. Plan to Achieve Goal:

   3. How will you know Goal has been Achieved:

       a. Expected level of Performance:

       b. Evidence of Performance:

   4. A conference will be held within ten (10) working days after administrator receives Goal Statement and plan to achieve Goal

19

Comments from teacher:

Comments from evaluator:

5. Follow-up conference for assessment of Progress (before final annual evaluation)

    Comments from teacher:

    Comments from evaluator:

Administrator _____ Date _____ Teacher _____ Date _____

The teacher's signature shall not be construed to indicate agreement or disagreement with statements contained on this form. The teacher has a right to offer a written response to this evaluation. The response shall be attached to this form

TALENT DEVELOPMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

CORE COMPETENCIES
DISTRICT-WIDE

DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). Revisiting professional learning communities at work: New insights for improving schools. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Eaker, R., & Keating, J. (2012). Every school, every team, every classroom: District leadership for growing professional learning communities at work. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Van Clay, M., Soldwedel, P., & Many, T.W. (2012). Aligning school districts as plc's. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Collins, J. (2005). Good to great and the social sectors. Boulder CO: Jim Collins.

Lencioni, P. (2012). The advantage: Why organizational health trumps everything else in business. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Senge, P.M. (2006). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Currency Doubleday.

Learning

20

We accept *learning* as the fundamental purpose of our district and therefore are willing to examine all practices in light of their impact on learning.

DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (Eds.). (2005). On common ground: The power of professional learning communities. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Conaty, B.,& Charan, R. (2010). The talent masters: Why smart leaders put people before numbers. New York: Crown Business.

Collins, J., & Porras, J.I. (2002). Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies. New York: Harper Business.

Coyle, D. (2009). The talent code: Greatness isn't born. It's grown. Here's how. New York: Bantam.

DuFour, R., & Marzano, R.J. (2011). Leaders of learning: How district, school, and classroom leaders improve student achievement. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Gladwell, M. (2008). Outliers: The story of success. New York: Little, Brown and Company.

Learning (continued)

Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. New York: Routlege.

Kelly, M. (2011). Off balance: Getting beyond the work-life balance myth to personal and professional satisfaction. New York: Hudson Street Press.

Marzano, R. J. (2012). Becoming a reflective teacher. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory.

Marzano, R. J. (2003). Classroom management that works: Research-based strategies for every teacher. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum.

Pink, D. H. (2009). Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us. New York: Riverhead Books.

Collaboration

We are committed to working interdependently to achieve our collective purpose through the implementation of *systems thinking*. We cultivate a *collaborative culture* through the development of high-performing teams.

DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (Eds.). (2005). On common ground: The power of

professional learning communities. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Goleman, D. (1997). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ. New York: Bantam Books.

Lencioni, P. (2006). Silos, politics, and turf wars: A leadership fable about destroying the barriers that turn colleagues into competitors. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Lencioni, P. (2002). The five dysfunctions of a team: A leadership fable. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Lencioni, P. (2005). Overcoming the five dysfunctions of a team: A field guide for leaders, managers, and facilitators. San Francisco,CA: Jossey Bass.

Kise, J. A. G., & Russell, B. (2010). Creating a coaching culture for professional learning communities. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Novak, D. (2012). Taking people with you: The only way to make big things happen. New York: Portfolio /Penguin.

Sagor, R. (2010). Collaborative action research for professional learning communities. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Results

We assess our effectiveness on the basis of *results* rather than intentions. We demonstrate high expectations of individuals, teams, schools, and district leaders. We seek relevant data and information and use that information to promote continuous improvement.

DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (Eds.). (2005). On common ground: The power of professional learning communities. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Lencioni, P. (2007). The three signs of a miserable job: A fable for managers and their employees. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Bossidy, L., & Charan, R. (2002). Execution: The discipline of getting things done. New York: Crown Business.

TALENT DEVELOPMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

ROLE COMPETENCIES

Instruction

Teachers clarify what students must learn and the strategies for learning

Ainsworth, L., & Christinson, J. (2006). Five easy steps to a balanced math program for primary grades: Grades K-2. Englewood, CO: Advanced Learning Press.

Ainsworth, L., & Christinson, J. (2006). Five easy steps to a balanced math program for secondary grades: Middle school & high school. Englewood, CO: Advanced Learning Press.

Ainsworth, L., & Christinson, J. (2006). Five easy steps to a balanced math program for upper elementary grades: Grades 3-5. Englewood, CO: Advanced Learning Press.

Ainsworth, L. (2012). Navigating assessment and collaboration with the common core state standards. Englewood, CO: The Leadership and Learning Center.

Ainsworth, L. (2010). Rigorous curriculum design: How to create curricular units of study that align standards, instruction, and assessment. Englewood, CO: The Leadership and Learning Center.

Bellanca, J.,A., Fogarty, R.J., & Pete, B.M. (2012). How to teach thinking skill within the common core. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Blevins, W. (2001). Teaching phonics & word study in the intermediate grades: A complete sourcebook. New York: Scholastic Professional Books.

Christinson, J. (2012). Navigating the mathematics common core state standards. Englewood, CO: The Leadership and Learning Center.

Fletcher, R., & Portalupi, J. (1998). Craft lessons: Teaching writing k-8. York, ME: NH: Heinemann.

Fletcher, R., & Portalupi, J. (2001). Writing workshop: The essential guide. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (2001). Guiding readers and writers: Teaching comprehension, genre, and content literacy. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Jacobs, H.H. (2006). Active literacy across the curriculum: Strategies for reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education, Inc.

Instruction (continued)

Kanold, T.D., Zimmerman, G., Carter, J.A., & Toncheff, M. (2012). Common core mathematics in a plc at work. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Keene, E.O., & Zimmerman, S. (1997). Mosaic of thought: Teaching comprehension in a reader's workshop. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D.J. (2005). Building academic vocabulary: Teacher's manual. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R.J., & Pickering, D.J., & Pollock, J.E., (2001) Classroom instruction that Works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement.

Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J. (2007). The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive framework for effective instruction. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J. (Ed.). (2010). On excellence in teaching. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Miller, D. (2009). The book whisperer: Awakening the inner reader in every child. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Miller, D. (2002). Reading with meaning: Teaching comprehension in the primary grades. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Peery, A. (2011). Navigating the English language arts common core state standards. Englewood, CO: The Leadership and Learning Center.

Perry, A. (2009). Writing matters in every classroom. Englewood, CO: The Leadership and Learning Center.

Piercy, T., & Piercy, W. (2011). Disciplinary literacy: Redefining deep understanding and leadership for 21st- century demands. Englewood, CO: The Leadership and Learning Center.

Pinnell, G.S., & Fountas, I.C. (1998). Word matters: Teaching phonics and spelling in the reading/writing classroom. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Rasinski, T. V. (2010). The fluent reader: Oral & silent reading strategies for building fluency, word recognition & comprehension (2nd ed.). New York: Scholastic.

Instruction (continued)

Rasinski, T. V. (Ed.). (2011). Rebuilding the foundation: Effective reading instruction for 21st century literacy. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Rasinski, T,, Padak, N., Newton, R.M. & Newton, E. (2008). Greek and latin roots: keys to building vocabulary. Huntington Beach, CA: Shell Education.

Reeves, D. B. (2011). Navigating implementation of the common core state standards.

Englewood, CO: The Leadership and Learning Center.

Richardson, J. (2009). The next step in guided reading: Focused assessments and targeted lessons for helping every student become a better reader. New York: Scholastic.

Rycik, J.A., and Irvin, J.L. (2005). Teaching reading in the middle grades: Understanding and supporting literacy development. New York: Pearson, Allyn and Bacon.

Schmoker, M. (2011). Focus: Evaluating the essentials to radically improve student achievement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Shumway, J.F. (2011). Number sense routines: Building numerical literacy everyday in grades k-3. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Taberski, S. (2000). On solid ground: Strategies for teaching reading k-3. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Van de Walle, J.A., & Lovin, L.H. (2006). Teaching student-centered mathematics: grades k-3. New Yori: Pearson, Allyn and Bacon.

Van de Walle, J.A., & Lovin, L.H. (2006). Teaching student-centered mathematics: grades 3-5. New Yori: Pearson, Allyn and Bacon.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). Understanding by design. Alexandria VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2004). Understanding by design: Professional development workbook. Alexandria VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Assessment
Teachers monitor learning

Ainsworth, L., & Viegut, D. (2006). Common formative assessments: How to connect standards-based instruction and assessment. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bailey, K., & Jakicic, C. (2012). Common formative assessment: A toolkit for professional learning communities at work. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2007). Checking for understanding: Formative assessment techniques for your classroom. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Popham, W.J. (2008). Transformative assessment. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Reeves, D. B. (Ed.). (2007). Ahead of the curve: The power of assessment to transform teaching and learning. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Richardson, J. (2009). The next step in guided reading: Focused assessments and targeted lessons for helping every student become a better reader. New York: Scholastic.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). Understanding by design. Alexandria VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2004). Understanding by design: Professional development workbook. Alexandria VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wiliam, D. (2011). Embedded formative assessment. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Interventions
Teachers respond to students

Beers. K. (2003). When kids can't read: What teachers can do. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Bender, W. N., & Crane, D. (2011). RTI in math: Practical guidelines for elementary teachers. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Interventions (continued)

Bender, W. N. (2012). RTI in middle and high schools. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree

Press.

Buffum, A., Mattos, M., & Weber, C. (2012). Simplifying response to intervention: Four essential guiding principles. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

DuFour, R., DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & Karhanek, G. (2010). Raising the bar and closing the gap: Whatever it takes. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Fisher, D., Frey N., & Rothenberg, C. (2011). Implementing rti with english learners. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Strickland, D.S., Ganske, K., & Monroe, J.K. (2002). Supporting struggling readers and writers: Strategies for classroom interventions 3-6. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Tomlinson C. A., & McTighe, J. (2006). Integrating differentiated instruction + understanding by design. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tomlinson C. A. (1999). The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tovani, C. (2000). I read it, but i don't get it: Comprehension strategies for adolescent readers. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.

Technology
Teachers use technology as a learning tool for students

Bellanca, J., & Brandt, R. (Eds.) (2010). 21st century skills: Rethinking how students learn. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Compliance guidelines with IC 20-28-11.5

Guidelines for New Albany Floyd County School Evaluators:

- Observations
    - School Administrators will use the Performance Management System to evaluate all certificated employees in their buildings.
    - School administrators will use the Student Data Analysis (SDA) to record all observations and evaluations.
    - All certificated employees must have a minimum of two extended observations per year – one per semester. An extended observation lasts a minimum of 40 minutes. It may be announced or unannounced. It may take place over one class period or span two consecutive class periods. Extended observations are accompanied by optional pre-conferences and <u>mandatory post-conferences including written feedback within five school days (7 days total) of the observation.</u>
    - In addition, all teachers will have a minimum of three short observations – at least one per semester. A short observation lasts a minimum of 10 minutes and should not be announced. There are no conferencing requirements around short observations, but a post-observation conference should be scheduled if there are areas of concern. A teacher must receive written feedback following a short observation within two school days.
- Evaluation
    - State Law requires all certificated employees to be evaluated once a year. An administrator may start the evaluation as soon as the minimum number of observations required by law is completed. Administrators will use the following terms for identifying all certificated employees in the evaluation process.
        - Highly effective: a teacher can receive a salary increase.
        - Effective: a teacher can receive a salary increase.
        - Improvement Necessary: a teacher cannot receive a raise.
            1) Must have a remediation (professional development) plan.
            2) May request a conference with the Superintendent / designee no later than 5 days after receiving this rating.
        - Ineffective: A teacher cannot receive a raise.
            3) Must have a remediation (professional development) plan.
            4) May request a conference with the Superintendent /designee no later than 5 days after receiving this rating.

- Evaluation (continued)

  3) Cannot be assigned to teach an ISTEP/ECA class if identified as an "ineffective" teacher for two consecutive years.   Exception: the school corporation gives written notice to parents.

- Remediation plan

  - If a teacher receives a rating of "ineffective" or "improvement necessary", the evaluator and the teacher shall develop a remediation (professional development plan) plan of not more than ninety (90) school days in length to correct the deficiencies noted in the teacher's evaluation. Administrators will follow the guidelines on page 13 of the Performance Management System Handbook. The remediation plan must require the use of the teacher's license renewal credits in professional development activities; this is intended to help the teacher achieve an effective rating on the next performance evaluation.

- Evaluators

  - For identification purposes the following positions will be the evaluators in the New Albany Floyd County School Corporation:

    - All administrative positions

    - All dean positions

    - Early Interventionist Coordinator

    - Head Nurse

- Training for evaluators

  - All administrators were trained on Thursday, July 19th, 2012 to implement the Performance Management System using the Student Data Analysis application. Ongoing training will be provided monthly throughout the school system by the Directors of High, Middle, and Elementary schools.

- Teacher Retention

  - Teachers who were employed during the 2010-2011 school year will be identified as Established. This label is for one year. After the 2012-2013 school year, all teachers will move to "Professional" status unless they receive an ineffective rating. If this happens, a teacher will be moved to "Probationary" status.

    - Professional: Can only be achieved if a teacher receives 3 evaluation ratings of "Effective" or 'Highly Effective in a five year period.   A teacher remains at "Professional" status until he/she receives an "Improvement necessary" or "Ineffective" rating.

- Teacher Retention (continued)

  - Probationary: A teacher remains in this category until he/she receives at least three ratings of "Effective" or "Highly Effective" in a five year period.

  - All new teachers hired to our School District after July 1st, 2011 fall under this identification.

  - A teacher who attains the rank of "Professional" teacher and receives a rating of "Ineffective" returns to a "Probationary" status. This teacher cannot be terminated on the rating basis unless the teacher is rated "Ineffective" the next year.

    - Exception: Any teacher's contract can be canceled immediately for immorality, insubordination, incompetence, neglect of duty, conviction for certain criminal offenses, or another good and just cause.

  - A "Probationary" teacher can be terminated if he/she receives an "Ineffective" rating or two consecutive years of "Needs Improvement" rating or for any reason relevant to the school corporation's interest.

- Request a Private Conference with the Superintendent

  The Principal's recommendation for a teacher evaluation is final unless the teacher requests a conference with the Superintendent. A teacher may request a meeting with the Superintendent and/or designee within 5 days of receiving this rating.

- Instruction Delivered by Teachers Rated Ineffective

  - According to state law, a student many not be instructed for two (2) consecutive years by two (2) consecutive teachers, each of whom was rated as "ineffective" in the school year immediately before and the school year in which the student is placed in the respective teacher's class. Each year, all building principals will review teacher evaluation ratings before making teaching assignments. If it is not possible for a building principal to schedule in compliance with this section, he or she will notify the appropriate Director (elementary, middle or high). The Director will notify in writing the parents/guardians of each applicable student indicating the student will be placed in a classroom of a teacher who has been

31

rated ineffective. The parents/guardians must be notified before the start of the second consecutive school year.

- Process for ensuring evaluation plan is in writing and explain to the governing body in a Public meeting
    - Each year at the July School Board meeting, the Superintendent or his/her designee will explain to the how teachers are evaluated using the NAFCS Performance Management Evaluation model and results of the previous year's teacher evaluations. Prior to the board the Superintendent or his/her designee will share this information with the President of the New Albany Floyd County Teachers Association.

- Teacher Appreciation Grant Policy
    - The amount of a stipend awarded to a teacher rated as Highly Effective must be at least 25% greater than the amount of a stipend awarded to a teacher rated as Effective.
    - The stipend will not be added to become permanent part of a teacher's salary. Process for ensuring evaluation plan is in writing and explain to the governing body in a Public meeting