# FTCSC



# Teacher Evaluation System

## Elementary Teacher (K-5)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

*"Who dares to teach must never cease to learn"*

**Robert Marzano**

**FTCSC TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM**
2019-2020

**Rationale**
The Franklin Township Community School Corporation teacher evaluation system was developed during the 2018-2019 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 (teacher evaluation 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 and PERFORMANCE INDICATORS OVERVIEW**
**All certified staff will be evaluated on the following four areas.**

**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. A *systems thinking* approach is an alignment of an organization's processes. 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.

**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 Indiana Literacy Standards.

These Role Competencies were reviewed and revised by curricular departments, grade level teams of teachers, media specialists, counselors, etc. and will be our **first attempt** to convey the important functions of each role. 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 Franklin Township Community School Corporation, we view the Professional Competencies as critical expectations in our profession. The Professional Competencies are scored on a 1 to 4 scale.

**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 five (5) performance indicators for each certified position. Each indicator is scored on a 1 to 4 scale.

**SCORING COMPETENCIES SUMMARY**

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

| Points per Competency / Indicator | |
|---|---|
| 3 – 12 points (1-4 per competency) | Core Competencies |
| 4 – 16 points (1-4 per competency) | Role Competencies |
| 1 - 4 points | Professional Competencies |
| 5 – 20 points (1-4 per indicator) | Performance Indicators |

The *Core, Role and Professional Competencies* are assigned a score of 1 **to** 4 based on the rating given by the evaluator.  Listed below are the ratings with definitions that evaluators will use for each competency. Competencies are found on pages 5, 6, and 7.

| Competency rating | Explanation of Competency Rating |
|---|---|
| 4 = Highly Effective | All indicators in the Competency Area were observed **and** some were observed multiple times |
| 3 = Effective | All indicators in the Competency Area were observed |
| 2 = Needs Improvement | The majority of the indicators in the Competency Area were observed |
| 1 = Ineffective | Indicators in the Competency Area were not observed |

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

| Total Points | Performance Evaluation ratings |
|---|---|
| 52-44 Points | Highly Effective |
| 43-35 Points | Effective |
| 34-26 Points | Needs Improvement |
| 25 points and below | Ineffective |

**CORE COMPETENCIES**
**DISTRICT -WIDE**

Teachers and administrators will be rated on each of the core competencies below.

# 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 lifelong 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
- Gives 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 ongoing cycle of goal setting, practice, and self-evaluation

**ROLE COMPETENCIES**
**Elementary Teacher (K-5)**

Teachers will be rated on each of the core competencies below.

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

- Follows Indiana Standards and District Pacing Guides
- Implements Guided Reading during the 120 Minute Literacy Block including (mini lessons, IRAs and Independent Structures D5)
- Implements *Everyday Math*
- Implements engaging lessons
- Introduces and builds the reading of complex texts with in-depth discussions & writing tasks

## Assessment
Teachers monitor learning.

- Checks for understanding on a daily basis
- Provides timely, intentional and corrective feedback
- Uses the district's grade level assessments and/or common formative assessments
- Analyzes assessment data to inform instruction
- Uses progress monitoring and assessment data to identify students by name and by need in order to provide timely, direct, and systematic support to accelerate student learning

## Interventions
Teachers respond to students.

- Provides more time and support for students who are not proficient
- Enriches and extends learning for students who are proficient/advanced
- Supports and utilizes the school-wide system of interventions
- Communicates with parents to keep them informed of their child's progress and solicits help at home

## Technology
Teachers use available technology as a learning tool for students.

- Integrate technology-enriched learning experiences via Google Classroom that incorporate digital tools and resources to promote student learning and creativity
- Teacher is proficient in Google Classroom basics and students interact with assignments regular basis

**PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES**
**DISTRICT-WIDE**

Teachers and administrators will be rated on each of the core competencies below.

- Maintaining a positive and professional presence within the school and the community.

- Being on time and meeting deadlines consistently.

- Dressing appropriately for educational setting for staff member's duties and should be easily identified as the classroom teacher.

- Complying with attendance guidelines relating to sick and general leave days.

## PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Teachers will be rated on each of the core competencies below.

**ELEMENTARY (K-5)**                    **ILEARN**

| RATING | PERFORMANCE INDICATOR |
|---|---|
|  | **District English Average for Grades 3, 4, 5** |
| 4 = | 80-100% of students achieved at or above Proficiency |
| 3 = | 70-79% of students achieved at or above Proficiency |
| 2 = | 60-69% of students achieved at or above Proficiency |
| 1 = | 59% or less of students achieved at or above Proficiency |
|  |  |
|  | **District Math Average for Grades 3, 4, 5** |
| 4 = | 80-100% of students achieved at or above Proficiency |
| 3 = | 70-79% of students achieved at or above Proficiency |
| 2 = | 60-69% of students achieved at or above Proficiency |
| 1 = | 59% or less of students achieved at or above Proficiency |
|  |  |
|  | **WRITING** |
| 4 = | Evidence of 4 or more writing pieces per student per semester |
| 3 = | Evidence of 3 writing pieces per student per semester |
| 2 = | Evidence of one writing piece per student per semester |
| 1 = | No evidence of writing |
|  |  |
|  | **CHECKING for UNDERSTANDING** |
| 4 = | *Using multiple techniques* teacher checks for understanding |
| 3 = | Teacher checks for understanding |
| 2 = | *Teacher rarely* checks for understanding |
| 1 = | Teacher does not check for understanding |
|  |  |
|  | **PERFORMANCE TASKS** |
| 4 = | Surpassing the expectation by using 4 or more Performance Tasks during the semester as evidenced by artifacts of student work |
| 3 = | Use of at least 3 performance tasks during the semester as evidenced by artifacts of student work |
| 2 = | Use of at least 1 performance tasks during the semester as evidenced by artifacts of student work |
| 1 = | No use of performance tasks |

**GUIDE FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

**<u>Writing</u>**

*The Indiana English/Language Arts Standards* that were adopted in April of 2014 lay out a vision of what literate students must know and be able to do in the 21st century. These 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 that every school district should implement more nonfiction writing across the curriculum. Reeves argues 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* could include the following where students are asked to develop 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) to list a few examples:

- Argumentative, Informative, and Narrative (grades K-5) writing pieces (Standard  W.3.1, W.3.2, W.3.31)
- Argumentative, Informative, and Narrative (grades 6-12) writing pieces (Standard W.3.1, W.3.2, W.3.1)
- Writing pieces where students are required to use technology to produce and publish their pieces
- Research-based writing pieces/projects where students draw information from several sources (Standard W.5)

Indiana State English/Language Arts Standards includes the definition and description of Argumentative, Persuasive, Informative and Narrative Writing at the IDOE website https://www.doe.in.gov/standards/englishlanguage-arts.   The site also provides tools that will assist teachers in viewing, discussing, and understanding what proficient writing looks like at each grade level.

## 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-whiteboards* – 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.
- *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 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.
- *Electric devices* -electronic surveying devices that give instant feedback and data like but not limited to Kahoot, Quizlet, Quizizz, Pear Deck, Menti-meter.
- *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 then 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**

A *Performance Task is* any learning activity that asks students to perform to demonstrate their knowledge, understanding and proficiency. *Performance tasks* yield a tangible product and/or performance that serve as evidence of learning.

- *Performance Tasks* 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* 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.

*Here are a few examples:*

- English/Language Arts - Timed Essay, 4 minute monologue in Speech class, Pre-writing activity, oral report, debates, written constructed response, etc.
- Math - Story problem, creating a pattern/explain the pattern, written constructed response, etc.
- Science - Steps of a lab activity, completion of a section of a rubric, construct a parallel circuit, written constructed response, etc.
- Related Arts - Pacer test, student performing a modified pull-up, art portfolio, music skill, written constructed response, etc.
- Social Studies - create a timeline, debate, written constructed response, reports, presentations, etc.

# SUMMARY EVALUATION SHEET

All teachers new to FTCSC (1-2 years) will have 4 formal observations (40-60) minutes once each quarter. Experienced Teachers (3+ years) will be observed 2 times per school year, 1 formal (40-60) and 1 informal (15-20). All formal observations will occur within 10 days of the pre-conference. The following is an example of the summary evaluation:

**Teacher Name**_____    **School year** _____

| Competencies / Indicators | Rating | Score |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |
| **Core Competencies** |  |  |
| Learning | 1 – 4 |  |
| Collaboration | 1 – 4 |  |
| Results | 1 – 4 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Role Competencies** |  |  |
| Instruction | 1 – 4 |  |
| Assessment | 1 – 4 |  |
| Interventions | 1 – 4 |  |
| Technology | 1 – 4 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Professional Competencies** | 1 - 4 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Performance Indicators** |  |  |
| Student Data Point (1st Performance Indicator, page 8) | 1 – 4 |  |
| Student Data Point (2nd Performance Indicator, page 8) | 1 – 4 |  |
| Writing | 1 – 4 |  |
| Checking for Understanding | 1 – 4 |  |
| Performance Tasks | 1 – 4 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Overall Rating (total points)** | 13 – 52 |  |

Based on the above rating, I have evaluated this teacher as:
_____Highly Effective (52-44 pts)                    _____Effective (43-35 pts)
_____Improvement Necessary (34-26 pts)        _____Ineffective (25 pts and below)

**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.*

# TEACHER SUPPORT PHASE AND IMPROVEMENT PLAN

The Teacher Improvement Plan is for teachers scored as Improvement Necessary in two or more competencies or Ineffective in one or more competencies in any domain of the evaluation rubric.

There are three clearly defined steps in the plan including:

1. Administrative Notice and Support
2. Collegial Support
3. Intensive Administrative Intervention

## Administrative Notice and Support

The Administrative Notice and Support step of the Teacher Improvement Plan, is to enhance communication between the building administrator and classroom teacher regarding FTCSC performance expectations. The singular goal of this process is to clearly communicate expectations and provide the necessary support. In the Administrative Notice and Support step, the principal notifies the teacher in writing of the specific area(s) in need of improvement. The competencies within the rubrics defining professional practice serve as the resource to clearly define the area and level of professional practice expected from the teacher. At this time the teacher, will work collaboratively with the principal, to fully focus on the area(s) identified as Improvement Necessary or Ineffective. Documented improvement at an Effective level, measured by the rubrics, will end the Teacher Improvement Plan.

The process is as follows:

- The administrator notifies the teacher that he/she is moving into the Administrative Notice and Support step of the Teacher improvement plan. The notification is in writing and includes the reasons for movement into Administrative Notice and Support. The process of the Teacher Improvement Plan is explained to the teacher.
- At the initial meeting, the principal and the teacher will design a plan which includes:
  - an established timeline
  - strategies for improvement
  - feedback and guidance while not serving in an evaluative role
  - evidence required to demonstrate improvement at an Effective level
- Documented improvement at an Effective level, measured by the rubrics, will end the Teacher Improvement Plan.
- If improved performance is not noted by the administrator, the teacher is notified in a conference and in writing that the teacher moves to the Collegial Support step of the Teacher Improvement Plan and this step is fully explained to the teacher.

## Collegial Support

This step is focused on expanding the number of resources to include teaching colleagues in an effort to more fully assist the teacher in meeting professional expectations for educators in FTCSC. The process follows a very similar format as the Administrative Notice and Support step. The rubrics continue to serve as a guide for expected professional practice. Documented improvement at an Effective level, measured by the rubrics, will end the Teacher Improvement Plan.

- At the conclusion of the Administrative Notice and Support step, the administrator notifies the teacher that he/she is moving into the Collegial Support step of the Teacher Improvement Plan. The notification is in writing and includes the reasons for movement into Collegial Support. The process is explained to the teacher.
- At the initial meeting, the principal and the teacher will review the previous plan (listed above) adjusting strategies and expanding the support system.
- When documented improvement at an Effective level is noted, the administrator notifies the teacher in conference, and in writing, that the professional expectations have been met and the Teacher Improvement Plan will end. Documentation will be placed in the teacher's personnel file as a permanent record of this level of intervention,
- If improved performance is not noted by the administrator, the teacher is notified in a conference and in writing that the teacher is placed in the Intensive Administrative Intervention step of the Teacher Improvement Plan. The process of the Intensive Administrative Intervention step is explained to the teacher.


## Intensive Administrative Intervention

The Intensive Administrative Intervention step of the Teacher Improvement Plan is the most comprehensive level of support the school corporation provides to a teacher in need of improvement. This level of support is for a teacher who has not met the rubrics expectations or fails to participate in either the Administrative Notice and Support step or Collegial Support step. This level of support must be completed within the time frame established in 1C 20-28. This level of support differs from Collegial Support in the severity of possible consequences, urgency, the level of resources and structured format.

- At the initial meeting, the principal and the teacher will review the previous plan, adjusting strategies and expanding the support system.
    - timeline established, including the meeting date, teacher evaluation and date for resolution
    - administrative directed teacher action plan
    - review of evidence required to demonstrate effectiveness
- When documented improvement at an Effective level is noted, the administrator notifies the teacher in conference, and in writing, that the professional expectations have been met and the Teacher Improvement Plan will end. Documentation will be placed in the teacher's personnel file as a permanent record of this level of intervention.
- If improved performance is not noted by the administrator, the teacher is notified in a conference and in writing that the teacher is being recommended for non-renewal of the teaching contract.

There may be times when a teacher demonstrates unacceptable behavior (immoral, insubordinate, incompetent, and criminal) and these provisions allow for moving the teacher immediately to the Intensive Administrative Intervention step. In cases of state statute or criminal law violations, the teacher may be immediately placed on Administrative Leave pending due process.

# Franklin Township Community School Corporation

**TO:**

**FROM:**

**SUBJECT:**

**DATE:**

The Teacher Evaluation has a component for teacher improvement. The Teacher Improvement Plan is a three step plan and is applicable to all Franklin Township teachers whose professional practice has diminished to a point, often times in a singular area, where support is essential.

The Teacher Improvement Plan utilizes the rubrics that defines what is expected of Highly Effective or Effective teachers. Area(s) where you are not meeting expectations (Not Evident) or need support (Needs Improvement) are:

| Indicator | Competency | Suggestions for Improvement |
|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

This letter (Administrative Notice and Support) is the first step of the Teacher Improvement Plan. Your professional behavior needs to be aligned with the rubrics. You may seek additional support or resources from me or another person who you feel may be helpful. During this time, I will be observing in your classroom or other locations where professional behavior is expected. If performance is once again in line with the rubric as evaluated by me, you will not continue further with the Teacher Improvement Plan.

Should there be insufficient progress, you will be moved to step two of the Plan - Collegial Support. The focus of this step is to clearly define expectations and establish date of the teacher evaluation for those expectations to be met. If moved to this step, the process will be carefully explained to you. It is suggested that you have another person with you. This person may be a representative from the Franklin Township Education Association (if you are a member) or may be another colleague whom you trust.

The final step is Intensive Administrative Intervention. If reaching this step in the Improvement Plan, the process will again be reviewed with you. This is the final step of the Plan and could result in the non-renewal/cancellation of your teaching contract with the Franklin Township Community Schools.

Once again, this letter serves as notification that you have some area(s) for improvement or areas that are unacceptable. While this letter is not punitive, it should be taken very seriously and improvement should be seen by me.

Teacher: _____     Date: _____

School: _____     Assignment: _____

Principal: _____     Date: _____


This plan is collaboratively developed with the teacher, administrator, and if appropriate, the Support Team.

Timeline:


Administrator will be in on a weekly/ bi-weekly basis to observe and support.  We will meet to have our final conference and determine if the Administrative support phase is complete or if we need to move to Collegial Support.
1.  The indicator(s) and criteria in which the teacher has been designated as in need of assistance and support. (Principal)
2.  Describe previous support utilized to address this area(s). (Teacher, Principal, Support Team)
3.  List strategies, including colleagues not on the Support Team that will support improvement efforts by the teacher. (Teacher, Principal, Support Team)
4.  List a timeline for support activities, including ongoing meetings to discuss progress. (Teacher, Principal, Support Team) _____
5.  Describe documentation that will be used to determine successful improvement in the identified areas regarding the teacher's job-related performance. (Teacher, Principal, Support Team)

**Franklin Township Community School Corporation**
**Teacher Support Phase Plan**

Teacher: _____  Date: _____

School: _____  Assignment: _____

Principal: _____

Level of Support (Circle One):    Administrative Support    Collegial Support    Intensive Support

Support Team Members and positions _____

_____

This plan is collaboratively developed with the teacher, administrator, and if appropriate, the Support Team.

1.  The indicator(s) and criteria in which the teacher has been designated as in need of assistance and support. (Principal)

_____

_____

_____

2.  Describe previous support utilized to address this area(s). (Teacher, Principal, Support Team)

_____

_____

_____

3.  List strategies, including colleagues not on the Support Team, that will support improvement efforts by the teacher. (Teacher, Principal, Support Team)

_____

_____

_____

4.  List a timeline for support activities, including ongoing meetings to discuss progress.  (Teacher, Principal, Support Team)

_____

_____

_____

5.  Describe documentation that will be used to determine successful improvement in the identified areas regarding the teacher's job-related performance. (Teacher, Principal, Support Team)

_____

_____

_____

Initial Conference:

Principal: _____ Date: _____

Teacher: _____ Date: _____


My principal and I have collaborated on the development of this plan and I understand the contents of it and the seriousness of these actions.

Final Conference of this phase:

Principal: _____ Date: _____

Teacher: _____ Date: _____


Has this plan been successfully completed?  If not, what are the next steps:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

**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

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.

**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.

## Instruction (Continued)

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.

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.

Peery, 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.

## Instruction (continued)

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.

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.