

TEACHER EVALUATION POLICY
SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

The Franklin Local Board of Education and the Franklin Local Teachers' Association hereby enter into this Supplemental Memorandum of Understanding in regard to Franklin Local School District's Teacher Evaluation Policy and said memorandum shall become effective upon the signature of each party. The board and the association, therefore, agree:

1. To adopt the revised (December 2015) Teacher Evaluation Policy in accordance with the standards-based statewide teacher evaluation framework adopted by the State Board of Education in November 2015. The Board acknowledges that this teacher evaluation policy aligns with the *Standards for the Teaching Profession* as set forth in State law.
2. The revisions to the Teacher Evaluation Policy referred to in this memorandum shall be construed by the board and by the association as a modification to Article 14 of the current collective bargaining agreement in effect between the parties.

FOR THE BOARD:



Marc Carpenter, Board President

Date 9/19/16

FOR THE ASSOCIATION:



Joe Starnin, Association President

Date 10-6-16

Teacher Evaluation Policy

Legal References: ORC 3319.111; 3319.112; 3319.58

Legislative Reference: Am. Sub. HB 153 (September 29, 2011); Sub. SB 316 (September 24, 2012)

The Board of Education (Board) of Franklin Local School District (District) adopts the following teacher evaluation policy in accordance with the standards-based statewide teacher evaluation framework adopted by the State Board of Education in November 2011. The Board acknowledges that this teacher evaluation policy aligns with the *Standards for the Teaching Profession* as set forth in State law.

The Board directs the Superintendent to implement this policy in accordance with State law.

Definition of “Teacher”

This policy applies to District employees who meet one of the following categories:

1. A teacher working under a license issued under Ohio Revised Code (ORC) Sections 3319.22, 3319.26, 3319.222 or 3319.226 who spends at least 50% of his/her time providing content-related student instruction; or
2. A teacher working under a permanent certificate issued under ORC 3319.222 as existed prior to September 2003 who spends at least 50% of his/her time providing content-related student instruction; or
3. A teacher working under a permanent certificate issued under ORC 3319.222 as it existed prior to September 2006 who spends at least 50% of his/her time providing content-related student instruction; or
4. A teacher working under a permit issued under ORC 3319.301 who spends at least 50% of his/her time providing content-related student instruction.
5. A teacher working under a license, who spends less than 50% of his/her time providing instruction, will be evaluated using a locally designed tool (i.e. guidance counselor). See attached tool.

Principals and assistant principals shall be evaluated in accordance with the principal evaluation policy adopted by the Board in accordance with ORC 3319.02.

This policy does not apply to the superintendent, assistant superintendent(s), business manager, treasurer or “other administrator” as defined by ORC 3319.02. This policy also does not apply to substitute teachers.

Assigning an Effectiveness Rating

Each evaluation will result in an effectiveness rating of “Accomplished,” “Skilled,” “Developing,” or “Ineffective.” An effectiveness rating is based on the following two categories: 1) Teacher Performance; and 2) Student Growth Measures. Fifty percent (50%) of the evaluation will be attributed to teacher performance and fifty-percent (50%) will be attributed to multiple measures of student growth.

Teacher Performance and Student Growth Measures ratings shall be combined to reach the final summative teacher effectiveness rating.

The Board shall annually submit to the Ohio Department of Education (ODE), in accordance with ODE guidelines, the number of teachers assigned an effectiveness rating, aggregated by the teacher preparation programs from which, and the years in which, the teachers graduated.

Calculating Teacher Performance

Teacher Performance is evaluated during a minimum of two formal observations and periodic classroom walkthroughs. Fifty-percent (50%) of the effectiveness rating will be attributed to Teacher Performance through a holistic process based upon the following *Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession* and training for credentialed evaluators:

1. Understanding Student Learning and Development and Respecting the Diversity of the Students they Teach;
2. Understanding the Content Area for which they have Instructional Responsibility;
3. Understanding and Using Varied Assessment to Inform Instruction, Evaluate and Ensure Student Learning;
4. Planning and Delivering Effective Instruction that Advances Individual Student Learning;
5. Creating Learning Environments that Promote High Levels of Learning and Student Achievement;
6. Collaborating and Communicating with Students, Parents, Other Educators, District Administrators and the Community to Support Student Learning; and
7. Assuming Responsibility for Professional Growth, Performance and Involvement.

The Superintendent/designee shall select or develop, in consultation with teachers, evaluation tools to be used in calculating the Teacher Performance fifty-percent (50%), which must be aligned to the *Ohio Standards for the Teaching Profession* and the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System Performance Rubric.

- The Evaluation Tool selected for use is the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System Framework.

Calculating Student Growth Measures

For purposes of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES), “student growth” means the change in student achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time. This component of the evaluation includes some combination of the following: 1) Teacher-level Value-Added Data; 2) ODE-Approved Assessments; and/or 3) Locally-determined Measures.

Category A - Teacher-level Value-Added: Where value-added data exists, it must be one of the multiple measures used in calculating student growth.

- Category A1: Teacher instructs State Value-Added Subjects Exclusively
- Category A2: Teacher instructs Value-Added Courses, But Not Exclusively

Category B - ODE Approved List of Vendor Assessments: Assessments, if utilized by the district, must be included as one of the multiple measures of student growth. Assessments utilized must be included when calculating the fifty percent (50%) attributed to student growth measures. The Superintendent/designee, in consultation with teachers and subject to Board approval, will utilize the assessments on the approved list as he/she deems necessary and appropriate.

Category C - Locally-determined Measures: For courses of instruction in which neither teacher level value-added data nor ODE-approved assessments are available, the Superintendent/designee, in consultation with teachers and subject to Board approval, shall establish a process in accordance with ODE guidance to create Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) to measure student growth in the courses of instruction.

Percentages to be attributed to each above category:

Category A:

A1: 50% State VA

A2: 25% State VA, 25% Vendor VA

Category B: 25% Vendor Assessment, 25% SLO

Category C: 50% SLO

House Bill 64 Effects on Teacher Evaluation for Years 2015-2016 and 2016-2017

Ohio House Bill 64, effective September 2015, includes language affecting several aspects of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System. Because of the transition to new state tests, which offer one means of calculating student growth, the General Assembly also extended and modified safe harbor provisions. That means that districts will not use value-added ratings from state tests for the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years as part of educator evaluations or when making decisions regarding dismissal, retention, tenure or compensation. Value-Added results lag a year, so this in effect for 2015-2016 and 2016-2017.

Category A:

A1: 50% SLO

A2: 25% SLO, 25% Vendor VA

Category B: 25% Vendor Assessment, 25% SLO OR 50% Vendor Assessment

Category C: 50% SLO

In the calculation for student academic growth, a student who has forty-five (45) or more excused and/or unexcused absences for the school year will not be included.

Data from these multiple measures will be scored on five levels in accordance with ODE guidance: Most Effective (5) 600 points, Above Average (4) 400 points, Average (3) 300 points, Approaching Average (2) 200 points, and Below Average (1) 0 points.

Recent legislative changes in Ohio House Bill 362 and according to the ODE document “Overview of the New Formula for OTES Final Summative Ratings” dated September 17, 2014:

The Evaluation Matrix, or “look-up table,” used in the past will no longer be used to calculate teachers’ final summative ratings. As such, Ohio is now using a formula-based approach based on a 600-point scale on a consistent basis for all teachers, including those whose districts select the original framework and those who choose the alternative framework of the Ohio Teacher Evaluation System.

The 600-point scale provides advantages: It accommodates both the 1-to-4 and 1-to-5 rating ladders used as inputs in the evaluation system and allows for minimal use of decimals in summative ratings. In addition, ratings are not confused with a 0-100 percent grading scale with specific built-in connotations (e.g. 75 percent is a letter grade of “C”).

Here are the steps for determining a final summative rating

1. As they submit data into the electronic Teacher and Principal Evaluation System (eTPES), districts enter ratings for each measure: teacher performance (from 1-to-4), each student growth measure (from 1-to-5) and, if selected, an alternative component (from 1-to-4).
2. eTPES assigns the point value that corresponds to the ratings from each component:
 - **Student growth.** This component may entail multiple measures (Value-Added scores, approved vendor assessments or student learning objectives) each with its own 1-to-5 rating. A most effective (5) rating results in 600 points; above average (4), 400 points; average (3), 300 points; approaching average (2), 200 points; and below average (1), 0 points.
 - **Teacher performance.** A rating of accomplished (4) results in 600 points; skilled (3), 400 points; developing (2), 200 points; and (1), 0 points.
3. eTPES multiplies the points for each measure by the appropriate weight or percentage. The department will release business rules for how weights will be assigned for student growth measures when multiple measures are employed.

The example on the following page illustrates how eTPES will follow these steps to calculate a final summative rating using the original teacher evaluation framework.

Franklin Local School District Teacher Evaluation Policy

4.03

Original Teacher Evaluation Framework (50 + 50)

Ratings and Points

Most Effective (5)	600	Accomplished (4)	600	Accomplished	500-600
Above Average (4)	400	Skilled (3)	400	Skilled	300-499
Average (3)	300	Developing (2)	200	Developing	100-299
Approaching Average (2)	200	Ineffective (1)	0	Ineffective	0-99
Below Average (1)	0				

Example #1. Grade 4 A2 Teacher

Mr. Wilson teaches Grade 4 and is an “A2” teacher (who teaches Value-Added courses, but not exclusively). He is using Value-Added and vendor assessments for his student growth measures. He has four different measures that need entered into eTPES (three for student growth and one for performance):

Measure		Rating	Points	Percentage or Weight	Calculation of Applied Points
Student Growth Measures 50 %	Value-Added	Below Average (1)	0	25%	0
	Vendor Assessment (Science)	Above Average (4)	400	12.50%	50
	Vendor Assessment (Social Studies)	Average (3)	300	12.50%	37.5
Performance	50%	Developing (2)	200	50%	100
Final Summative Rating					188 corresponding to Developing

Franklin Local School District Teacher Evaluation Policy

4.03

Using the new formula, eTPES will calculate the final summative rating by multiplying the points for each measure by the measure's weight, and then summing the applied points:

$$(0 * 25\%) + (400 * 12.5\%) + (300 * 12.5\%) + (200 * 50\%) = 187.5$$

Evaluation Timeline

Credentialed evaluators shall conduct an evaluation of each teacher subject to this policy at least annually. Each evaluation shall include: 1) Two (2) formal observations of at least thirty (30) minutes each; and 2) Periodic classroom walkthroughs by the evaluator. All teacher evaluations shall be completed by May 1st and each teacher subject to this policy shall be provided with a written copy of the evaluation results by May 10th.

For those teachers who are on limited or extended limited contracts pursuant to ORC 3319.11 and who are under consideration for nonrenewal, one evaluation consisting of at least three formal observations must be conducted annually by May 1st. Each teacher on a limited or extended limited contract shall be provided with a written copy of the evaluation results by May 10th.

Beginning in 2014-2015:

The Board elects to evaluate a teacher receiving a rating of "Accomplished" every three years as long as the teacher's student academic growth measure for the most recent school year for which data is available is average or higher.

The Board elects to evaluate a teacher receiving a rating of "Skilled" every two years as long as the teacher's student academic growth measure for the most recent school year for which data is available is average or higher.

In any year in which a teacher who has not been formally evaluated as a result of having previously received a rating of Accomplished or Skilled, a credentialed evaluator shall conduct at least one observation of the teacher and hold at least one conference with the teacher. This also applies to teachers who received an Accomplished rating in 2013-2014.

TEACHERS ON LEAVE OR RETIRING:

The Board elects not to conduct an evaluation of a teacher who: (1) was on leave for 50 percent or more of the school year; or (2) has submitted notice of retirement and that notice has been accepted by the Board not later than the first day of December of the school year in which the evaluation is otherwise scheduled to be conducted.

Credentialed Evaluators

The Board will adopt a list of approved credentialed evaluators which currently includes district administrators. Each teacher evaluation conducted under this policy shall be conducted by a person: 1) who is eligible to be an evaluator in accordance with ORC 3319.111(D); and 2) who holds a credential established by ODE for being an evaluator. Every evaluator must complete state-sponsored evaluation training and is required to pass an online credentialing assessment.

Professional Growth and Improvement Plans

The teacher's performance rating will be combined with the results of student growth measures and if selected, the alternative component, to produce a summative evaluation rating according to ODE requirements.

Teachers with a final summative rating of accomplished will develop a professional growth plan* and may choose their credentialed evaluator for the evaluation cycle. Teachers with a final summative rating of skilled will develop a professional growth plan* collaboratively with their credentialed evaluator and will have input on their credentialed evaluator for the evaluation cycle.

Teachers with a final summative rating of developing will develop a professional growth plan* with their credentialed evaluator. The administration will assign the credentialed evaluator for the evaluation cycle and approve the professional growth plan*.

Teachers with a final summative rating of ineffective will develop an improvement plan with their credentialed evaluator. The administration will assign the credentialed evaluator for the evaluation cycle and approve the improvement plan.

*Districts have discretion to place a teacher on an improvement plan at any time based on deficiencies in any individual component of the evaluation system subject to collective bargaining.

Testing for Teachers in Core Subject Areas

Beginning with the 2015-16 school year, teachers who teach in a "core subject area" are required to register for and take all written examinations of content knowledge selected by ODE if the teacher has received an effectiveness rating of "Ineffective" on evaluations for two of the three most recent school years. "Core subject area" means reading and English language arts, mathematics, science, foreign language, government, economics, fine arts, history, and geography.

Retention and Promotion Decisions – Limited Contracts

The Board adopts the following procedures to be used by district administrators in making retention and promotion decisions:

Teachers rated developing, skilled, and accomplished through the evaluation procedure shall be considered “comparable” to the rest of the bargaining unit for the purpose of reduction in force.

Teachers rated ineffective or unsatisfactory through the evaluation procedure shall no longer be considered “comparable” to the rest of the bargaining unit for the purpose of reduction in force.

Selection of teachers to have their contracts suspended for the purpose of a reduction in force shall be based on “comparable” evaluations in the following order:

1. Ineffective by seniority
2. Effective by seniority

(See Article 12 of the Negotiated Agreement for further information.)

Recall of teachers affected by the reduction in force shall be in the reverse order of the layoff.

Removal of Poorly-Performing Teachers

The Board adopts the following procedures to be used by district administrators in removing poorly-performing teachers:

1. A teacher that receives an overall “Ineffective” rating will be put on an Improvement Plan for the next year, at which point if the teacher’s rating is still “Ineffective”, the teacher will be non-renewed.
2. The process of RC 3319.16 to terminate a continuing contract teacher or a limited contract teacher for other behaviors not associated with the evaluation process during the term of the limited contract will take into account written evaluations during the most recent three (3) years.

Professional Development

The Board’s plan for the allocation of financial resources to support professional development will be determined by the superintendent (or designee).

Policy Adoption Date: December 20, 2012; Revised: August 15, 2013; Revised: October 17, 2013; Revised: July 17, 2014; Revised: December 18, 2014; Revised: September 17, 2015; Revised: December 17, 2015; Revised: September 19, 2016

