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A system that ensures fair and accurate judgments about the teaching and learning process;
A system that enables valid judgments/assessment of student growth;
A system that includes multiple measures of student achievement;
A system that facilitates a productive, professional dialogue among a teacher and administrator to ensure continuous improvement;
A system that creates confidence and support for all stakeholders;
A system that incorporates procedures to address anomalies and inconsistencies in the implementation process; and,
A system that incorporates collegial decision-making.

What is INTASS?
Essential Components of a Quality System

- Intent and Philosophy
- Strategic Communication Plan
- Process for Observations
- Weights of Measures
- Timelines/Protocols
- Measuring Student Learning
- Data Systems
- Converting Scores to Teacher Ratings
- Oversight
- Professional Development
- Forms
Figure 1. Participants’ Self-Reported Knowledge of IN-TASS Topic Areas

- IDOE’s “Growth Model” for analyzing ISTEP+ data: 26% initial, 60% final.
- Measuring teachers’ instructional practices using rubrics and/or standardized objectives: 31% initial, 76% final.
- Developing local assessments to measure student growth: 25% initial, 65% final.
- Indiana’s recent legislation on teacher appraisal systems: 31% initial, 80% final.
Figure 2. Participants’ Self-Reported Confidence in Teacher Appraisal Components

- The appraisal system being developed by our team will be implemented with fidelity in our district: 79% initial, 86% final.
- Efforts to develop a fair appraisal system are supported by teachers in my district: 62% initial, 80% final.
- IN-TASS will allow our district to develop a fair appraisal system: 58% initial, 86% final.
- My district’s participation in IN-TASS will be worth the time and effort invested: 59% initial, 82% final.
- My district’s participation in IN-TASS will lead to improved outcomes for students: 57% initial, 86% final.
- My district’s participation in IN-TASS will lead to improved outcomes for teachers: 59% initial, 91% final.
What We Learned

- Don’t underestimate purpose/beliefs
- Continue to drive the purpose
- The “big picture” is important
What We Learned

- Communicate expectations to evaluators and teachers
- Spend time internalizing rubric
- Don’t underestimate time commitment
- Identify peer coaches early
What We Learned

- Anxiety exists
- Multiple measures are critical
- School wide measure is important
What We Learned

- Review scores at semester and year end
- Hard to attain highly effective or be scored ineffective
- Review rubric definitions and category scale
What We Learned

- Still evolving
- Signature pages, verifications, agreements
- Professional development should be driven by data
- Currently implementing a mandatory assistance plan
What We Learned

- Share thoughts from first semester review
- Learned what we did not know
SUMMATIVE EVALUATION FORM

Name of Teacher: ____________________________    School: ________________________
Grade Level(s): ______________    Subject(s): _____________________________
Name of Evaluator: ____________________________    Date: ________________________
PROBATIONARY: ______   ESTABLISHED: ______    PROFESSIONAL: ______

The narrative sections below for the summative evaluation/rating strengths and weaknesses should include comments addressing the four domains of Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Personal & Professional Responsibilities as well as Student Growth.

Areas of Strength:

Areas for Further Development:

Teacher Effectiveness Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>12.5%</th>
<th>__</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TER Final Rating = (A)

Student Growth – 2 of the following

IN Growth Model    ___ x 21% = ___

OR

Category 1    ___ x 20% = ___
Category 2    ___ x 20% = ___
Category 3    ___ x 20% = ___

School Wide Measure    ___ x 9 or 10 = ___

TOTAL = (B)

Final Professional Evaluation

System Score:    A + B = ___________

1.5

2.5

3.5

□ Ineffective

□ Improvement

□ Necessary

□ Effective

□ Highly Effective

Teacher’s Signature * ____________________________    Date ________________________
Evaluator’s Signature ____________________________    Date ________________________

*Teacher’s signature indicates only that the teacher has read this report.
ATTACH ALL OBSERVATION DOCUMENTATION.
Professional Evaluation System

50% Teacher Effectiveness Rubric

50% Growth Model Data

Danielson Evaluation Rubric

12.5% Planning and Preparation
12.5% Classroom Environment
12.5% Instruction
12.5% Professional Resp.

Growth Model Data

Teacher With IGM Data OR Teacher Without IGM Data

21% Category 1 Measure
20% Category 2 or 3 Measure

20% Category 2 or 3 Measure

9% School Wide Measure

10% School Wide Measure
For more information on INTASS:

Contact Dr. Sandi Cole
812-855-7779
cmcole@indiana.edu