NDSEC

NORTH DUPAGE SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVE

Professional Licensed Staff Appraisal

Packet #1
- The Evaluation Process -

NDSEC

NORTH DUPAGE SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVE

Licensed Professional Staff Appraisal Plan

Introduction

The North DuPage Special Education Cooperative (NDSEC) Professional Appraisal Plan assesses licensed professional staff performance based on the four domains of professional skills found in the Danielson "Framework for Teaching: Evaluation Instrument" 2013. Professional staff include all licensed classroom and itinerant teachers, speech-language pathologists, vocational facilitators, social workers, occupational therapists, physical therapists, licensed school nurses, and school psychologists (hereinafter "Staff") employed by the Board.

Four domains and elements within each domain provide the framework for the appraisal process, define the scope of the program, and facilitate the focus on the specific elements of professional practice. Each discipline has a rubric defining each domain and associated elements.

The NDSEC Professional Plan Joint Committee has reviewed the Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA 2010), which includes professional practice and student growth. For licensed teachers, including classroom, hearing itinerant, vision itinerant, adaptive PE and vocational, the student growth component is outlined in the *NDSEC Teacher Evaluation Plan Related to Student Growth*.

2015-16 Committee Members include:
Melanie Bogue, Teacher
Abigail Currie, Hearing Itinerant Teacher
Kelly Gould, Private Placement & Related Services Coordinator
Rosemary Nizzi, TLC Principal & ALSP Coordinator
Todd Putnam, Director of Programs & Services
Laura Robinson, School Nurse
Julie Sacco, Teacher
Lisa Sporer, School Social Worker
Karin Stevens, NDSEC Special Education Coordinator
Lori Wissinger, Physical Therapist

Original committee members were: Melanie Bogue, Dr. Lea Anne Frost, Donna LaRocca, Cheryl Riley, Julie Sacco, Karin Stevens, and Angela Tennant.

The NDSEC plan of performance appraisal includes steps for monitoring, assessment and revision. It is assumed the plan must be monitored, assessed and revised after it has been implemented. The Evaluation Committee will meet on an annual basis to review, refine and revise procedures and forms as necessary. Redefinition of performance criteria will be considered as necessary.

Philosophy of Evaluation

The primary purpose of the evaluation process is to enhance quality instruction, encourage professional growth, and improve student achievement for all students of the North DuPage Special Education Cooperative.

Overview

The North DuPage Special Education Cooperative selects professional staff of the highest caliber and holds high expectations for their professional performance. Evaluation of non-tenured and tenured staff is viewed as critical to the success of the individual and the Cooperative in serving students and the community. This system is designed to provide staff with a clear understanding of the Cooperative's performance standards, feedback regarding professional effectiveness, and support for growth.

The performance appraisal system is built around two major concepts: Formative Appraisal and Summative Evaluation.

Formative Appraisal (Observation/Evaluation)

Formative appraisal is intended to improve individual staff performance. Appraisal focuses on identification of strengths and weaknesses, identification of staff development strategies, and resources to address areas in need of improvement. The formative appraisal consists of both informal and formal observations.

Time Lines

Any time lines for the completion of an observation, conference, Formative or Summative Evaluation, Professional Development Plan or Remediation Plan may, at the Evaluator's discretion, be extended if the employee utilizes an FMLA leave or otherwise misses more than five (5) workdays during the pertinent time period. If the Evaluator determines to extend one or more time lines, the affected staff member shall be notified in writing by the Evaluator and the Association President provided with a copy thereof. There is also an exception for staff hired after November 15. The observation time lines will be extended to ensure new staff are not evaluated more than once in a three-week period. Therefore, the Summative Evaluation may be completed after February 28.

Informal Observations

The primary purpose of informal observation is to validate and support effective instruction on a continual basis. In addition, informal observations lend to a more thorough evaluation of staff performance. Informal observation is a natural process, which acknowledges performance beyond the formal observation.

Informal observations include any and all things that reflect overall professional competencies. Informal observation is, as the name implies, informal. It is ongoing and could take place in a variety of professional environments. It may be considered to be part of any or all interactions, between professionals. It may include:

- lesson observations, classroom walk-throughs, and school activities outside the classroom;
- focus on professional behavior in a variety of school settings and/or between a variety of individuals: students, colleagues, parents, administrators or other school staff;
- annual reviews, IEP conferences, parent-teacher conferences

Informal observation may be of any duration and may be conducted as often as the evaluator considers appropriate. At least one (1) informal observation is required for all staff. If data is to be used from an informal observation in the evaluation, staff will receive written notification within 10 days of the observation and be given the opportunity to meet with the evaluator to discuss.

Formal Observation(s)

A formal observation for tenured staff consists of at least one visitation of no less than 45 consecutive minutes, a complete lesson, or an entire class period in a classroom/work setting. All staff who are to be evaluated will be given written notification prior to students' first day of attendance. Each formal observation must be documented by a written observation report completed and reviewed by the evaluator with the staff member within 10 working days.

A minimum of two (2) formal observations and one (1) informal observation are required for non-tenured staff for the first four years. Evaluators may initiate additional formal and informal observations at their discretion.

The first Formative Evaluation for non-tenured staff must be completed by November 15 and the second by January 31.

The Summative Evaluation for tenured and non-tenured staff must be completed no later than February 28.

Pre-Observation Conference

The purpose of a pre-observation conference is for the staff member to provide the evaluator with information regarding the objectives of the lesson to be observed, the prior instruction of students, the learning activities or methods to be used to meet the stated objectives and/or any relevant characteristics of the learning environment. All staff will complete a pre-observation form and submit to the evaluator prior to the pre-conference. The pre-observation form serves as a guide for discussion between the staff member and evaluator. Not all areas on the pre-observation form need to be addressed in each pre-observation conference.

Post-Observation/Formative Evaluation Conference

A post-observation reflection form is required for the staff member to submit to the evaluator within three days following each formal observation. The evaluator will hold the formative evaluation conference with the staff member within 10 working days following completion of the formal observation.

The conference will focus on discussion of the observation and other factors deemed relevant to the performance of responsibilities listed in the position description and standards of professional practice. The evaluator will share with the staff member indicators of performance related to the position description. In addition to the formal observation, data sources may include lesson plans, student work samples, records or other appropriate materials to substantiate performance. Strengths and weaknesses will be discussed and recommendations for growth and/or improvement will be formulated. The staff member may attach additional comments or include a response to the observation report, if desired.

Summative Evaluation

The summative evaluation reflects the overall effectiveness of the staff member. It further provides data to assist personnel decisions and assignment, transfers, promotions and continuing employment. Illinois Ed Reform (Senate Bill 7, P.A. 97-0008) requires teacher performance-based evaluations under the Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA). The summative evaluation is utilized for all staff.

Summative Evaluation Conference Report

An annual summative evaluation (biennial for tenured staff) conference will be completed for each licensed professional staff member no later than February 28. The summative evaluation will focus on the staff member's overall performance throughout the year and will include information gained through formal and informal observations, conferences between the evaluator and evaluatee, and other data sources cited as appropriate to substantiate performance. Such other data souces may include lesson plans, student work samples, records, or other materials relevant to performance assessment.

The summative evaluation will consist of an overall evaluative rating: Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, or Excellent.

The Summative Evaluation Conference Report will be signed by both parties and be included in the staff member's personnel file. The signature of the staff member does not necessarily indicate agreement with the written evaluation, but rather shall indicate that the conference and the discussion have been held and that the staff member is in receipt of a copy of the written evaluation.

Evaluation Requirements

Non-Tenured	Tenured (during evaluation year)
1) **Pre-Observation Form (goal setting)**	1) **Pre-Observation Form (goal setting)**
2) **Minimum one (1) informal evaluation**	2) **Minimum one (1) informal evaluation**
3) **Minimum two (2) formal observations/evaluations and one (1) summative evaluation**	3) **Minimum one (1) formative observation/evaluation and one (1) summative evaluation**
4) **Post-Observation Reflection Form**	4) **Post-Observation Reflection Form**

<h1 align="center">Professional Development Plan (PDP) for Tenured Professionals</h1>

<u>Premise</u>

Non-tenured staff shall be formally evaluated (formative, summative) annually using the same evaluation instrument as tenured staff for the first four years of employment. Non-tenured staff is not entitled to a PDP in the event of a "needs improvement" rating.

Within 30 school days of the completion of a summative evaluation rating of a tenured staff member as "needs improvement", the evaluator, in consultation with the staff member, must create a PDP that is directed to the areas of needed improvement. The PDP includes defined areas of professional practice that need to be improved and types of evidence towards progress/achievement of goal. The plan also must describe any support the Cooperative will provide to address any areas identified as needing improvement (PERA 2010).

<u>Purpose</u>

The purpose of the Professional Development Plan for tenured professionals is:

1) To enable an administrator to assist a tenured professional needing assistance in any of the Domains for Professional Practice.
2) To enable a tenured professional the opportunity to seek assistance in any of the Domains for Professional Practice.
3) To provide more specific guidance and assistance for the resolution of concerns identified in the summative evaluation for tenured staff.
4) To provide an opportunity for the staff member to demonstrate performance at a proficient or better rating.

The Professional Development Plan (PDP) for tenured professionals will be discussed at an initial meeting to be held within thirty (30) school days of the final meeting of the summative evaluation. During the PDP phase, intensive supervisory procedures and timelines will be established collaboratively. These procedures will be referred to on the PDP Action Plan Form.

The Professional Development Plan for tenured professionals will include:

1) A statement(s) identifying the concern(s) relative to the Domains for Professional Practice;
2) An identification of individuals involved in the plan;
3) A listing of activities/procedures to be initiated and utilized;
4) A listing of resources to be allocated for plan implementation and completion including but not limited to materials, staff development and budgetary considerations;
5) A timeline indicating implementation dates, final review dates, and meeting dates to review progress on the plan. All PDPs must be scheduled for a minimum of 30 school days and two observations/conferences.

Changes can be made to a PDP that is in process as long as the administrator and staff member agree to such changes.
At the end of a PDP, the evaluator will schedule a formal observation to complete a summative evaluation. If the summative evaluation identifies new areas of concern (rating of "needs improvement"), the PDP process will be initiated for those areas.

If the summative evaluation results in an "unsatisfactory", the remediation process will be initiated.

When a staff member achieves a rating of "proficient" or "excellent" on the summative evaluation following a PDP, they must partake in a minimum of three observations in the following year: two of which must be formal, one informal, and a summative evaluation.

Remediation Plan

The Remediation Plan is initiated if a tenured staff member receives a rating of "unsatisfactory" on the summative evaluation. Non-tenured staff is not entitled to a remediation plan in the event of an unsatisfactory rating.

1. The Remediation Phase will be discussed at an initial meeting to be held within 5 school days of the summative evaluation conference.

2. The Remediation Plan must be implemented within 30 school days after receipt of an unsatisfactory evaluation.

3. The Remediation Plan must continue for 90 school days.

4. The consulting staff member shall participate in the development of the plan.

5. A "consulting staff member" is defined in the statute as a staff member with reasonable familiarity with the subject area of the staff member under remediation, has been rated "excellent" on his/her most recent evaluation, and has at least 5 years experience. If no one within the cooperative meets these criteria, the statute allows the cooperative to request the regional superintendent to provide a list of such individuals.

6. An open-format form is included to reflect the issues unique to each staff member under remediation.

7. A staff member shall be issued a minimum mid-point and final evaluation using the Professional Practice Rubric while on remediation. The mid-point evaluation must be within 45 school days of the start date of the remediation plan and the final evaluation must be provided within 10 school days after conclusion of the remediation plan. Each evaluation must assess the staff member's performance during the time period since the prior evaluation. The final evaluation shall also include an overall evaluation of the staff member's performance during the remediation period. The evaluator will use the forms provided for the annual evaluation of staff in the cooperative's evaluation plan.

8. If the staff member fails to complete the remediation period with a rating equal to or better than "proficient", he/she must be dismissed per Section 24-12 of the School Code.

9. If a staff member receives a proficient or an excellent rating, the evaluation cycle resumes at year one of the evaluation cycle and a summative evaluation the following year which will include a minimum of 3 observations, two of which must be formal.

NDSEC

NORTH DUPAGE SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVE

Professional Licensed Staff Appraisal

Packet #2
- Evaluation Process Forms -

2

NDSEC
SPECIAL EDUCATION CERTIFIED STAFF PRE-OBSERVATION PLANNING RECORD

Staff
Member: _____   Evaluator: _____

Building: _____   Program/
Grade Level: _____   Content
Area: _____

Pre-Observation Date: _____   Observation Date: _____   Post-Observation Date: _____

1. Briefly describe the relevancy of this activity, including any difficulties you anticipate. (This may include, but is not limited to, students, staff, learning environment, etc.)	4. How do you plan to engage participants in the content? What will you do? What will the participants do?
2. What are your goals and objectives for this activity? Why are these goals suitable?	5. What instructional materials or other resources will you use?
3. How do these goals support the standards relevant to your role? (Ex: CCSS, ITPL, SEL, etc.)	6. How do you plan to gather data and assess achievement of the goals? How do you plan to make use of the results of the assessment?

North DuPage Special Education Cooperative
Post-Observation Reflection Form – Completed by Staff

Staff Member: _____   Evaluator: _____

Building: _____   Program/ Grade Level: _____   Content Area: _____

Pre-Observation Date: _____   Observation Date: _____   Post-Observation Date: _____

Please complete questions and return to evaluator (within 3 days of the observations) for discussion at the conference.

1. In general, how successful was the activity? Did the participants learn what you intended for them to learn? How do you know?

[ ]

2. Did you alter your goals or instructional plan as you led the activity? If so why?

[ ]

3. Comment on your delivery procedures, participant conduct, and use of physical space. To what extent did those contribute to achieving your objective?

[ ]

4. If you are able to bring samples of student work, what do those samples reveal about those students' levels of engagement and understanding?

[ ]

Staff are encouraged to bring to the post-conference evidence and artifacts to demonstrate knowledge of which domains may or may not have been observed.

North DuPage Special Education Cooperative
Professional Development Plan (PDP) Action Plan Form

Staff Member: _____   Date: _____

Evaluator: _____   School/Position: _____

I. Based upon the evidence collected in the Framework for Teaching Evaluation Form, the highlighted area(s) have been identified as "needs improvement."

Standards for Professional Practice			
Domain I	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4
Describe:	**Describe:**	**Describe:**	**Describe:**
Additional Notes:			
Beginning Date:		End Date:	

I acknowledge that I have reviewed and discussed the above concerns with my Evaluator.

_____   _____
Staff Member Signature   Date   Evaluator Signature   Date

II. Professional Development Plan Form

Name: _____   Supervisor/Evaluator: _____

Date of Meeting: _____   Approximate Start Date: _____

Approximate End Date: _____

PDP Priorities:

A. Domain / Component	Indicators for Effective Teaching (e.g., Critical Attributes):	
Date of Development	Improvement Strategies/Tasks	Staff Support and Resources:
Date of Updates	Action Plan – Indicators of Success	Staff Support and Resources

B. Domain / Component	Indicators for Effective Teaching (e.g., Critical Attributes):	
Date of Development	Improvement Strategies/Tasks	Staff Support and Resources:
Date of Updates	Action Plan – Indicators of Success	Staff Support and Resources

C. Domain / Component	Indicators for Effective Teaching (e.g., Critical Attributes):	
Date of Development	Improvement Strategies/Tasks	Staff Support and Resources:
Date of Updates	Action Plan – Indicators of Success	Staff Support and Resources

D. Domain / Component	Indicators for Effective Teaching (e.g., Critical Attributes):	
Date of Development	Improvement Strategies/Tasks	Staff Support and Resources:
Date of Updates	Action Plan – Indicators of Success	Staff Support and Resources

III. Signature Section

Duration of the PDP is determined in Section I.

PDP Initial Signatures

Evaluator:		Staff Member:	
Date:		Date:	

PDP Observation/Conference Signatures: (This block may be repeated.)

Evaluator:		Staff Member:	
Date:		Date:	
Comments:			

Administrator's Signature: _____   Date: _____

Staff Member's Signature: _____   Date: _____

Distribution List: Personnel File
                         Staff Member
                         Building Administrator/Evaluator

North DuPage Special Education Cooperative
Remediation Plan

Staff Member: _____   Evaluator/Supervisor: _____

Consulting Staff
Member   _____

Date of   Date of Mid-Point   Date of Final
Initiation: _____ Evaluation: _____   Evaluation: _____

Initial Meeting:

Concerns:

Educator Plan:

Follow-Up Date: _____

Staff Member Signature: _____   Evaluator Signature: _____

Follow-Up Meeting: (This block may be repeated.)

Progress:

Continued or additional concerns:

Follow-Up Date: _____

Staff Member Signature: _____   Evaluator Signature: _____

NDSEC

NORTH DUPAGE SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVE

Staff Appraisal

Packet #3
- Evaluation Rubric – Vision Itinerant Teacher -

Domain 1: Planning & Preparation – Component 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
1a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy **Performance** *(Evaluated via pre-observation interview, and discussion)*	Planning incorporates little to no knowledge of grade/age level curriculum and development, discipline specific content, and best practice to develop appropriate instruction. Plans include ineffective strategies and limited knowledge of low-incidence disability needs.	Planning incorporates some knowledge of grade/age level curriculum and development, discipline specific content, and best practice to develop appropriate instruction. Plans include a few effective strategies and incomplete knowledge of low-incidence disability needs.	Planning incorporates knowledge of grade/age level curriculum and development, discipline specific content, and best practice to develop appropriate instruction. Plans include effective strategies and knowledge of low-incidence disability needs.	Planning incorporates in-depth knowledge of grade/age level curriculum and development, discipline specific content, and best practice to develop appropriate instruction. Plans include many effective strategies and demonstrate thorough knowledge of low-incidence disability needs.
1a. Critical Attributes	• Cannot identify where other students of same age/grade are functioning • Unaware of student deficits related to disability • Cannot rationalize why the instructional strategy was chosen • Unfamiliar with skills sequencing and has little to no evidence of planning based on prior skills acquisition • Does not ask questions or seek information • Does not pick up/fix equipment • Limited knowledge of medical conditions • Does not equip students with technology and does not perform maintenance checks • Cannot articulate relevant information related to vision impairment • Incorrectly interprets ocular information	• Identifies some areas where other students of same age/grade are functioning • Somewhat aware of student deficits related to disability • Sometimes rationalizes why one instructional strategy was chosen over another • Knows some skills sequencing and has some evidence of planning based on prior skills acquisition • Finds information when supported • Needs multiple repetition of the same information for moderate mastery • Can interpret/articulate only basic information from ocular reports • Can equip students with technology with assistance • Slow to respond to equipment issues	• Can identify where other students of same age/grade are functioning so the itinerant is aware of student deficits related to disability • Can rationalize why one instructional strategy was chosen over another • Knows skills sequencing and has evidence of planning based on prior skills acquisition and future mastery • Prepares in-services for staff on students and vision loss – includes interpretation of ocular report • Knowledge of resources, new technology, and trends in the field of visual impairment • Puts plans in place for equipment use and care • Proficiency in using of equipment and technology specific to visual impairments	• Identifies where other students of same age/grade are functioning -aware of student deficits related to disability • Rationalizes why one instructional strategy was chosen over another • Sequences skills in a variety of areas and plans on prior skills acquisition and future mastery • Student shows knowledge of own needs • Assists students in preparation of in-services when appropriate • Prepares lessons related to grade level expectations/ assessments/units of instruction • Prepares classroom teacher to monitor student use of equipment • Provides information to team related to student's specific type/degree etc. of vision loss and appropriate expectations in the classroom and its impact on accessing instruction • Provides in service to team members, other vision itinerants on equipment/technology related to visual impairments

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 1: Planning & Preparation – Component 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students **Performance** *(Evaluated via pre-observation interview, and discussion)*	Plans demonstrate little to no understanding of the learning process and the impact of the child's impairment. Planning does not incorporate personal interests, personality, family and culture of students. Little knowledge of student communication skills and developmental level is reflected in planning of instruction	Plans demonstrate basic understanding of the learning process and the impact of the child's impairment. Planning does not often incorporate personal interests, personality, family and culture of students. Basic knowledge of student communication skills and developmental level is reflected in planning of instruction	Plans demonstrate clear understanding of the learning process and the impact of the child's impairment. Planning incorporates personal interests, personality, family and culture of students. Knowledge of student communication skills and developmental level is reflected in planning of instruction	Plans demonstrate in-depth understanding of the learning process and the impact of the child's impairment. Planning incorporates personal interests, personality, family and culture of students in a variety of ways. Knowledge of student communication skills and developmental level is reflected in planning of instruction. Student participation in planning is evident
1b. Critical Attributes	• Plans are inappropriate for developmental levels • Unfamiliar with students' additional disabilities or impact • Unfamiliar with family background/culture • Itinerant knowledge of student is not incorporated into plans • Little to no understanding of impact of medical condition • Plans lack awareness of disability and skill • Does not seek information related to student's language or academic levels, classroom functioning • Uses Incorrect instructional level materials– too low or too high • Cannot describe relationship of vision loss to social/academic behaviors	• Some plans are appropriate for developmental levels • Knowledgeable about some students' additional disabilities • Familiar with some students' family background/culture • Itinerant knowledge of student is sometimes incorporated into plans • Some understanding of impact of medical condition • Can identify personal interests of few students on caseload • Cannot identify impact of vision loss on other areas of development • Cannot identify the impact of vision loss on social and communication areas • Can articulate students' current visual acuity but does not incorporate into instructional plan	• Plans are appropriate for developmental levels • Knowledgeable about students' additional disabilities • Familiar with family background/culture • Itinerant knowledge of student is incorporated into plans • Clear understanding of impact of medical condition • Accommodation page is specific to the disability and developmental level of the student • In-service materials reflect the specific needs of the student • IEP Goals related to students' needs • Lesson plans reflect cultural awareness and student interests • Emails demonstrate knowledge and interest about students	• Plans are specific to developmental levels, interests and IEP goals • Plans reflect knowledge of students' additional disabilities Knowledge of family background/ culture is evident in planning • Clear understanding of impact of medical condition • Student's demonstrates knowledge of self and participates in planning • Appropriate checklists are developed for specific skills or specific students • Identifies impact of disability versus age typicality • Uses curricular or student interest materials to plan goal activities • Monitor current grades, district benchmarks, MAP scores or other indicators of academic achievement

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 1: Planning & Preparation – Component 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes **Performance** *(Evaluated via pre-observation interview, and discussion)*	IEP goals are not individualized or aligned with academic or functional needs. Alignment to academic standards is unclear or non-existent. Itinerant lesson plans do not connect learning outcomes to IEP.	IEP goals are individualized for some students and are partially aligned to students' current levels. Weak alignment to appropriate academic standards. Some lesson plans include IEP goals.	IEP goals are individualized, measureable and related to student needs and appropriate academic standards. These goals are evident/present in teacher's plans and incorporated into the lesson.	IEP goals are measureable, individualized and are structured to increase student independence. IEP goals are based on student present level of performance and tied to appropriate academic standards. Plans reflect high learning expectations including having learners apply the learned skill.
1c. Critical Attributes	• Goals are not specifically related to student present level of performance • Common Core Standards or other learning objectives are missing from IEP goals. • Lesson plans do not reference IEP goals. • Itinerant is unable to identify the IEP goal(s) are being addressed in a lesson • Itinerant is unable to connect lesson to a learning standard • Itinerant lacks data to show relationship between student performance and IEP goals	• Goals are not consistently related to student present level of performance • Common Core Standards or other learning objectives are present on IEP but not actively addressed in lesson plans • Itinerant is unclear about relationship between current level of performance and IEP goal	• Goals target student's area of need • Goals are differentiated based on developmental/curricular levels of individual student • Assessments for measuring goals are clear • Lesson plans link to IEP goal and benchmarks • Goals are specific to student's area of disability • Lessons include goals, objectives or area of need • Goals and benchmarks are specific to the developmental need of the student	• IEP goals meet specific student learning styles and needs • How goals will be achieved is clear through benchmarks and measuring instrument • Goals scaffold skills to promote student independence • Itinerant is aware of all current IEP goals for their student and incorporates them when appropriate into their lessons • Itinerant aligns goals with educational and family needs • Analyze and interprets information to make recommendations regarding individual vision needs

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 1: Planning & Preparation – Component 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources **Performance** *(Evaluated via pre-observation interview, and discussion)*	Not knowledgeable about NDSEC resources. Unaware of external resources.	Knowledgeable about resources within NDSEC. Aware of external resources Incorporates knowledge into plans for students.	Knowledgeable about resources both within and beyond NDSEC and their districts. Researches external resources and incorporates knowledge into instructional plans and communications with school teams and families.	Knowledgeable about resources both within and beyond NDSEC and their districts. Researches external resources and incorporates knowledge into instructional plans and communications with school teams and families. Student is knowledgeable about resources.
1d. Critical Attributes	• No knowledge/application of resources for families • Little to no knowledge of state and federal guidelines • No knowledge of district policies • Information provided to team and family is incorrect • Unexcused absences on professional development days • Unwilling to put forth an effort to investigate resources for families or staff • Outdated or irrelevant information	• Familiar with a few resources or resources in a few areas • Inconsistently incorporates resources into instructional plans • Limited knowledge of district, state and federal guidelines • Inconsistently or infrequently shares resources with stakeholders • Provides inaccurate information • Unaware of resources outside of NDSEC	• Itinerant accesses resources for medical information, data collection, assessment, lesson planning, materials, equipment, district, state and federal guidelines, financial assistance and community resources. • Incorporates resources into instructional plans • Shares information with families, colleagues, school staff • Knowledgeable about state, federal and school district IEP policies • Works with families and schools to get equipment and resources for students • Demonstrates knowledge of district, state and federal regulations and guidelines • Demonstrates knowledge of organizations, vendors, scholarships, etc. that provide services and benefits for people with visual impairments.	• Itinerant collects, organizes and shares resources for medical information, data collection, assessment, lesson planning, materials, equipment, district, state and federal guidelines, financial assistance and community resources. • Develops innovative systems for communicating information about resources to stakeholders • Proactively develops and shares materials for families/stakeholders with access to local, state, national or online resources • As appropriate, students or other team members, download books, troubleshoot equipment issues, etc. • Use and share appropriate resources specific to vison needs

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 1: Planning & Preparation – Component 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
1e. Designing Coherent Instruction **Performance** *(Evaluated via pre-observation interview, and discussion)*	Limited or no knowledge of learners' needs and design of instructional activities is not based on student's IEP goals. Learning activities and plans or lessons do not target a particular skill.	Knowledge of learners' needs and the content is inconsistently applied in the design of instructional activities that are based on student's IEP goals. Some learning activities are sequential and plans or lessons teach a particular skill.	Knowledge of learners' needs and the content is evident through the design of instructional activities based on student's IEP goals. Learning activities are sequential and there are a variety of well-developed plans or lessons to teach a particular skill.	Knowledge of learners' needs and the content is evident through the design of instructional activities based on student's IEP goals. Learning activities are sequential and there are a variety of well-developed plans or lessons to teach a particular skill. Student identifies related activities to address IEP goals
1e. Critical Attributes	• Lesson plans do not reflect knowledge of learning goals and students • Does not plan strategies to use • Lessons are unorganized • Lessons are not sequential • Lesson doesn't match the IEP Goals • Accommodations are not in place • Lesson is not geared toward student needs • Lessons are disconnected from each other • Objectives are not connected to assessment • No scaffolding of instruction	• Lesson plans reflect basic knowledge of learning goals and students • Plans to uses a few strategies • Lessons are loosely organized • Lessons are too high/low for student • Lessons are redundant or lacking coherence • Only some accommodations are in place	• Lesson plans reflect knowledge of learning goals and students • Plans to use several strategies • Lessons are well sequenced, scaffolded and organized • Lessons geared towards student's curriculum and IEP • Lessons are well organized and planned • Lessons are differentiated and consist of varied activities • Collaborates with team members regarding students instructional goals	• Lesson plans reflect in-depth knowledge of learning goals and students • Consistently plans to use several strategies • Lessons are well sequenced, scaffolded and organized • Students participate in identifying learning goals and planning • Student can generalize lesson goals to curriculum • Decisions are based on multiple avenues of available data (teacher reports, class observations, criterion referenced checklists and forms) • Lesson activities individualized to fully engage students in learning

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 1: Planning & Preparation – Component 1f: Demonstrating Knowledge of Technology

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
1f. Demonstrating Knowledge of Technology **Performance** *(Evaluated via pre-observation interview, and discussion)*	Plans to use of technology are limited and not related to student's specific area of need. Plans for lessons do not include consideration of technology	Plans include available technology and equipment. Consideration of using electronic technology to access instruction is done with prompting. Does not independently seek out additional or innovative resources involving technology.	Plans incorporate general and field specific technology and equipment. Appropriate technology/equipment is selected to support IEP goals and access to educational activities. Itinerant consistently seeks out additional and innovative resources and takes responsibility for learning district-specific software and protocols.	Plans incorporate technology and preparations for malfunctions have been made. Data is used to select the most appropriate technology to support IEP goals and increase educational access and independence. Consistently seeks out new technology/equipment and incorporates knowledge into lessons. Fully knowledgeable of district technology.
1f. Critical Attributes	• Use of irrelevant tools/instruction – not tied to student needs • No criteria for student learning • Student assessments/data not utilized to inform instructional decisions • Itinerant is unfamiliar with technology beyond what the student already uses • Does not attend trainings related to technology • Does not use NDSEC-provided technology during instruction	• Uses what is available • Does not look for additional or new ways to access instruction • Attends trainings or linkage meetings in which technology is presented but does not incorporate its use on own • Itinerant is knowledgeable about technology that students are using • No documentation that other types of technology were considered • Programs/apps/ideas shared with itinerant are not used during instruction	• Proactive in planning for use of technology in classroom • Takes advantage of classes/training for new technology, equipment, programs and software • Itinerant is familiar with Bookshare, Zoomtext, etc. • Plans include checking and troubleshooting of personal equipment and technology • Knowledgeable of district-specific policies and programs	• Student/staff can work without technology for short period because itinerant prepared them for this • Technology for students is based on a data-driven process • Willing to try new/unfamiliar technology after learning about it • Shares information with district/classroom teacher about accommodations related to district technology • Process of choosing technology is documented

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 2: The Environment – Component 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport **Performance** *(Evaluated via direct observation)*	Interactions with staff, students and parents are negative, insensitive or inappropriate. Staff, students and parents appear to be uncomfortable and unfamiliar with expectations. Student interactions with itinerant teacher are disrespectful. Instructional environment does not respect student dignity and/or discourages risk-taking.	Interactions with staff, students and parents are generally appropriate. Learners demonstrate minimal respect for the itinerant Some students are disrespectful to itinerant teacher. Instructional environment may respect the dignity of some students but does not always promote a safe environment for students.	Interactions with staff, students and parents are consistently respectful and positive and collaborative. Learners are respectful and comfortable when working with the itinerant teacher and expectations are known. Instruction provides a safe, supportive environment.	Interactions with staff, students and parents are characterized by two-way collaboration and are respectful and positive. Itinerant teacher interactions reflect genuine concern and respect. Instructional environment is nurturing.
2a. Critical Attributes	• No attempt to build report with student, staff and families is made by itinerant • Not showing up • Negative feedback is given • Unable to answer school team or family • Unwilling to look for answers to questions about student learning	• Itinerant teacher's effort to build rapport with students and stakeholders is only partially successful and may not be sensitive to individual's culture or special needs. • Occasionally disrespectful • Little to no positive feedback to student • No elaboration on answers asked by school team or parents • Unclear explanations about student learning	• Courteous and respectful language used by student and itinerant teacher • Itinerant teacher incorporates classroom/school rules into one-on-one instruction • Humor is used when appropriate • Attempts to build rapport are successful • Establish rapport and trust through positive verbal and non-verbal exchanges • Student/staff interactions are respectful, reflecting warmth and caring • Student/staff interactions are appropriates to the cultural and developmental differences of each other	• Turnaround time (getting back to parent or staff once contacted is initiated) is quick and respectful • Two-way collaboration between itinerant teacher and school team/parents • Learning preferred mode of communication with staff/itinerant teacher • Consistently establishes rapport and positive verbal and non – verbal exchanges • Student/staff interactions are consistently respectful, reflecting warmth and caring

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 2: The Environment – Component 2b: Managing Instruction

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
2b. Managing Instruction **Performance** *(Evaluated via direct observation)*	Materials are general and not always appropriate to the needs of the learner. Significant amounts of instructional time are lost due to weak transitions between activities. Little evidence that students know and/or follow routines.	Materials are generally appropriate. Some loss of instructional time is evident due to weak transitions between activities. Some evidence that students know and/or follow routines. Pacing is uneven.	Materials and supplies are well organized and are appropriate for students or staff. Instructional time is used efficiently and transitions are smooth. Students know and/or follow routines. Non-instructional duties are done with little loss of instructional time. Pacing of the lesson is appropriate	Materials are ready, appropriate and include additional resources and multiple ways to access material. Instructional time is maximized. Students have been involved in establishing routines. Students are engaged with learning while itinerant attends to non- instructional duties. Pacing is appropriate.
2b. Critical Attributes	• Transitions disorganized • No procedures in place for handling instructional materials • Materials are inappropriate for students or content. • Considerable time off task due to unclear procedures • Lessons do not match length of time of the session. • Student waits for itinerant teacher to find materials during instruction • Lesson ends early or doesn't get finished • Activities are not linked together • Student folder does not contain necessary items	• Time between activities is not utilized • Inconsistent procedures in place for handling instructional materials • Some materials are inappropriate for student or task • Some time off task due to unclear procedures • Lesson generally runs the same length of time as the session • Materials selected for student are not individualized • Transitions are characterized by off-topic discussions/activities • Materials are somewhat accessible • Organized folders for some students	• Transitions do not interrupt instruction • Instructional time is well utilized due to clear procedures/routines • Itinerant multi-tasks to keep student engaged in order to complete student related, non-instructional duties. (notes to home, data collection, equipment check.) • Moving from one activity to another is smooth • Materials have been prepared and are ready to use • Activities change throughout the lesson as needed • Student folders well organized and complete	• Consistently links student interests to lessons • Transitions are smooth and utilized for additional learning • Procedures in place for handling instructional materials have been developed with student input • Materials are appropriate or organized • Instructional time is highly efficient due to clear procedures developed by student and itinerant teacher • Multiple ways to instruct – use of cell phone, laptop, school-safe technology tools • Materials are sequentially organized • Time between activities is used for informal assessment, re-checking comprehension or extending instruction

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 2: The Environment – Component 2c: Managing Student Behavior				
	*Unsatisfactory (1)	**Needs Improvement (2)**	**Proficient (3)**	**Excellent (4)**
2c. Managing Student Behavior **Performance** *(Evaluated via direct observation)*	No standards for conduct appear to have been established and/or students challenge established standards. Itinerant teacher does not respond to misbehavior and/or responses are disrespectful or inappropriate.	Standards for conduct appear to be established and itinerant is generally aware of student behavior. Attempts to respond to student misbehavior have uneven results.	Standards of conduct are clear to students and itinerant is alert to student behavior at all times. Response to misbehavior is respectful and appropriate behavior is positively reinforced.	Standards of conduct are clear and appear to have been developed with student participation and include behavior plans from students' classrooms. Behavior is managed proactively and planned for. Response to misbehavior is sensitive to student needs and is entirely appropriate.
2c. Critical Attributes	• Not aware of school policy/plans regarding student behavior • Instructional setting has no clear standards for conduct • Itinerant teacher does not monitor student behavior • No response to behavior concerns • Yells at student • Uses inappropriate language • Does not incorporate classroom/school rules or individual behavior plans	• Itinerant is aware of some school policy/plans regarding student behavior • Expectations for behavior in the instructional setting are unclear or inconsistent • Occasionally responds to behavior concerns • Inconsistent follow through with rewards or consequences related to • student behavior	• Incorporates school positive behavior support policies/initiatives into expectation and positive reinforcement to manage behavior • Itinerant uses student's personal behavior chart as appropriate, knows skills sequencing and has evidence of planning based on prior skills acquisition and future mastery • Clear and consistent expectations • Monitoring of student behavior • Proactive response to behavior • Consistent implementation of behavior intervention plans.	• Incorporates school and classroom positive behavior support policies/initiatives into expectations • Includes and utilizes a classroom behavior chart • Immediately responds to behavior concerns • Shares behavior data with teaching team

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 2: The Environment – Component 2d: Creating a Technology Rich Environment

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
2d. Creating a Technology Rich Environment **Performance** *(Evaluated via direct observation)*	Electronic technology is not used during instruction. Itinerant is unaware of resources such as tablet applications, disability-specific assistive technology and is unable to determine how student can better access academic content using technology.	High and low technology use is limited during instruction. Some technology is used to reinforce or reward behavior but not as an instructional tool.	Assistive and electronic technologies are integrated into instruction. Itinerant uses tools to provide ways for students to access information and to learn and practice new skills.	Technology is integrated into instruction. Itinerant uses multiple tools to provide ways for students to access instruction and to learn and practice new skills
2d. Critical Attributes	• Technology not used even if available to enhance lesson • No process to determine if disability-specific technology (CCTV, FM system, IPAD etc.) would be of help to student • Technology (such as IPAD) that is available is not used for instruction • Itinerant unaware of resources to learn about technology • Itinerant does not feel comfortable with technology and does not make an attempt to use it with students	• Technology is inconsistently utilized to enhance instruction • Attempts to integrate technology are basic • Itinerant does not consider technology beyond what is offered by school, NDSEC or parent • Student picks a game to play that does not reinforce an academic skill • Itinerant does not question team about what can be done with technology to improve access to curriculum	• Appropriate accommodations • Technology is incorporated throughout lesson activities • Itinerant attends workshops or other learning opportunities and uses new skills to enhance instruction • Students have multiple tools to learn material • Itinerant uses resources to learn about technology that the team recommends • Selected materials and applications enhance learning	• Itinerant teaches student's team about technology and has plans to incorporate its use throughout the school day • Instruction is focused not just on access of technology but independence of use by students • Concept is taught using a variety of tools – CD, DVD, IPAD, direct instruction, etc. • Students can apply knowledge of technology outside of school

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 2: The Environment – Component 2e: Managing Direct Service Delivery

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
2e. Managing Direct Service Delivery **Performance** *(Evaluated via post-observation interview, and discussion)*	The lack of setting clear priorities results in confusion, missed deadlines and conflicting schedules. Equipment issues are mishandled and instructional time is lost. Materials and supplies are unorganized resulting in having to change lessons on site.	Essential activities are carried out but not always in an efficient manner. An unexpected event causes a significant disruption of service. Equipment issues are dealt with as they arise but not systematically. Loss of instructional time occurs due to disorganized materials and supplies.	Service priorities result in clear schedules that allow itinerant to attend to student and/or staff expected and unexpected needs. Equipment issues are handled efficiently. Materials and supplies are organized.	Service priorities result in clear schedules that allow itinerant to attend to staff and student needs. A plan for unexpected additional time is in place. Equipment issues are handled efficiently by the student's team. The itinerant uses an efficient system to manage materials and supplies.
2e. Critical Attributes	• Itinerant is not able to accomplish tasks necessary – seeing all students, attending to emergencies, attend meetings, consulting, etc. • Supplies and materials are missing or forgotten • Students miss multiple days of instruction due to failed equipment and no additional accommodations were put into place • Service logs indicate multiple missed sessions without any attempt to make up time • Necessary supplies and materials are not with itinerant for lesson	• Inconsistent weekly schedule • No time built into schedule for emergencies • Because of schedule, itinerant is unable to reschedule cancellations • No proactive plan to check on equipment • Students have to wait more than 3 days for equipment to be picked up or dropped off • Minutes on service log are behind • Itinerant appears unprepared because materials and supplies are disorganized and not easily accessible • Time to make or enlarge materials is not made in schedule	• Schedule is designed with some flexibility for emergencies • Prioritizes beginning of the year in-services • Works unexpected equipment issues into schedule without major disruption of services for other students • Materials are prepared and accessible • Schedules students at times that meets the students best interest • Itinerant schedule is organized by area, when possible • Adjusts schedule to accommodate school calendars and future schedule changes of students	• Willing/able to reschedule cancellations • Meets with student team • Utilizes additional time in a professional manner • Plans for equipment malfunctions • Attends team meetings when appropriate related to student needs outside of low-incidence disability area • Unplanned time is used to research or read, complete paperwork, observe a student, meet with peers • Student, staff or parents inform itinerant of schedule changes/conflicts

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 3: Delivery of Service – Component 3a: Communicating with Students

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
3a. Communicating with Students **Performance** *(Evaluated via direct observation)*	Itinerant does not state or post the objective of the session. Itinerant does not explain procedures and directions clearly. Language and vocabulary are consistently unclear, incorrect and inappropriate to the age and interest of the student.	Itinerant inconsistently states or posts the objective of the session. Itinerant's explanations of procedures and directions are unclear. Language and vocabulary are often incorrect and inappropriate to the age and interest of the student.	Itinerant states or posts the objective of the session. Itinerant explains procedures and directions clearly. Language and vocabulary are clear, correct and appropriate to the age and interest of the student.	Itinerant states or posts the objective of the session. Itinerant explains procedures and directions clearly. Language and vocabulary are clear, correct and appropriate to the age and interest of the student and student is able to communicate expectation of task/ goal
3a. Critical Attributes	• The objective of the lesson is not posted and does not show a relationship to the student's IEP. Explanations are unclear or absent during the lesson. • Communications include errors of vocabulary or usage. • Vocabulary is inappropriate to the age or culture of the students. • No goal for the lesson is shared • Teacher begins the lesson without giving the student directions. • Itinerant makes a serious content error that will affect student's understanding of lesson	• The objective of the lesson is unclear or not posted. Explanation of lesson is vague and non-specific • Explanation of the content consists of a monologue or is purely procedural, with minimal participation by student. • Vocabulary is too advanced or too juvenile for the student. • There is little connection to background knowledge or previous lessons. • Itinerant talks much more than student • No opportunity for student input. • Student appears confused.	• Clearly states the objective of the session. • Explanation of content • Itinerant links session to previous lessons and knowledge • An objective is clearly presented to the student. • Student verbalizes or demonstrates understanding of the procedures.	• Uses goals to drive the objectives of the lesson which are posted in the session. Explanation of content is clear and invites student participation and thinking • Students verbalize or demonstrate understanding of objectives and directions • Itinerant links session to previous lessons and knowledge • Uses rich language, offering brief vocabulary lessons where appropriate. • Communication with students is varied. • Student assists Itinerant in clarifying learning goals

Domain 3: Delivery of Service – Component 3b: Lesson Content

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
3b. Lesson Content **Performance** *(Evaluated via direct observation)*	No connection between lesson and IEP goals. The content of the lesson is not appropriate for the student. There is no connection between the lesson and the classroom or grade level materials.	Explicit connection between IEP goals and lesson content is not present. Lesson content may be appropriate for the student's disability. The connection between the lesson and grade level content is unclear.	Content of lesson reflects stated objectives. Lesson will assist student to meet IEP benchmarks and goals. Lesson content is related to student's disability and is appropriate for student's age and the learning objective. The lesson is tied to grade level content.	Lesson meets its own objective and is related to IEP goals/benchmarks. Clear relationship between lesson and content standards throughout instruction. Lesson reflects current practice and is related to student's disability. Classroom and schoolwide initiatives, themes or activities are included.
3b. Critical Attributes	• Lesson stands alone – is out of context of student's IEP • No connections to classroom or grade level learning • Itinerant is unable to articulate a goal for the lesson • The lesson is unrelated to the student's disability • Unaware of what student is learning in classroom	• Connections between lesson and IEP benchmarks is unclear • Weak connection between lesson and grade level material • Lesson is generally appropriate for student's disability • Itinerant is able to articulate goal for the lesson but not how it is related to IEP goals • Unable to connect lesson to what student is learning in the classroom	• Materials and resources support the learning goals • Content is appropriate for student's age, learning objective and disability • Lesson demonstrates remediation or acquisition of a specific skill related to student's disability • Lesson topic, materials or theme is related to student's classroom activity	• Data on IEP goals can be gathered based on lesson taught • Knowledge of what student is expected to do in classroom • Itinerant verbalizes connections between lessons and skills • Uses vocabulary or materials from classroom for instruction • Lessons reflect high expectations and encourage independence

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 3: Delivery of Service – Component 3c: Instructional Design				
	*Unsatisfactory (1)	**Needs Improvement (2)**	**Proficient (3)**	**Excellent (4)**
3c. Instructional Design **Performance** *(Evaluated via direct observation)*	Only one type of instructional strategy is used. Activities are inappropriate for students' age, background, disability or IEP goals. The lesson does not have a structure. Itinerant does not check for understanding.	The lesson relies heavily on one type of instructional strategy or activity. Activities are generally appropriate for the students' age, background, disability or IEP goals. The lesson has a recognizable structure. Questions are used to check for understanding.	The Itinerant engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies. Multiple ways to access content are provided. Activities are appropriate for students' age, background, disability. The lesson has a clearly defined structure that includes goal setting and closure. Questions promote thinking and understanding of content.	A variety of instructional strategies that incorporate student interests are used. Activities are appropriate for students' age, background, disability and consider student's culture and interests. The lesson has a clearly defined structure that includes goal setting, closure and reflection. Questions challenge students to engage in metacognition and high level thinking.
3c. Critical Attributes	• Activities are not specific to the student's needs. • Lesson is not organized nor sequential • Student involvement is low • Little to no student participation • Materials and resources are not ready and not related to lesson • The itinerant does not ask questions during the session	• Student does not have the opportunity to ask questions or make choices • Insufficient time or student to practice skills • One to two instructional activities are completed during the lesson • The lesson has an opening and goals are set for the activity • Some questions are asked to see if student understands	• Lesson provides the student adequate time to practice skills • Student has opportunity to make choices, ask questions and explain responses • Itinerant builds upon student responses to questions • Questions follow Bloom's Taxonomy • Varied activities throughout the lesson • High level/open ended questions • Connects relevance of lessons to previous understanding	• Students contribute ideas for modifying and/or extending the lesson/materials • Materials and resources extend student learning and are tied to student interests. • Student can demonstrate an understanding of the application of the lesson to their needs • Student reflection is a thorough and ongoing part of the lesson • Students contribute to their learning through asking questions.

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 3: Delivery of Service – Component 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
3d. Using Assessment in Instruction **Performance** *(Evaluated via direct observation)*	Assessment is not used during the lesson to monitor progress as evidence of student learning. Little to no feedback is given to the student. Student is not involved in any assessment.	Assessment is used inconsistently during the lesson to monitor progress as evidence of student learning. Feedback is unspecific and untimely. Student is unaware of assessment criteria.	Assessment is used regularly by the itinerant during the lesson to monitor progress as evidence of student learning and to guide future instruction. Feedback is accurate and timely and advances learning. Students have opportunities to self-assess.	A variety of assessments are used that are fully integrated into lesson to monitor progress as evidence of student learning and to guide future instruction. Feedback is timely, consistent and extends learning. Student is aware of assessment criteria and itinerant teacher successfully differentiates instruction to address individual student misunderstandings.
3d. Critical Attributes	• No assessment is done throughout the lesson. • Makes no effort to determine whether the student understands the lesson. • Does not ask the student to evaluate his/her work • No feedback is given throughout the lesson. • No assessment of students is given throughout instruction • No feedback • No checks for understanding	• Assessment is integrated into instruction inconsistently • Some checks for understanding/uses assessment to monitor student progress • Feedback to students is not specific or constructive. • Little evidence that the student understands how his/her work will be evaluated • Feedback does not guide the student to better understanding • Few checks for understanding	• Feedback includes suggestions for future improvement • Itinerant adjusts instruction to address individual student misunderstandings • Frequent checks for understanding using appropriately leveled questions. • Itinerant uses a variety of formative and summative assessments. • Teacher includes student in assessment. • Assessment is evident throughout instruction • Feedback is specific • Frequent checks for understanding. Data is reviewed with student at the end.	• Student participates in assessment • Frequent checks for understanding using appropriately leveled questions. • Itinerant differentiates throughout the lesson based on the assessments. • Student self-assesses. • Feedback is a two way conversation • Students self-assess • Goal data is presented on charts, graphs or other visuals

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 3: Delivery of Service – Component 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness				
	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness **Performance** *(Evaluated via direct observation)*	No revisions or adjustments are made throughout instruction. Flexibility is not exercised in setting priorities and effectively utilizing additional time or addressing unexpected tasks. Itinerant is not responsive to student instructional needs and ignores questions.	Modest revisions and adjustments are made throughout instruction. Flexibility is inconsistent when setting priorities and itinerant has difficulty effectively utilizing additional time or addressing unexpected tasks. Itinerant teacher attempts to be responsive to student instructional needs, but is only partially successful in promoting intellectual engagement.	Revisions and adjustments are made throughout instruction. Flexibility is exercised in setting priorities and effectively utilizing additional time or addressing unexpected tasks. Itinerant is responsive to student instructional needs.	Itinerant consistently makes revisions and adjustments seeking ways to improve instruction Itinerant teacher prioritizes and effectively utilizes additional time for addressing unexpected tasks. Itinerant and promotes intellectual engagement.
3e. Critical Attributes	• Does not address and/or incorporate student interests or needs into learning • Does not persist in assisting students having difficulty learning • Itinerant teacher handles changes and requests in an unprofessional manner and is not has difficulty completing a lesion without the loss of time. • Itinerant teacher is upset and frustrated with schedule/location changes and is not able to complete a lesson	• Inconsistently addresses student questions fully. • Itinerant teacher handles changes and requests hesitantly and is inconsistently able to complete a lesson with little difficulty or loss of time. • Itinerant teacher is frustrated with changes in schedule/location but is able to complete a partial lesson	• Consistently addresses student questions • Itinerant handles changes and requests in a professional manner and is able to complete a lesson with little difficulty or loss of time. • Requests for help from team members of the student. • Itinerant teacher consistently checks the functioning of equipment • Itinerant teacher handles schedule/location changes in a professional manner and is able to complete a lesson	• Consistently incorporates student's needs/interests into the lesson. • Itinerant handles requests in a very professional manner and effectively utilizes additional time to extend learning. • Consistently utilizes resources and collaborates with team members of the student. • Itinerant teacher takes all changes in stride and seeks opportunity for implementing a lesson that matches new time or place • Itinerant teacher and student collaborate to find additional resources when existing resources are insufficient

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities – Component 4a: Reflecting on Practice				
	*Unsatisfactory (1)	**Needs Improvement (2)**	**Proficient (3)**	**Excellent (4)**
4a. Reflecting on Practice **Performance** *(Evaluated via post-observation interview, and discussion)*	Unable to determine whether a lesson was effective or achieved instructional outcomes and/or profoundly misjudges the success of a lesson. Offers no suggestions for how a lesson could be improved.	A generally accurate impression of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which instructional outcomes were met is evident. General suggestions are made about how a lesson could be improved.	Accurate reflection on practice and additions or adjustments in instruction and staff support are made. Reflections include specific references to the lesson to determine effectiveness. Specific suggestions about what to try next time are generated.	Reflects consistently on practice and adds to or adjusts instruction and staff support. Reflections include specific examples from the lesson to determine effectiveness. Alternative actions and probable success of different courses of action are evaluated. Implements alternative plans consistently.
4a. Critical Attributes	• Does not understand whether a lesson was effective or achieved instructional outcomes • Profoundly misjudges the success of a lesson. • No suggestions for improving a lesson • No data collection to indicate the success or lack of success for each lesson	• All information is generally accurate – feels lesson went well but can't identify specific skills that were developed or enhanced • Reports that lesson went well or didn't go so well but not specific about issues • Suggestions for improvement are general and not specific to skill or to student need	• Ongoing reflection during and after lessons • Reflections break down the lesson into specific components and each component is analyzed • Suggestions are specific to student and skill areas that are being worked on • Data collection, charting, and progress notes • Notes to self about what to try next time	• Reflections consider itinerant instruction and all over supports that students receive • Possible alternatives for instruction are evaluated based on all other supports student receives • Thoroughly familiar with skills that are being taught to students in classroom or in other related services areas

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities – Component 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records				
	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
4b. Maintaining Accurate Records **Performance** *(Evaluated via post-observation interview, and discussion)*	Unprepared for meetings. Reports are general and not always complete and/or accurate. Service minutes are not up to date.	Reports are generally accurate regarding student progress. Itinerant teacher attends meetings, but is often unprepared. Service minutes are generally up to date, but may only be partially accurate or are late.	Itinerant teacher prepares for meetings. IEP Present Levels and goal updates are data driven. Reports accurately convey student current profile. NDSEC required records are accurate.	Preparation for meetings includes extensive evidence from a variety of sources and stakeholders. Reports are thorough and specific, providing extensive data on student progress. Service minutes are accurate,. Students contribute information and/or participate in maintaining/tracking records.
4b. Critical Attributes	• Deadlines frequently are not met and reminders are often needed. • Student records are in disarray resulting in errors and confusion. • No system for maintaining information on student progress • Service minutes are rarely accurate or updated. • Frequent calls from schools asking if itinerant teacher can complete paperwork and provide reports	• Student records may be incomplete • Deadlines are inconsistently met • Frequently attends meetings with minimal information on student progress • Reports do not include specific data or evidence of assessment • Service minutes are accurate • Folders are not appropriately purged	• Service minutes, computer sheets, IIMC requests, student drops and additions are accurate and up to date. • Surveys of staff, assessment of students, written reports. • Process for record keeping is efficient and effective • Student records (student folder) are in order, accurate, complete and readily available. • Attend meetings • Medical reports updated	• Information is shared with student allowing student to reflect on strengths and weaknesses • Students contribute to tracking progress and/or maintaining records • Implements and proactively shares extensive record-keeping systems for tracking student progress • Multiple systems/reports for tracking student progress • E-mails from staff that in-service accommodations are being used/implemented

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities – Component 4c: Communicating with Families				
	*Unsatisfactory (1)	**Needs Improvement (2)**	**Proficient (3)**	**Excellent (4)**
4c. Communicating with Families **Performance** *(Evaluated via post-observation interview, and discussion)*	Communication with families is sporadic or culturally inappropriate. Unfamiliar with resources to share with families.	Sporadic attempts are made to communicate with families about the instructional program and student progress. Communications are one-way and are not always appropriate to the cultural norms of the family.	Itinerant appropriately communicates with families about the instructional program and individual student progress. Relevant resources are shared with families. Itinerant is sensitive to family culture.	Two-way communication with families occurs regularly and includes students' contribution. Resources for families are sought out and shared. Itinerant educates his/herself on family culture and background.
4c. Critical Attributes	• Does not respond or responds insensitively to family concerns • Makes no attempt to engage families or such efforts are inappropriate • Meets family once per year • No consideration of second language needs	• Inconsistent in responding to the family • Infrequent or incomplete information is sent home by itinerant teacher • Communication may be inaccessible because of the language of the family • Everything is provided in one language • No evidence that family is a part of the planning process • IEP updates are the only communication	• Available as needed to respond to family concerns • Seeks parent input about the student • Share information about workshops, social events, financial assistance, camps, scholarships, adult agencies, housing, transportation, colleges, perks, PACE, resources. • Regular emails/contact regarding student progress/resources • Translating letters/information to parents • Telephone calls/texts • Effort made to learn about cultural heritage is evident	• Assignments and activities include a family participation component • Itinerant connects families with resources specific to student • Communication with families is systematized. • Newsletter • Website or resource list • E-mails or communications from parent • Student has a role in communication • Workshops/classes or other professional development to learn about different cultures • Parent/staff surveys asking for feedback • Parent notes/emails/cards

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities – Component 4d: Participating in a Professional Community/Staff Communication

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
4d. Participating in a Professional Community/Staff Communication **Performance** *(Evaluated via post-observation interview, and discussion)*	Itinerant is unable and/or unwilling to work with colleagues and school teams. Does not consult or collaborate with student's team. Staff training does not occur. Does not respond to requests for assistance from school teams.	Itinerant will find out information at the request of colleagues and school teams. Consults/collaborates with student's team upon request. Staff training is general. Response and availability to school team is uneven.	Itinerant shares knowledge and resources with colleagues and school teams. Regularly consults/collaborates with student's team. Trains staff and provides them information about student and equipment. Response and availability to school team is timely and helpful.	Colleagues and school teams seek out itinerant for professional advice and suggestions. Itinerant is considered a vital member of the student's planning team. Trains staff about students, equipment and what to do in unexpected situations. Response and availability is immediate, reliable and helpful.
4d. Critical Attributes	• Purposely avoids becoming involved in projects • Relationships with colleagues are negative or self-serving • Absent from meetings • Unwilling to use colleagues for assistance	• Participates in projects when specifically asked. • Listens to colleagues but does not implement their suggestions • Inconsistent	• Itinerant collaborates with outside agencies and specialists. • Itinerant contributes to linkage meetings • Promptly communicates information to stakeholders as needed • Explanation of student information and technology is 'teacher friendly' and understandable • Requests copies of medical reports • Notes • Speaks at meetings • Meeting evidence – notes, sign in sheet, etc. • Investigates and suggests guest speakers for linkage meetings • Teacher is aware of district/NDSEC/State guidelines and follows those guidelines in planning and communication with staff/parents.	• Contribution of itinerant teacher is valued by team members • Itinerant finds answers and information independently and shares with team • Itinerant is responsive and sensitive to the needs of the student's team • Collects data after implementing suggestions from colleagues • Sought out for information and/or assistance by staff members • Volunteers for additional non-instructional duties • Puts together presentations for linkage meetings • Student writes/conducts in-service or attends it • Gears in-service for specific team members and areas of expertise • In-service is completed before school starts for the students

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities – Component 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
4e. Growing and Developing Professionally **Performance** *(Evaluated via post-observation interview, and discussion)*	Itinerant teacher does not work with colleagues to improve and/or enhance practice. Unaware of conferences or relevant workshops. Dos not respond to feedback from colleagues or supervisor.	Itinerant teacher participates actively in assisting and working with colleagues to enhance practice. Requests to attend conferences or workshops. Does not respond to feedback from colleagues or supervisor.	Itinerant teacher participates actively in assisting and working with colleagues to enhance practice and contribute to the profession. Shares information with teams. Requests to attend conferences or workshops, shares and applies learned information. Professionally responds to feedback from colleagues and supervisors in a professional manner.	Itinerant teacher participates actively in assisting and working with colleagues to enhance practice and contribute to the profession. Conducts action research and shares information with teams. Requests to attend conferences or workshops, shares and applies learned information. Seeks out feedback from colleagues and supervisors.
4e. Critical Attributes	• Doesn't attend classes, conferences or workshops • Doesn't seek help or guidance • Resistant to feedback on practice • Doesn't ask peers • Allows certification to lapse • No in-service	• Attends professional development when required • Does not incorporate new strategies/feedback into practice • Doesn't contribute or share information with team or at linkage meetings	• Shares at team and linkage meetings • Subscribes to professional newsletters and organizations • Shares information from professional organizations • Attends professional conferences/workshops • Meets with teams and peers • Maintains professional certificate • Seeks out new resources • Willing to try a new idea or technology and reflects on its success • Participates in webinars	• Independently creates own growth opportunities that are tied to student growth • Willing to try alternative ways to get students to grow • Frequently seeks out resources to improve practice • Seeks feedback • Presents at conferences • Attendances conferences outside area of expertise for needs of students • Takes courses to increase knowledge • Reflects on activities with other team members and itinerants • Surveys student team members on effectiveness of services

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities – Component 4f: Showing Professionalism

	*Unsatisfactory (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Proficient (3)	Excellent (4)
4f. Showing Professionalism **Performance** *(Evaluated via post-observation interview, and discussion)*	Itinerant does not displays high standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality in interactions with colleagues, students and public. Unfamiliar with NDSEC and district regulations and practice. Itinerant does not represent him/herself in a professional manner. Deadlines are not met.	Itinerant displays standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality in interactions with colleagues, students and public. Somewhat knowledgeable about NDSEC and district regulations and practice. Itinerant represents him/herself in a professional manner. Deadlines require frequent reminders.	Itinerant displays high standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality in interactions with colleagues, students and public. Respectful and knowledgeable about NDSEC and district regulations and practice. Itinerant represents him/herself in a professional manner. Deadlines are met with minimal oversight.	Itinerant displays high standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality in interactions with colleagues, students and public. Respectful and knowledgeable about NDSEC and district regulations and practice. Itinerant represents him/herself in a professional manner. Deadlines are met independently and on time.
4f. Critical Attributes	• Decisions are questionable • Itinerant teacher is dishonest • Service logs are not completed on time • Equipment arrives after school year has started • Unaware of IEP process in districts • Calls from school or teachers are received at CIS indicating that communication about absences or schedule changes did not occur	• Lacks understanding that schools have different processes in writing IEPs • Informs schools at the last minutes of planned schedule changes • Student instruction is disrupted due to lack of equipment or training	• Schools are informed of changes/conflicts • On time to meetings • Responds to requests in a timely manner (registrations for workshops, projections, caseload updates) • Understands the protocols in districts served • Has a backup plan if materials are an issue so that students can access instruction • Emails • School sign in sheets • School feedback • IEPs • Equipment checklists • Awareness of field trips and other planned activities at the school	• Records are up to date and completed independently. Equipment and materials for students are anticipated and ordered Itinerant is proactive and assumes a leadership role in ensuring highest standards. • Confidentiality is a priority • Emails • Informs school sites of scheduling conflicts and changes • Appropriate attire • IEPs are turned in to NDSEC in a timely manner

*Applicable to ALL UNSATISFACTORY Component ratings: Staff member is marginally and/or non-responsive to addressing PDP and/or identified areas of improvement.

NDSEC
NORTH DUPAGE SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVE

Professional Licensed Staff Appraisal

Packet #4
Teacher
- Observation Documents and Ratings -
Summative Evaluation

Name of Staff: _____

Program/Department: _____

Position: _____

Grade Level: _____

Location: _____

Evaluator: _____

Summative Conference Date: _____

Summative Rating: _____

Date	Purpose	Evaluatee Signature	Evaluator Signature
	Pre-Conference		
	Formal Conference 1		
	Pre-Conference		
	Formal Conference 2		
	Informal Observation		
	Informal Observation		
	Informal Observation		

G:\Forms\Human Resource Forms\Job Descriptions-Evaluations\Evaluations\1 Professional Licensed Evaluations\2017-18 Eval Forms\4 Teacher Staff Appraisal (4-Observation, Rating, Summative Forms) - 2017-18.docx

1

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation
        Descriptor Rating

Observation Notes, Comments, Evidence of Strengths and Weaknesses for Domain 1:

Below to be completed as part of the Summative Evaluation:

Domain 1 Rating   **Descriptor rating for Domain 1**

a: _____

b: _____   ☐   **Unsatisfactory**

c: _____

d: _____   ☐   **Needs Improvement**

e: _____

f: _____   ☐   **Proficient**

                                    ☐   **Excellent**

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment
        Descriptor Rating

Observation Notes, Comments, Evidence of Strengths and Weaknesses for Domain 2:

Below to be completed as part of the Summative Evaluation:

Domain 2 Rating   **Descriptor rating for Domain 2**

        a: _____   ☐   **Unsatisfactory**
        b: _____
        c: _____   ☐   **Needs Improvement**
        d: _____
        e: _____   ☐   **Proficient**
        f: _____

                                                ☐   **Excellent**

Domain 3: Instruction Component
      Descriptor Rating

Observation Notes, Comments, Evidence of Strengths and Weaknesses for Domain 3:

Below to be completed as part of the Summative Evaluation:

Domain 3 Rating

    a: _____

    b: _____

    c: _____

    d: _____

    e: _____

Descriptor rating for Domain 3

☐   **Unsatisfactory**

☐   **Needs Improvement**

☐   **Proficient**

☐   **Excellent**

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities
    Descriptor Rating

Observation Notes, Comments, Evidence of Strengths and Weaknesses for Domain 4:

Below to be completed as part of the Summative Evaluation:

Domain 4 Rating	**Descriptor rating for Domain 4**

a: _____

b: _____

☐ **Unsatisfactory**

c: _____

☐ **Needs Improvement**

d: _____

e: _____

☐ **Proficient**

f: _____

☐ **Excellent**

NORTH DUPAGE SPECIAL EDUCATION COOPERATIVE

TEACHER SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

Evaluatee: **Location:**   **Date:**

Evaluator: **Assignment:**   **Days Absent:**   **Days Tardy:**

Attach pre & post conference forms.

Observation date(s) forming the basis of this evaluation: _____

Informal observation dates: _____

Domain 1 – Planning and Preparation	**Descriptor:** _____
Domain 2 – Classroom Environment	**Descriptor:** _____
Domain 3 – Instruction	**Descriptor:** _____
Domain 4 – Professional Responsibilities	**Descriptor:** _____
Professional Practice Rating	**Descriptor:** _____

Professional Practice Rating
Excellent = *Excellent* ratings in at least 3 domains, with the remaining domain rated *Proficient.*
Proficient = All domains rated as *Proficient* or higher.
Needs Improvement = 1 or more domains rated *Needs Improvement.*
Unsatisfactory = <u>Any</u> domain rated *Unsatisfactory.*

Domain Ratings (Based on Domain Rubric)

• **Excellent:** *Excellent* ratings in the majority of the components of the domain, with the remaining components rated no lower than *Proficient*

   o For Excellent rating, a majority of the components shall be defined as

   1) Domain 1: 4 of 6 rated excellent
   2) Domain 2: 4 of 6 rated excellent
   3) Domain 3: 3 of 5 rated excellent
   4) Domain 4: 4 of 6 rated excellent
   All) All remaining components in Domain rated no lower than Proficient

• **Proficient:**
   o Domains 1, 2, & 4 earn a rating of *Proficient* if no more than 2 components are rated as *Needs Improvement.*
   o Domain 3 earns a rating of *Proficient* if no more than 1 component is rated *Needs Improvement.*
   o The remaining components must be rated at *Proficient* or higher.

• **Needs Improvement:**
   o Domains 1, 2, & 4 earn a rating of *Needs Improvement* if 3 or more components are rated *Needs Improvement.*
   o Domain 3 earns a rating of *Needs Improvement* if 2 or more components are rated *Needs Improvement.*

• **Unsatisfactory: Any** component rated as *Unsatisfactory.*

STUDENT GROWTH COMPONENT	
Section 50.310 Student Growth Components **Defining Student Growth Performance Levels:**	**Student Growth Rating Scale:**
• **Excellent** – 75%-100% of students met the indicated growth targets	4.00 (Excellent)
• **Proficient** – 50%-74% of students met the indicated growth targets	3.00 (Proficient)
• **Needs Improvement** -25%-49% of students met the indicated growth targets	2.00 (Needs Improvement)
• **Unsatisfactory** – Less than 25% of students met the indicated growth targets	1.00 (Unsatisfactory)

6

Student Growth Model and Professional Practice Rating - 2016-17 & 2017-18				
Element	**Student Growth Ratings**			
25% Student Growth Rating:	Student Growth 1 (12.5%):	_____ x .125 = _____ +	**Overall Rating:**	**Excellent = 3.5 - 4.0** **Proficient = 2.5 - 3.49** **Needs Improvement = 1.5 - 2.49** **Unsatisfactory = 1.0 - 1.49**
	Student Growth 2 (12.5%):	_____ x .125 = _____ +		
75% Professional Practice Rating:	Professional Practice (75%)	_____ x .75 = _____ =		
Summative Rating	_____			
Additional Comments:				

We have conducted a conversation on the rubrics. The staff member has the right to attach written comments within (10) school days of completion of this form for inclusion in his/her personnel file.

Staff Member Signature: _____   Conference Date: _____

*The signature of the staff member does not necessarily indicate agreement with the evaluation, but rather that the evaluation conference has been held and that the staff member has received a copy of the written evaluation.

Evaluator Signature: _____   Conference Date: _____

Additional Comments Attached: ☐ Yes   ☐ No