RISE shines a spotlight on great teaching, and gives all teachers a clear picture of their instructional performance.

Rating Teachers’ Performance

If our goal is to help all Indiana teachers succeed with their students, we need an evaluation system that recognizes outstanding work in the classroom, and identifies those teachers who need more support and development. RISE gives teachers a clear sense of their performance by combining measures of professional practice and student growth into one of four holistic, meaningful ratings. School leaders can reliably use this system to recognize and retain their best educators, and give all of their teachers the real-time feedback they deserve as professionals.
There are four summative rating levels in RISE.

Highly Effective: Consistently exceeds expectations for professional practice, student achievement and professional contribution to the school or corporation.

Effective: Consistently meets expectations for professional practice, student achievement and professional contribution to the school or corporation.

Improvement Necessary: Room for growth in professional practice, student achievement and professional contribution to school or corporation.

Ineffective: Consistently fails to meet expectations for professional practice, student achievement and contribution to school or corporation.
The summative rating reflects a teacher’s professional practice and contribution to student growth.

1) Professional Practice – Assessment of instructional knowledge and skills

**Measure:** Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER)

2) Student Learning – Contribution to student academic progress

**Measure:** Individual Growth Model (IGM)*
**Measure:** School-wide Learning Measure (SWL)
**Measure:** Student Learning Objectives (SLO)

* Only teachers in grades 4-8 ELA/Math have individual growth model data

- Each of these measures is scored separately and combined for the summative rating.
Evaluators use the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric to rate a teacher at the end of the year using a four step process.

1) Professional Practice – Assessment of instructional knowledge and skills

**Measure:** Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric (TER)

1. Compile ratings and notes from multiple observations, drop-ins, and other sources of evidence

2. Use professional judgment to establish three, final ratings in Planning, Instruction, and Leadership

**Example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>1.1</th>
<th>1.2</th>
<th>1.3</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Rating</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competency ratings based on notes from observations, conferences and other sources of evidence.

Use Professional Judgment

Final Domain 1 Rating: 3
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The last two steps convert domain ratings to a final, overall Professional Practice rating

3. Use established weights to roll-up three domain ratings into one rating for Domains 1-3

4. Multiply each domain rating by its designated weight. Add up the weighted ratings. Subtract one point if the teacher did not meet all of the core professionalism expectations

Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Rating (1 - 4)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Weighted rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain 1: Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x 0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 2: Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x 0.75</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 3: Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x 0.15</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 2.25

All professionalism expectations met: – 0

Final TER Score: 2.25
Each of the three possible measures of student learning will receive 1 – 4 rating.

2) Student Learning – Contribution to student academic progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Growth Model (IGM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-wide Learning Measure (SWL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Objectives (SLO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Growth Model Measure**
Teachers who teach grades 4-8 ELA/Math will receive one growth model score that has been rolled up across classes.

**Student Learning Objective Measure**
The average score of the Primary and Secondary Learning Objective is used for this measure.

**School-wide Learning Measure**
The school-wide measure counts equally for all teachers. It will be aligned to the new A-F accountability policy.

* See the Measures of Student Learning page for more information on these measures.
Teachers fall into one of three groups for the purpose of calculating a summative rating.

**Group 1**
Half or more of classes taught have growth model data
Most 4th-8th Grade Teachers

**Group 2**
Less than half of classes taught (but at least one) have growth model data
Some Elementary/Middle Teachers

**Group 3**
No individual growth model data
Most High School and PK-3rd Teachers
Each group uses a different weighting scheme.

Group 1 Teachers: Half or more Growth Model classes
- IGM: 35%
- SWL: 5%
- SLO: 10%
- TER: 50%

Group 2 Teachers: Less than half Growth Model classes
- IGM: 20%
- SWL: 5%
- SLO: 15%
- TER: 60%

Group 3 Teachers: No Growth Model classes
- SLO: 20%
- SWL: 5%
- TER: 75%

Key:
TER: Teacher Effectiveness Rubric
IGM: Individual Growth Model
SLO: Student Learning Objective
SWL: School-wide Learning Measure
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Weighting Example

• Mrs. Smith teaches three sections of 8th grade ELA and three sections of 8th grade Social Studies.

• Because half or more of her classes taught have individual growth model data, she is a Group 1 Teacher.

• We use the Group 1 weights from the previous slide to calculate her summative score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Weight*</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Effectiveness Rubric</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>x 50%</td>
<td>= 1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Growth Model Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x 35%</td>
<td>= 1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Objectives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x 10%</td>
<td>= .4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-wide Learning Measure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x 5%</td>
<td>= .1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum of the Weighted Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.675</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The weighted score determines the final rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ineffective</th>
<th>Improvement Necessary</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Highly Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Points</td>
<td>1.75 Points</td>
<td>2.5 Points</td>
<td>3.5 Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Borderline points always round up.

- In the Mrs. Smith example, the weighted score of 2.675 is mapped to this scale. The final rating is “Effective”.
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The Indiana Department of Education is committed to helping teachers and students succeed with RISE.

For more information visit www.riseindiana.org

Or contact RISE@doe.in.gov.