

*Joliet Township High School  
District #204*



*Certified Staff*

*Performance Evaluation Agreement*

**2026-2027**

***Mission Statement***

*The mission of Joliet Township High School, a historically rich, inclusive, and innovative learning community that values and embraces diversity, is to maximize every student's potential to positively impact our community and thrive in a global society by providing an equitable, personalized, and rigorous education.*

## **Strategic Plan Belief Statements**

We Believe:

- High quality schools are essential to the quality of life for the whole community.
- Each individual possesses inherent worth and equal value.
- A safe environment is essential for every individual.
- Every individual deserves to be supported.
- Diversity strengthens and enriches society.
- An inclusive school community acknowledges, celebrates, and respects all cultures.
- Empathy, honesty, integrity, respect, and mutual trust are essential in building and maintaining a strong community.
- Life-long learning is necessary to thrive in a continuously changing world.
- Individuals learn at different rates, in different ways, and in a variety of settings.
- High expectations positively influence individual growth.
- Individuals are accountable for their own choices.
- Motivation, perseverance, determination, and a growth mindset strengthen the ability of an individual to reach potential.
- The family environment has a strong influence on the development of each of its members.
- Education is a collaborative responsibility among students, family, staff, and the community.
- An educated and informed public enriches our democracy.
- All people can learn.

## **Strategic Plan Objectives**

- 1) Each student will achieve their growth targets as measured by district and standardized assessments.
- 2) The achievement gap among all subgroups will decrease annually as measured by district and standardized assessments.
- 3) The graduation rate among all subgroups will be 90% or higher.
- 4) By 2027, each senior will complete a post-secondary plan.
- 5) The average chronic absenteeism rate will decrease on an annual basis among all subgroups.

## **Strategic Plan Parameters**

- We will always leverage the benefits of our diversity to enrich and strengthen our programs.
- We will always maintain a safe, secure, and supportive environment.
- We will always use data, effective instruction, and a continuum of academic and social/emotional support to improve student success.
- We will always work in collaboration with our sender school districts to provide cohesive and rigorous educational programs.
- School and District Improvement Plans must always be consistent with the Strategic Plan.
- We will not tolerate behavior which demeans the self-worth or dignity of any individual or group.

- We will never accept or retain a program or service unless it is consistent with the strategic plan, its benefits clearly justify the cost, and provisions are made for staff development with sufficient time for effective implementation and program evaluation.
- We will always focus on developing college and career readiness in each student while considering their individual goals.
- We will always ensure District practices, policies, and procedures are equitable and inclusive.

### **Strategic Plan Strategies**

- 1) We will, in partnership with families and community, implement a systemic approach to culturally sustaining experiences and restorative justice to deliver an equitable educational experience while expanding the diversity of our faculty and administration in order to remove systemic educational barriers.
- 2) We will establish a culture and organizational structure that will foster a positive, safe, inclusive, and supportive climate that engages all stakeholders.
- 3) We will implement a holistic approach to supporting students through family, community, and student engagement, targeted supports, and flexible learning opportunities to improve student attendance and academic performance.
- 4) We will maximize the district's resources to update facilities, improve collaborative and functional spaces, and develop creative programming and scheduling to meet the ever-changing needs of our students and community.

## **History**

In 1986, a teacher evaluation plan was developed and revised through the cooperative efforts of the teachers and administrators.

Members of the committee were:

- Robert Beach, Director of Personnel and Community Services
- James Benson, Teacher
- Sandra Cookas, Teacher
- Karen Freeman, Teacher
- Matt Kochevar, Humanities Division Chairperson
- Harold A. Miller, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services
- David Warner, Science & Mathematics Division Chairperson

In 2003, the classroom teacher evaluation instrument was revised after studying Charlotte Danielson's Enhancing Professional Practice – A Framework for Teaching. The committee studied the framework for teaching and after two and a half years reached consensus on the new document. The teachers' union overwhelmingly approved the instrument through a district wide vote, sponsored by the teacher's union. The Board of Education approved the plan May 20, 2003. All evaluators participated in a three-day *Framework for Teaching* training in the use of the instrument.

Members of the committee were:

- Edna Brass, Special Education Division Chairperson
- Jessie Cambic, English Teacher
- Beth Feucht, English Teacher
- Kathy Kachel, Special Education Teacher
- Cheryl McCarthy, Principal
- Don Prola, Applied Life Teacher
- Craig Spiers, Principal
- Florence Dittle, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

In 2011, an Evaluation Review Committee was formed to study the changes required by legislation, specifically, SB 7 and SB 315.

The committee was charged with the task to review the current evaluation instruments and make recommendations so that our instruments meet the following criteria:

- Utilization of an instructional framework based on research regarding effective instruction that includes planning, instructional delivery, and classroom management
- Aligned to Illinois Professional Teaching Standards
- Include a description of the four rating categories and how the categories are aligned to the required rating levels (unsatisfactory, needs improvement, proficient, and excellent)
- Define the relative importance of each portion of the framework to the final teacher practice rating.

Members of the committee were:

- Karla Barker, Special Education Teacher (Teacher Document)
- Jenine Barnes, PPS Coordinator (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Lynn Benson, Academy Coordinator (Teacher Document)
- Edna Brass, District Director (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Deb Burroughs, SAP (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Jeff Clinton, Assistant Principal (Teacher Document)
- Alexshea Conn, Guidance Counselor (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Stacy Eighner, Special Education Teacher (Teacher Document)
- Marcia Ferlin-Hutnik, Nurse (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Alberto Filippioni, District Curriculum Director (Teacher Document)
- Teresa Gibson, Principal (Teacher Document)
- Shad Hallihan, Assistant Principal (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Jason Hermann, Applied Life (Teacher Document)
- Terry Houchens, Science Teacher/Content Specialist (Teacher Document)
- Kristen Koppers, English Teacher (Teacher Document)
- Susan Kulevich, CTE Teacher (Teacher Document)
- Amy Lingafelter, Library/Media (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Kelly Manning-Smith, Dean (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Tara McNeal, Psychologist (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Luis Medina, ESL teacher (Teacher Document)
- Chris Olson, District Athletic Director (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Mark Peterson, SAP (Non-Classroom Documents)
- John Randich, Principal (Teacher Document)
- Jennifer Rea, Assistant Principal (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Patty Sewing, Special Education Coordinator (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Brian Shaw, Assistant Principal (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Vicky Soliman, Special Education Coordinator (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Tracy Spesia, School Board Member (Teacher Document)
- Chris Triebel, Math Teacher (Teacher Document)
- Jackie Tyler, Speech Pathologist (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Tracy Ward, Psychologist (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Eric Wendt, Science Teacher (Teacher Document)
- John Wietlispach, Social Studies Teacher (Teacher Document)
- Jo Wooten, PPS Coordinator (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Marcene Staley, Literacy and Special Education Teacher, Co-Facilitator (Teacher Document)
- Karla Guseman, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services, Co-Facilitator (Teacher Document)
- LaTanya Harris, Alternate School Director (Non-Classroom Documents)
- Phillip Staley, Dean, Co-facilitator (Non-Classroom Documents)

## Decisions Made By the 2011-2012 Committee

- Updated language on the teacher instrument to reflect best current practices.
- Updated category levels to unsatisfactory, needs improvement, proficient, and excellent for each component of the teacher instrument and utilized the same levels for the non-classroom instruments.
- Changed the evidence section to be included after each component.
- Updated the cover sheet to reflect the new overall ratings.
- Developed new evaluation instruments for Deans, Guidance Counselors, Library/Media, Social Workers, Psychologists, Nurse, and IEP Manager to reflect a framework that is consistent with the job responsibilities of the respective positions.
- Changed the non-tenured evaluation process from three formal cycles per year to two formal cycles per year for years 1 and 2.
- Changed all formal evaluation cycles to be uniform for years 1 through 4.
- Starting with the 2013-2014 school year, changed the evaluation cycle to begin March 1<sup>st</sup> and end February 28<sup>th</sup> for all staff except year 1.
- Defined the terms unsatisfactory, needs improvement, proficient, and excellent TBD.
- Guidelines for determining overall rating TBD.

## Changes Based on Legal Requirements

- Updated the overall evaluation ratings of unsatisfactory, needs improvement, proficient, and excellent on all evaluation instruments.
- Added the language with regards to the Professional Development Plan for tenured teachers who receive an overall rating of needs improvement.
- Added the language with regards to the remediation plan for tenured teachers who receive an overall rating of unsatisfactory.
- Added that the post conference must occur within ten school days of the final observation.
- Added that the teacher must be presented with the cover sheet and final document within ten school days of the evaluation (ten school days after the last post conference).
- Defined the terms unsatisfactory, needs improvement, proficient, and excellent.
- Guidelines for determining overall rating.

In 2013, an Evaluation Review Committee was formed to study the changes required by legislation, specifically, SB 7 and SB 315.

The committee was charged with making recommendations for the incorporation of student growth into the teacher performance evaluation in accordance with legislation.

Members of the committee were:

- Nigel Anderson, Psychologist
- Mary Balsie, District Curriculum Director - Math
- John Barber, CTE Teacher
- Linda Bowers, English Teacher
- Edna Brass, Director of Special Services (retired 2014)
- Jessica Burns, Special Education Teacher
- Brian Conant, District Curriculum Director – English and Fine Arts
- Iman Ellis-Bowen, Director of Special Services (joined 2014)
- Al Filipponi, District Curriculum Director – Social Science, World Language, ESL
- Doug Fowler, Special Education Teacher
- Teresa Gibson, Principal
- Mary Guirguis, English Teacher
- Angel Hauert, Academy Coordinator/Applied Life (joined 2014)
- Timi Hensel, Math Teacher
- Jason Herrmann, Applied Life Teacher
- Tammy Hunsaker, World Language Teacher
- Jeff Jakob, Social Science Teacher
- Erik Jurgens, Science Teacher (resigned 2014)
- Becky Kemp, AVAC/Transition Center Coordinator
- Melissa Magnuson, Math Teacher
- Dianne McDonald, District Curriculum Director – Science and Applied Life
- Matthew Narducci, Academy Coordinator/Applied Life (joined 2014)
- Greg Peterson, Math Teacher
- Jeff Riley, CTE Teacher
- Terri Schrishuhn, Academy Coordinator (new position 2014)
- Karen Stiehr, Science Teacher
- John Randich, Principal
- John Wietlispach, Social Science Teacher
- Dede Woodard, District Curriculum Director - CTE
- Marcene Staley, Literacy and Special Education Teacher, Co- Facilitator
- Karla Guseman, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services, Co-Facilitator

The Joint Committee was established October 30, 2014 and included the following members:

- Ronald Fonck, Science Teacher, Union President
- Marcene Staley, Literacy and Special Education Teacher, Union Board Representative
- Cheryl McCarthy, Superintendent
- Karla Guseman, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

In 2022, the Evaluation Review Committee met to address changes required by legislation, specifically HB 18. The committee was charged with making recommendations to shift the tenured cycle from 2 years to 3 years.

Members of the committee were:

- Jennifer Baxter, Instructional Coach
- Debrah Clark, Infant Childcare Center Director
- Melissa Cady, Special Education Teacher
- Iman Ellis-Bowen, Director of Special Services
- Teresa Gibson, Principal
- Jessica-Christine Gunia, CTE Teacher
- Shad Hallihan, Principal
- Sean Hackney, District Curriculum Director-English
- Angel Hauert, Academy Coordinator
- Kathryn Hunt, Special Education Teacher
- Brett Marcum, District Director of Student Support Services
- Christopher McGuffey, District Curriculum Director-CTE
- Nicole McMorris, District Curriculum Director-Math
- Patrick O'Neill, Academy Coordinator
- Paul Oswald, District Curriculum Director, Social Science, World Languages, ESL
- Greg Peterson, Math Teacher
- Jennifer Pryor, CTE Teacher
- Don Stinson, Fine Arts Teacher
- Kristine Webster, English Teacher
- Eric Wendt, Science Teacher
- Corinne Zimmerman, District Curriculum Director-Applied Life and Science
- Timi Hensel, Math Teacher, Co-Facilitator
- Dianne McDonald, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services, Co-Facilitator

In 2023-2024, the Evaluation Review Committee met to address changes required by legislation, specifically Public Act 103-0500. The committee was charged with adjusting the tenure timeline for full-time teachers hired before 7/1/2023 and after 7/1/2023.

Members of the committee were:

- Antoinette Bernard, Special Education Teacher
- Susan Cailteux, Health Teacher
- Catherine Cerri, Special Education Teacher
- BobbieSue Chavez, Math Teacher
- Deb Clark, Infant Childcare Center Director

- Kristen Cooke, Social Worker
- Maribel Diaz, Instructional Coach
- Robin English, Special Education Teacher
- Arianna Farias, Science Teacher
- Jessica-Christine Gunia, CTE Teacher
- Sean Hackney, District Curriculum Director-English
- Matthew Hall, Math Teacher
- Shad Hallihan, Principal
- Angel Hauert, Academy Coordinator
- Timi Hensel, Math Teacher
- Lauren Kline, Science Teacher
- Mike Kuziel, Academy Coordinator
- Dan Markun, Academy Coordinator
- Katie Markun, Instructional Coach
- Jamie McGrath, Special Education Teacher
- Christopher McGuffey, District Curriculum Director-CTE
- Nicole McMorris, District Curriculum Director-Math
- Chad Mirus, English Teacher
- Susana Montano, Instructional Coach
- Misty Mullin, Math Teacher
- Patrick O'Neill, District Curriculum Director-Applied Life and Science
- Paul Oswald, District Curriculum Director-Social Science, WL, ELL
- Tecara Parker, Principal
- Gandhi Schlotte, Instructional Coach
- Christina Vercelote, English Teacher
- Eric Wendt, Science Teacher
- Steven Zeko, Science Teacher

Updated legislation signed 6/30/2025 by Governor Pritzker public act 104-0020:

Beginning July 1, 2025, each school district may, in good faith cooperation with its teachers or, where applicable, with the exclusive bargaining representatives of its teachers, incorporate the use of data and indicators on student growth as a factor in rating teaching performance, into its evaluation plan for all teachers in contractual continued service and teachers not in contractual continued service. The Public Act 104-0020 SB0028 Enrolled LRB104 07498 LNS 17542 b plan shall at least meet the standards and requirements for teacher evaluations established under Section 24A-7.

The Joint Committee agreed to remove student growth from the teacher evaluation agreement for the 2025-2026 school year.

The current Joint Committee includes the following members:

- Yvette Justice, Counselor, Union President
- Annie Monninger, Social Science Teacher, Union Board Representative
- Karla Guseman, Superintendent
- Dianne McDonald, Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

## **Purposes of the Certified Staff Evaluation Plan:**

The purpose of the Certified Staff Evaluation Plan is to ...

- Promote student learning through the highest quality of teaching, which includes a commitment to continual professional growth and development, professional dialogue and reflection, and collective inquiry.
- Develop each individual's capacity for professional contribution to the team, academy, building and district.
- Support Joliet Township High school district initiatives, culture, vision, and mission.
- Support non-tenured staff growth through a formative process with clearly defined expectations for non-tenured staff and Instructional Coaches.
- Support tenured staff growth through a formative process that promotes collective inquiry and examination of practice.
- Build and foster collaborative relationships among all staff.
- Validate the hiring/selection/retention process.

## **Job Descriptions:**

Job descriptions will be reviewed annually and any changes in job qualifications must be completed and communicated by May 10<sup>th</sup> to be in effect the following school year. All job descriptions will be posted on JT Web under Human Resources: <https://tinyurl.com/bdz4x6es>

## **Professional Practice Levels of Performance**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| <b>Excellent</b>         | <b>Professional practice shows evidence of the highest level of expertise and commitment to student learning. Staff members are experts in content, assessment, and student engagement. They build and support a community of learners by engaging in extensive, reflective personal and collaborative professional development.</b>                                       |
| <b>Proficient</b>        | <b>Professional practice shows evidence of thorough knowledge of all aspects of the profession. Staff members at this level know their content and how to engage their students. Expectations for students are high. Staff know and follow the standards, establish an environment that functions effectively and efficiently, and reflect and use assessment to plan.</b> |
| <b>Needs Improvement</b> | <b>Professional practice shows evidence of basic knowledge and skills required to practice, but performance is ineffective and/or inconsistent.</b>  |
| <b>Unsatisfactory</b>    | <b>Professional practice shows evidence of inadequately applying or not understanding the concepts underlying the components of the JTHS evaluation instruments. Performance may represent practice that is or may be deemed harmful.</b>  |

## Procedures for Non-Tenured (Probationary) Teachers

### Definition:

Before 7/1/2023, a regular full-time first, second, third-, and possibly fourth-year staff member is considered to be a non-tenured probationary teacher.

After 7/1/2023, a regular full-time first, second, and possibly third-year staff member is considered to be a non-tenured probationary teacher.

Any regular full-time teacher hired after the 2023-2024 school year that does not have a Professional Educator License (PEL), an Educator License with stipulations with a career and technical educator endorsement, or an Educator License with stipulations with a provisional career and technical educator endorsement, will not be eligible for tenure according to Public Act 103-0617. This teacher will be evaluated yearly following the year 3 schedule.

The primary purpose of evaluation is the improvement of instruction. The process allows for ongoing conversations based upon evidence gathered by both staff members and evaluator and identification of areas of strength and improvement based upon formative feedback, planning, reflective conversations, and summative appraisal.

Probationary teachers shall be evaluated annually using the same evaluation instrument as tenured teachers. The schedule for each school year will be posted at the beginning of each school year on SharePoint via <https://studentjths.sharepoint.com/sites/jtweb>. Non-tenured (probationary) teachers are not entitled to a remediation plan in the event of an “unsatisfactory” evaluation or a professional development plan in the event of a rating of “needs improvement.” The evaluation cycle will begin on March 1<sup>st</sup> and be completed by February 19th for all non-tenured teachers.

## Vocabulary Related to Evaluations

### Definitions:

- **Formal Observation**
  - Previously known as an announced observation
  - Date and class period are announced by the evaluator.
  - Pre-Conference
    - Lesson plans and other request materials are provided to evaluator.
  - Reflection
  - Post Conference
- **Informal Observation**
  - Previously known as unannounced observation
  - Date and class period are not announced by the evaluator.
  - Reflection
  - Post Conference
- **Goals Check/Midcycle Observation**
  - No Reflection
  - Pre-planned date and time between teacher and evaluator
  - Evidence will not be included in the teacher’s summative evaluation.
  - Observation duration will be dependent on the teachers’ individual goals.

| <b>Non-Tenured Teacher Evaluation Guidelines: 2026-2027</b> |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Years 1 and 2</b>  |  |  |
| Professional Practice Portion (100%)                        | <p><b>1st – Due by November 6, 2026</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluator A</li> <li>• A minimum of 2 visits, 1 formal, 1 informal</li> <li>• A pre-conference must occur prior to every formal observation.</li> <li>• A post-conference must occur after each observation (within 10 school days of the observation).</li> <li>• Conduct an evaluation conference within 10 school days of the final post-conference when the completed formative professional practice portion is reviewed and discussed.</li> </ul> | <p><b>2nd – Due by February 19, 2027</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluator B</li> <li>• A minimum of 2 visits, 1 formal, 1 informal</li> <li>• A pre-conference must occur prior to every formal observation.</li> <li>• A post-conference must occur after each observation (within 10 school days of the observation).</li> <li>• Conduct a final professional practice evaluation conference within 10 school days of the final post-conference where the final rating for professional practice is reviewed and discussed.</li> <li>• Write-up and final rating on professional practice will be determined collaboratively between Administrator A and Administrator B.</li> </ul> |
| Conclusion to Non-Tenured Teacher Evaluation                | <p><b>Due by February 19, 2027</b></p> <p>Evaluator B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct a final evaluation conference before the evaluation deadline to review and discuss the final summative rating.</li> <li>• Sign evaluation document electronically in Evaluwise.</li> </ul>  |  |

| <b>Non-Tenured Teacher Evaluation Guidelines: 2026-2027</b><br><b>Year 3, 4 and Non-tenured track</b> |   |
|---|---|
| Professional Practice Portion (100%)  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of 3 visits, 2 formal, 1 informal</li> <li>• A pre-conference must occur prior to every formal observation.</li> <li>• A post-conference must occur after each observation (within 10 school days of the observation).</li> <li>• Conduct a final professional practice evaluation conference within 10 school days of the final post-conference when the final rating for professional practice is reviewed and discussed.</li> </ul> |
| Conclusion to Non-Tenured Teacher Evaluation  | <p><b><i>Due by February 19, 2027</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct a final evaluation conference before the evaluation deadline to review and discuss the final summative rating.</li> <li>• Sign evaluation document electronically in Evaluwise.</li> </ul>   |

### Procedures to Meet Tenure

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Hire date before 7/1/2023:<br>Accelerated Tenure | Teachers complete three consecutive school terms of service if they receive two overall annual evaluation ratings of Excellent in the three consecutive school term period.   |
| Hire date after 7/1/2023:<br>Accelerated Tenure  | Teachers complete two consecutive terms of full-time service in which the teacher holds a PEL, Educator License with stipulations with a career and technical educator endorsement, or an Educator License with stipulations with a provisional career and technical educator endorsement and receives two Excellent ratings.   |
| Hire date before 7/1/2023:<br>Tenure             | Teachers complete four consecutive school terms of service with ratings of at least Proficient in the third and fourth school terms.  |
| Hire date after 7/1/2023:<br>Tenure              | Teachers complete three consecutive school terms of services in which the teacher holds a PEL, Educator License with stipulations with a career and technical educator endorsement, or an Educator License with stipulations with a provisional career and technical educator endorsement and receives overall annual evaluation ratings of at least Proficient in the second and third school terms. |

Tenured teachers must be evaluated every three years. The schedule will be posted on SharePoint via [JT Web](#).

The evaluation cycle will begin on March 1<sup>st</sup> and be completed by February 19<sup>th</sup>. Additionally, tenured teachers who receive either a “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” overall rating and successfully complete noted area(s) of concern must be evaluated in the year following the rating. A tenured teacher who changes job responsibility (i.e., teacher to guidance counselor) will be evaluated in the first year of the new position, regardless of their placement on the evaluation cycle.

## Tenured Teacher Evaluation Guidelines 3-year Cycle: 2026-2027

### Timeline for the Tenured 3-year Evaluation Cycle (HB 18)

| Example | 2025-2026          | 2026-2027          | 2027-2028          | 2028-2029          |
|---------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1       | Year 2 Goals Check | Year 3 On-Cycle    | Year 1 Off Cycle   | Year 2 Goals Check |
| 2       | Year 3 On-Cycle    | Off Cycle          | Year 2 Goals Check | Year 3 On-Cycle    |
| 3       | Year 1 Off Cycle   | Year 2 Goals Check | Year 3 On-Cycle    | Year 1 Off Cycle   |

|  |  |                     |
|--|--|---------------------|
| <b>Off Cycle</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No formal observation</li> </ul>  | Year 1<br>OFF Cycle |
| <b>Goals Check/Midcycle</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluator</li> <li>• 1 Goals Check Observation</li> <li>• A post-conference must occur after each observation (within 10 school days of the observation). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current and future goal setting</li> </ul> </li> <li>• * Teachers coming off a PDP will skip the goals check</li> </ul>  | Year 2<br>Mid Cycle |
| <b>Professional Practice Portion (100%)</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluator</li> <li>• A minimum of 2 visits, 1 formal, 1 informal</li> <li>• A pre-conference must occur prior to every formal observation.</li> <li>• A post-conference must occur after each observation (within 10 school days of the observation).</li> <li>• Conduct a final professional practice evaluation conference within 10 school days of the final post-conference when the final rating for professional practice is reviewed and discussed.</li> </ul> | Year 3<br>On Cycle  |
| <b>Conclusion to Tenured Teacher Evaluation</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct a final evaluation conference before the evaluation deadline to review and discuss the final summative rating.</li> <li>• Sign evaluation document electronically in Evaluwise.</li> </ul>  |                     |
| <b>**No Alternative Evaluation Plans will be approved for the 2026-2027 evaluation cycles.</b> |  |                     |

### **Tenured – Professional Development Plan**

All tenured teachers rated with an overall rating of “Needs Improvement” will receive a Professional Development Plan within thirty school days of the completion of the evaluation. The evaluator, in consultation with the teacher, will create a professional development plan that is directed to the areas of needed improvement. The plan must take into account the teacher’s ongoing professional responsibilities, including his or her regular teaching assignments. The plan must describe any support the district will provide to address any areas identified as needing improvement. Tenured Staff must be evaluated at least once in the school year following the Professional Development Plan. Staff members who are rated “Proficient” or “Excellent” at that time will be reinstated to the Tenured Staff Evaluation Process for Proficient and Excellent Individual Growth Plan.

For tenured Staff who are evaluated less than “Proficient” at the completion of the PDP, the school district will start a remediation plan under the provisions of Illinois School Code 105 ILCS 5/24A-5.

### **Tenured – Remediation Plan**

All tenured teachers rated with an overall rating of “Unsatisfactory” will receive a Remediation Plan within thirty school days of the completion of the evaluation. The development and commencement of the Remediation Plan is designed to correct deficiencies stated in the evaluation, provided the deficiencies are remediable. The Remediation Plan shall provide for ninety school days of remediation in the classroom. The tenured teacher’s performance must be evaluated midway through, and at the conclusion of, the remediation period. Each evaluation shall assess the teacher’s performance during the remediation period. A written copy of the evaluations and ratings, in which any deficiencies in performance and recommendations for correction are identified, shall be provided to and discussed with the teacher within ten school days after the date of the evaluation. Evaluations at the conclusion of the remediation process may be separate and distinct from the required annual evaluations of teachers and may not be subject to the guidelines and procedures relating to these annual evaluations. The evaluator may, but is not required to, use forms provided for the annual evaluation of teachers in the district evaluation plan.

A consulting teacher shall provide advice to the tenured teacher rated “unsatisfactory” on how to improve teaching skills to successfully complete the Remediation Plan, but the final decision as to the content of the evaluation shall be left solely to the evaluator.

If, at the end of the remediation period, the staff member has not corrected the performance deficiencies, they are dismissed in accordance with Section 24-12 of the School Code. Tenured teachers who receive an “unsatisfactory” overall rating must be evaluated in the year following the rating.

Nothing in this plan should be construed as preventing immediate dismissal of a tenured staff member for deficiencies deemed irremediable or for actions that injury or endanger the health or person of students in the classroom or school.

## **Tenured Teacher-Appeal Process**

### **Appeals Process Timeline**

Teacher must submit written notification of the appeal with the documented concerns that are aligned to the “Criteria for an Appeal” that the teacher is grieving to the Union President and Superintendent within 3 school days after receiving the summative teacher evaluation resulting in an “Unsatisfactory” rating at the final evaluation conference. Only tenured teachers who receive an Unsatisfactory on their summative evaluation may submit an appeal.

### **Evaluation Appeals Committee Composition**

The Evaluation Appeals Committee (EAC) will be comprised of 6 individuals formed with equal representation of Union members and Administrators approved by the Joint Committee. All EAC members must be qualified evaluators as determined by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). The evaluator cannot serve as an EAC member. A union executive board member and either the Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent would be expected to be present to hear the proceedings but would not be on the panel and their role would be to ensure the process is followed.

### **Criteria for an Appeal**

1. Significant Bias
2. Inaccurate evidence or lack of evidence entered by the evaluator.
3. Failure to calculate the rubric correctly or evidence used does not match rubric scoring.

### **Panel Procedures**

1. The panel will organize a meeting with the teacher within five school days of the appeal being submitted where the teacher presents the concerns to the panel and answers all questions pertaining to the appeal. The teacher cannot add or present additional evidence or artifacts that were not uploaded during the evaluation process.
2. The panel will discuss the concerns and determine questions and information needed from the evaluator. The teacher is not present.
3. The evaluator may be asked to meet with the panel to answer the determined questions.
4. The panel will convene to seek to reach consensus. If consensus is not reached, the team would hold a vote where each EAC member will have one (1) vote as to whether to uphold the appeal. This decision would be determined through voting majority. If there is a tie, the Superintendent will make the final determination.
5. The panel will provide the teacher and evaluator a written statement of their findings within three school days.
  - a. If the appeal is upheld, the teacher rating will be changed to “needs improvement” and the teacher will receive a professional development plan within thirty days of the appeal decision. The professional development plan will be created by the original evaluator with input from administrators on the panel. The teacher will be given a different evaluator for the next evaluation. The teacher must be evaluated in the year following the appeal.
  - b. If the appeal is denied, the district will follow remediation procedures.

**Evaluation Instruments** All Instruments are available in Evaluwise:

- Alternative Services Facilitator
- Classroom Teacher (Gateway to Graduation 2.0, Bravo Pathways, River Valley)
- Dean of Students
- School Counselors
- IEP Manager
- Consult Model
- Library Media Specialists
- School Nurse
- School Psychologist
- Social Worker (Catalyst Coordinator, Cool Down Room Coordinator, Substance Abuse Clinician)
- Speech Pathologist
- District Transition Coordinator
- Professional Growth Plan
- Math Interventionist

## Professional Practice Summative Rating

|  | Unsatisfactory | Needs Improvement | Proficient | Excellent |
|--|----------------|-------------------|------------|-----------|
| <b>Excellent</b><br>An <i>Excellent</i> rating in two or more of the Domains, with the remaining Domains rated as <i>Proficient</i> .              |                |                   |            | XXXX      |
|  |                |                   | X          | XXX       |
|  |                |                   | XX         | XX        |
| <b>Proficient</b><br>No more than one Domain rated <i>Needs Improvement</i> , with the remaining Domains rated as <i>Proficient</i> or higher.     |                |                   | XXX        | X         |
|  |                |                   | XXXX       |           |
|  | X              | XX                | X          | X         |
|  | X              | X                 | XX         |           |
|  | X              |                   |            | XXX       |
|  | X              | XXX               |            |           |
| <b>Needs Improvement</b><br>More than one Domain rated <i>Needs Improvement</i> , with the remaining Domains rated as <i>Proficient</i> or higher. |                | XX                |            | XX        |
|  |                | XX                | X          | X         |
|  |                | XX                | XX         |           |
|  |                | XXX               | X          |           |
|  |                | XXX               |            | X         |
|  |                | XXXX              |            |           |
| <b>Unsatisfactory</b><br><i>Unsatisfactory</i> in any Domain.  | XXXX           |                   |            |           |
|  | XXX            | X                 |            |           |
|  | XXX            |                   | X          |           |
|  | XXX            |                   |            | X         |
|  | XX             | XX                |            |           |
|  | XX             | X                 | X          |           |
|  | XX             |                   | X          | X         |
|  | XX             |                   | XX         |           |
|  | XX             |                   |            | XX        |
|  | X              |                   | XXX        |           |
|  | X              |                   | XX         | X         |
|  | X              |                   | X          | XX        |
|  | X              |                   |            | XXX       |
|  | X              | X                 | XX         |           |
|  | X              | X                 | X          | X         |
|  | X              | X                 |            | XX        |

The guidelines on the following page show how each domain rating is determined so that the overall summative rating can be determined using the chart above.

## Summative Rating System for Classroom Teachers: Domain Guidelines

### Domain 1 & 4

| <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>   | <b>Needs Improvement</b> | <b>Proficient</b>                         | <b>Excellent</b>                          |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|---|---|
| Excellent             | None  | None                     | Remainder                                 | At least 3                                |
| Proficient            | None  | No more than 1 NI        | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |   |
| Needs Improvement     | Combination of 2 NI & U with no more than 1 being U           |                          |   | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |
| Unsatisfactory        | More than 1 U or any combination of NI & U totaling 3 or more |                          |   | Any Combination                           |

### Domain 2 & 3

| <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>   | <b>Needs Improvement</b> | <b>Proficient</b>                         | <b>Excellent</b>                          |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|---|---|
| Excellent             | None  | None                     | Remainder                                 | At least 2                                |
| Proficient            | None  | No more than 1 NI        | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |   |
| Needs Improvement     | Combination of 2 NI & U with no more than 1 being U           |                          |   | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |
| Unsatisfactory        | More than 1 U or any combination of NI & U totaling 3 or more |                          |   | Any Combination                           |

## **Rubric Guidelines: Alternative Services Facilitator Evaluation Tool**

### **Alternative Services Facilitator Evaluation Tool: 30 Elements**

| <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>                                  | <b>Needs Improvement</b> | <b>Proficient</b>                         | <b>Excellent</b> |
|-----------------------|--|--------------------------|---|------------------|
| Excellent             | None   | None                     | Remainder                                 | At least 15      |
| Proficient            | None   | 1-3                      | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Needs Improvement     | 1  | 4                        | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Unsatisfactory        | Any Unsatisfactory or more than 4<br>Needs Improvement |                          | Any Combination                           |                  |

## **Rubric Guidelines: Dean Evaluation Tool**

### **Dean Evaluation Tool: 24 Elements**

| <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>                                  | <b>Needs Improvement</b> | <b>Proficient</b>                         | <b>Excellent</b> |
|-----------------------|--|--------------------------|---|------------------|
| Excellent             | None   | None                     | Remainder                                 | At least 11      |
| Proficient            | None   | 1-2                      | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Needs Improvement     | None   | 3                        | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Unsatisfactory        | Any Unsatisfactory or more than 3<br>Needs Improvement |                          | Any Combination                           |                  |

## **Rubric Guidelines: School Counselor Evaluation Tool**

### **School Counselor Evaluation Tool: 21 Elements**

| <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>                                  | <b>Needs Improvement</b> | <b>Proficient</b>                         | <b>Excellent</b> |
|-----------------------|--|--------------------------|---|------------------|
| Excellent             | None   | None                     | Remainder                                 | At least 10      |
| Proficient            | None   | 1-2                      | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Needs Improvement     | None   | 3                        | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Unsatisfactory        | Any Unsatisfactory or more than 2<br>Needs Improvement |                          | Any Combination                           |                  |

## Rubric Guidelines: IEP Manager Evaluation Tool

### IEP Manager Tool: 24 Elements

| Overall Rating    | Unsatisfactory   | Needs Improvement | Proficient                                | Excellent   |
|-------------------|--|-------------------|---|-------------|
| Excellent         | None   | None              | Remainder                                 | At least 11 |
| Proficient        | None   | 1-2               | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |             |
| Needs Improvement | None   | 3                 | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |             |
| Unsatisfactory    | Any Unsatisfactory or more than 3<br>Needs Improvement |                   | Any Combination                           |             |

## Rubric Guidelines: F.A.C. Teacher

### Consult Teacher Evaluation Tool: 64 Elements

| Overall Rating    | Unsatisfactory   | Needs Improvement | Proficient                                | Excellent                                 |
|-------------------|--|-------------------|---|---|
| Excellent         | None   | None              | Remainder                                 | At least 10                               |
| Proficient        | None   | 1-5               | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |   |
| Needs Improvement | Combination of 6-8 Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory, with no more than 3 being Unsatisfactory     |                   |   | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |
| Unsatisfactory    | 4 or more Unsatisfactory or a combination of Needs Improvement & Unsatisfactory totaling more than 9 |                   |   | Any Combination                           |

## Rubric Guidelines: Math Interventionist

### Math Interventionist Evaluation Tool: 67 Elements

| Overall Rating    | Unsatisfactory   | Needs Improvement | Proficient                                | Excellent                                 |
|-------------------|--|-------------------|---|---|
| Excellent         | None   | None              | Remainder                                 | At least 15                               |
| Proficient        | None   | 1-5               | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |   |
| Needs Improvement | Combination of 6-8 Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory, with no more than 3 being Unsatisfactory     |                   |   | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |
| Unsatisfactory    | 4 or more Unsatisfactory or a combination of Needs Improvement & Unsatisfactory totaling more than 9 |                   |   | Any Combination                           |

## **Rubric Guidelines: Library Media Specialist Evaluation Tool**

### **Library Media Specialist Evaluation Tool: 22 Elements**

| <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>                                  | <b>Needs Improvement</b> | <b>Proficient</b>                         | <b>Excellent</b> |
|-----------------------|--|--------------------------|---|------------------|
| Excellent             | None   | None                     | Remainder                                 | At least 10      |
| Proficient            | None   | 1-2                      | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Needs Improvement     | None   | 3                        | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Unsatisfactory        | Any Unsatisfactory or more than 3<br>Needs Improvement |                          | Any Combination                           |                  |

## **Rubric Guidelines: School Nurse Evaluation Tool**

### **School Nurse Evaluation Tool: 22 Elements**

| <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>                                  | <b>Needs Improvement</b> | <b>Proficient</b>                         | <b>Excellent</b> |
|-----------------------|--|--------------------------|---|------------------|
| Excellent             | None   | None                     | Remainder                                 | At least 5       |
| Proficient            | None   | 1-3                      | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Needs Improvement     | None   | 4                        | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Unsatisfactory        | Any Unsatisfactory or more than 4<br>Needs Improvement |                          | Any Combination                           |                  |

## **Rubric Guidelines: School Psychologist Evaluation Tool**

### **School Psychologist Evaluation Tool: 17 Elements**

| <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>                                  | <b>Needs Improvement</b> | <b>Proficient</b>                         | <b>Excellent</b> |
|-----------------------|--|--------------------------|---|------------------|
| Excellent             | None   | None                     | Remainder                                 | At least 8       |
| Proficient            | None   | 1-2                      | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Needs Improvement     | None   | 3                        | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Unsatisfactory        | Any Unsatisfactory or more than 3<br>Needs Improvement |                          | Any Combination                           |                  |

## **Rubric Guidelines: Social Worker Evaluation Tool**

### **Social Worker Evaluation Tool: 21 Elements**

| <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>                               | <b>Needs Improvement</b> | <b>Proficient</b>                         | <b>Excellent</b> |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|---|------------------|
| Excellent             | None  | None                     | Remainder                                 | At least 10      |
| Proficient            | None  | 1-2                      | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Needs Improvement     | None  | 3                        | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Unsatisfactory        | Any Unsatisfactory or more than 3 Needs Improvement |                          | Any Combination                           |                  |

## **Rubric Guidelines: Speech Pathologist Evaluation Tool**

### **Speech Pathologist Evaluation Tool: 21 Elements**

| <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>                                       | <b>Needs Improvement</b> | <b>Proficient</b>                         | <b>Excellent</b> |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|---|------------------|
| Excellent             | None  | None                     | Remainder                                 | At least 10      |
| Proficient            | None  | 1-3                      | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Needs Improvement     | 1   | 1-4                      | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Unsatisfactory        | More than 1 Unsatisfactory or more than 4 Needs Improvement |                          | Any Combination                           |                  |

## **Rubric Guidelines: District Transition Coordinator Evaluation Tool**

### **Speech Pathologist Evaluation Tool: 21 Elements**

| <b>Overall Rating</b> | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>                                       | <b>Needs Improvement</b> | <b>Proficient</b>                         | <b>Excellent</b> |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|---|------------------|
| Excellent             | None  | None                     | Remainder                                 | At least 10      |
| Proficient            | None  | 1-3                      | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Needs Improvement     | 1   | 1-4                      | Remainder are Proficient and/or Excellent |                  |
| Unsatisfactory        | More than 1 Unsatisfactory or more than 4 Needs Improvement |                          | Any Combination                           |                  |