Teacher Evaluation Plan



Revised: November 12, 2026

Peru Elementary School District #124

Table of Contents

Section Title	Page
I. Teacher Evaluation Plan Development Process	1
II. The Teacher Evaluation Framework	1
III. Committee Members and Plan Approval	1-2
IV. Core Beliefs of the Teacher Evaluation Process	2
V. Goals of the Teacher Evaluation Plan	2
VI. The Domains, Components and Elements	2-3
VII. Levels of Performance and the Four Rating Categories	3
VIII. Domain Rating System	3
IX. Professional Practice Rating Score (100 Percent)	3-4
X. Final Summative Score and Rating	4
XI. Observation and Evaluation Timeframes and Schedule	4-5
XII. Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory Ratings	5-6
XIII. Summary Evaluation Rating and Written Response	7
XIV. Assignments, Representation, Training, and Disclaimers	7

Appendices Title

Appendix A: Framework for Teaching Summary
Appendix B: Evaluation Plan Timeframes
Appendix C: Artifacts
Appendix D: Pre-Observation Self-Evaluation
Appendix E: Pre-Observation Conference Guiding Questions
Appendix F: Post-Observation Reflection Conference
Appendix G: Formative Evaluation Framework
Appendix H: Final Summative Evaluation Score and Rating Report
Appendix I: Individual Growth Plan
Appendix J: Teacher Job Description
Appendix K: Unsatisfactory Rating Appeals Form

I. Teacher Evaluation Plan Development Process

In 2012, a committee of teachers, administrators and a member of the Board of Education meticulously researched and developed the Peru Elementary School District 124 Teacher Evaluation Plan that follows. In part, this process was necessary to ensure compliance with the Illinois Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA), which is Public Act 96-0861. PERA required significant changes to how teachers are evaluated and how evaluations are used.

The development of a research-based teacher evaluation plan that incorporates "the growth of student learning and the growth of the teacher as a professional" was part of the Strategic Plan for Peru Elementary School District 124. The focus was to develop a more effective evaluation plan that focuses on the growth of the teacher and provides a more objective and clear means of communication throughout the process. The task of this committee was to study, plan, research, develop and implement a new, comprehensive teacher evaluation plan that is in compliance with PERA, and also that meets the needs of the district and the professional growth needs of the district's teachers with the ultimate goal of improving the process of teaching and learning. This committee has continued this work to develop the student growth model in a manner that is relevant, meaningful and professional.

In 2021-2022, a committee of teachers and administrators convened to review the Teacher Evaluation Plan, Framework, and Student Learning Objectives. The purpose and focus of the committee was to review all aspects of the evaluation process and make necessary adjustments based on input from teachers and administrators. After multiple meetings and subcommittee meetings, the committee made recommendations that are reflected in the current evaluation plan.

In 2025-26, a committee of teachers and administrators convened to review the Teacher Evaluation Plan to consider eliminating the student growth component and determine how to structure the value of each of the four domains as permissible under Public Act 104- 0020 (SB28) which indicated as of July 1, 2025, student growth is no longer a required factor in evaluations.

II. The Teacher Evaluation Framework

After considerable research, including a group study of Charlotte Danielson's *A Framework for Teaching (2nd Edition)*, the committee focused on the development of an evaluation instrument aligned with Danielson's framework. Danielson has revolutionized the teacher evaluation process with language among the four domains that is clear, concise and more easily understood between the teacher and the evaluator. It also recognizes professional growth as a major component in the process. The 2021-2022 committee revised and clarified language from the original framework and made recommended changes without disturbing the integrity of the framework.

III. Committee Members and Plan Approval

The members directly involved with the 2021-2022 revised Teacher Evaluation Plan Committee were: Brandi Anderson-Maier, Tara Backes, Heather Baker, Cinnamon Bosnich, Melissa Bosnich, Carolyn Bryant, Katie Budnick, Melissa Cass, Jamie Craven, Tara Duncan, Jade Hubinsky, Dawn Ladzinski, Sara McDonald, Beth Rich, Kelly Schaefer, Phil Whaley.

On March 10th, 2022, the committee voted unanimously to approve the updated evaluation plan. The committee continues to periodically review and update the plan as needed, and the Board approves the plan annually.

The following committee members met on September 15th, 2025 (Heather Baker, Sara McDonald, Wendy DePhilips, Brent Ziegler, Ryan Linnig, Carolyn Bryant, Katie Budnick, Melissa Cass, Beth Rich, Phil Whaley, Jade Hubinsky, Tara Backes, and Abby Kotecki) and unanimously approved the changes

to the plan. The PERA Joint Committee met on November 13th, 2025 (Members of the PEA: Beth Rich, Katie Budnick, and Alexia Donovan and District #124 Administration Representatives: Ryan Linnig-Superintendent, Brent Ziegler-Principal (Parkside), and Sara McDonald-Principal (Northview) and approved recommended changes to the plan.

The PERA Joint Committee met on February 12th, 2026 (Members of the PEA: Beth Rich &Katie Budnick, and District #124 Administration Representatives: Ryan Linnig-Superintendent and Brent Ziegler-Principal (Parkside) and approved recommended changes to the plan.

IV. Core Beliefs of the Teacher Evaluation Process

The committee developed a list of eight core beliefs that we believe are critical to the teacher evaluation process. In no particular order, these beliefs are as follows:

- ✔ The evaluation should be part of an ongoing process.
- ✔ There should be clarity of expectations for both the teacher and the evaluator.
- ✔ The evaluation should be based on continual improvement of instruction with the goal of improved student learning.
- ✔ The evaluation should be flexible enough to account for different teaching assignments, grade levels and professional responsibilities.
- ✔ The evaluation process should be collaborative in nature.
- ✔ The evaluation process should include self-reflection and self-assessment.
- ✔ The evaluation process should take into account the professional growth and experience of the teacher.
- ✔ Professional growth can always take place and improvement should never end.

V. Goals of the Teacher Evaluation Plan

The committee also developed five goals as work progressed on the Teacher Evaluation Plan. In no particular order, these goals are as follows:

- ✔ To develop an evaluation tool that ultimately improves teaching and learning.
- ✔ To provide a fair and consistent method of teacher evaluation across the school district that meets the diverse needs of the staff.
- ✔ To provide a common language that allows for clear expectations about effective instruction and professional dialogue.
- ✔ To allow teachers to play a direct, active role in the process of their own evaluation, including opportunities for self-reflection and professional growth.
- ✔ To develop a plan that is legally sound and in compliance with PERA.

VI. The Domains, Components and Elements

Danielson's framework outlines four "Domains of Teaching Responsibility", as well as components under each domain. The Teacher Evaluation Plan Committee modified the components to fit the needs of the District's teachers, while also allowing for exactly five components under each domain.

The Framework for Teaching Summary (Appendix A) provides more detailed elements under each component, and the Formative Evaluation Framework (Appendix G) includes descriptors for each performance level for the four domains and twenty components. The four domains, as well as the five components under each domain, are as follows:

Domain 1 Planning and Preparation

1A Demonstrating Knowledge of Content, Pedagogy and Resources
1B Demonstrating Knowledge of Students
1C Setting Instructional Outcomes
1D Designing Coherent Instruction
1E Designing Student Assessments

Domain 2 The Classroom Environment
2A Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport
2B Establishing a Culture for Learning
2C Managing Classroom Procedures
2D Managing Student Behavior
2E Organizing Physical Space

Domain 3 Instruction
3A Communicating with Students
3B Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
3C Engaging Students in Learning
3D Using Assessment in Instruction
3E Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities
4A Reflecting on Teaching
4B Maintaining Accurate Records
4C Communicating with Families
4D Growing and Developing While Participating in a Professional Community
4E Showing Professionalism

VII. Levels of Performance and the Four Rating Categories

In compliance with PERA, the Teacher Evaluation Plan includes four specific rating categories that correspond with Danielson's Levels of Performance. The four evaluation rating categories are: Excellent, Proficient, Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory.

VIII. Domain Rating System

Under each of the domains, individual teachers are rated according to the above levels for each of the twenty components. The five component ratings under each domain are then used to determine the overall rating for the corresponding domain as follows:

Excellent: Excellent ratings in at least three of the components of the domain, with the remaining components rated as no lower than Proficient.

Proficient: No more than one component rated as Needs Improvement, with the remaining components rated as Proficient or higher.

Needs Improvement: One component rated as Unsatisfactory; OR more than one component rated as Needs Improvement, with the remaining components rated as Proficient or higher.

Unsatisfactory: Any two or more components rated as Unsatisfactory.

IX. Professional Practice Rating Score (100 Percent)

The overall Professional Practice Rating comprises 100 percent of the final summative rating calculation. Individual teachers are assigned a professional practice rating (with the Professional Practice score shown in parentheses) based on the four domain ratings as follows:

Excellent (4): Excellent ratings in three or more of the domains, with the remaining domain rated as Proficient.

Proficient (3): No more than one domain rated as Needs Improvement, with the remaining domains rated as Proficient or higher.

Needs Improvement (2): More than one domain rated as Needs Improvement, with the remaining domains rated as Proficient or higher.

Unsatisfactory (1): Any domain rated as Unsatisfactory.

Professional Practice Rating Score

The Professional Practice rating score is based on Danielson's Levels of Performance as explained in Section IX. The rating categories are then converted to a Professional Practice score of 4, 3, 2 or 1.

Professional Practice Rating	Professional Practice Score
Excellent	4
Proficient	3
Needs Improvement	2
Unsatisfactory	1

Domain	Weight
Domain 1 = 20%	0.2
Domain 2 = 30%	0.3
Domain 3 = 30%	0.3
Domain 4 = 20%	0.2

X. Final Summative Score and Rating

The calculation for the combined summative score and rating is based upon Professional Practice (see Appendix H), resulting in the teacher receiving a Combined Summative Score and Final Summative Rating as follows:

Combined Final Summative Score	Rating
3.70 - 4.00	Excellent
2.70 - 3.69	Proficient
2.00 - 2.69	Needs Improvement
1.0 - 1.99	Unsatisfactory

XI. Observation and Evaluation Timeframes and Schedule

As stated in the core beliefs and goals of the Teacher Evaluation Plan, the teacher evaluation process is an ongoing effort focused on the professional growth of the teacher and should ultimately improve teaching and learning. It is also a legal process with specific requirements and necessary timelines that need to be followed. The Evaluation Plan timeframes are summarized in Appendix B.

Formal Observations

A schedule with the planned week of dates of formal observations will be distributed by the evaluator to all affected teachers no later than the first student attendance day of the school year. Should circumstances arise that make it necessary to make changes to this schedule, the evaluator or teacher will notify the other a minimum of one week prior to the rescheduled date, unless an earlier time is mutually agreed upon by both parties.

Probationary teachers shall be evaluated each year with a minimum of two (2) formal observations.

Tenured teachers receiving a domain rating of Proficient or Excellent shall be evaluated a minimum of one (1) time every three (3) years with a minimum of one (1) formal observation.

A tenured teacher receiving a domain rating of Needs Improvement may be evaluated again the next school term with a minimum of two (2) formal observations and one (1) informal observation during the new evaluation cycle.

Pre-Conference Forms and Schedule

The evaluator and teacher will establish the specific dates and times of the preobservation conference and formal observations. Formal observations will not be conducted during the first week of school or in the last full week and remaining days before winter break. Each formal classroom observation shall be a minimum of thirty (30) consecutive minutes.

The teacher will provide the evaluator with the completed Pre-Observation Self-Evaluation form (Appendix D) at least one (1) day prior to the scheduled pre-observation conference. Prior to the pre-observation conference, both the teacher and the evaluator should also refer to the Pre-Observation Conference Guiding Questions (Appendix E). This includes potential guiding questions intended to open up conversations between the teacher and evaluator about the lesson to be formally observed. This form does not need to be completed in writing or submitted, but can be used for notes or discussion.

Post-Observation Reflection Conference Forms and Schedule

The post-observation reflection conference must take place within ten (10) school days of the formal observation. The teacher will provide the evaluator with the completed Post Observation Reflection Conference form (Appendix F) within two (2) days after the scheduled observation. Any other necessary post-observation conference documents will be provided by the evaluator to the teacher at least one (1) day prior to the scheduled post-observation reflection conference.

Informal Observations

In addition to the number of formal observations described above for probationary and tenured teachers, at least one informal observation must be conducted during each evaluation cycle. Informal observations do not require any notifications or forms; however, if any information from the informal observations is used in the final summative rating, then this information must be shared in writing to the teacher within ten (10) days after the completion of the informal observation and the teacher must have an opportunity to discuss this with the evaluator following the observation.

Annual Professional Responsibilities Data Collection

Any artifacts (See Appendix C) must be submitted by the teacher to the evaluator on by February 1st of each school year.

Missed Timelines and Special Circumstances

Any teacher who is not evaluated during their scheduled evaluation year due to timelines missed by the evaluator will have a letter placed in his/her personnel file with a copy to the teacher stating that the lack of an evaluation signifies that the teacher is performing at an “excellent” level.

In the event a teacher's medical leave or other unforeseen, long-term absence prevents the issuance of a final summative evaluation rating, a rating will not be provided and the teacher will be placed on the evaluation cycle the following year.

XII. Needs Improvement and Unsatisfactory Ratings

A. **Needs Improvement Rating:** A Professional Development Plan (PDP) (Appendix I) must be developed between the teacher and the evaluator within thirty (30) days after the completion of a summative evaluation rating in which a tenured teacher is rated as Needs Improvement. The plan should address all domains and/or components rated as Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory. A tenured teacher on a Professional Development Plan must receive a summative rating of at least Proficient to successfully complete the PDP. Failure to do so will result in either an extension of the PDP or development of a new PDP. If the tenured teacher fails to receive a summative rating of at

least Proficient after the extension or 2nd PDP, an Unsatisfactory rating will be assigned and a remediation plan as outlined in section B below will be developed.

The Individual Growth Plan is not utilized for non-tenured teachers who receive a rating of Needs Improvement.

B. Unsatisfactory Rating and Remediation: In the event a tenured teacher receives an overall summative evaluation rating of Unsatisfactory, a remediation plan will be developed in accordance with current statute. The remediation process includes a number of specific requirements for the teacher under remediation, the evaluator(s) and the consulting teacher, and also includes specific timelines per the law.

If a tenured teacher exhibits evidence of Unsatisfactory practice at any time, the summative evaluation process may be commenced to determine the rating. Should the rating be determined to be Unsatisfactory, then a remediation plan will be developed as described above.

The teacher will be provided with the opportunity to provide any artifacts or evidence in response to an Unsatisfactory rating, with the understanding that the timeline will follow the schedule determined in the remediation plan, rather than any other references contained in the Teacher Evaluation Plan.

C. Appeals Process for an Unsatisfactory Rating: **Public Act 101-0591** allows teachers to challenge an **"Unsatisfactory" summative performance rating**. This process is used to determine if a rating was erroneous and may result in the issuance of a replacement rating.

1. Right to Appeal

- **Eligibility**: Any teacher who receives a final summative performance evaluation rating of "Unsatisfactory" has the right to appeal the rating.
- **Scope**: The appeal may challenge procedural violations, objective calculation errors, or substantive evidentiary claims regarding teacher practice components.
- **Status Pending Appeal**: The statutory 90-school-day remediation plan timeline will commence as required by 105 ILCS 5/24A-5; however, if the appeal is successful, the remediation plan shall be terminated immediately, and the rating adjusted accordingly.

2. Timeline for Submission

- **Filing Deadline**: The teacher must submit a formal, written *Unsatisfactory Rating Appeal Form* to the Superintendent and the Union President within **fourteen (14) calendar days** of receiving the final signed summative evaluation.
- **Required Contents**: The written appeal must explicitly state:
  - The specific components, rubrics, or procedural steps being disputed.
  - The precise grounds for the appeal (e.g., administrator error, unconsidered evidence, biased implementation).
  - All relevant supporting artifacts, observation notes, and documentation.

3. The Appeals Panel (The Review Committee)

- **Composition**: A panel of qualified evaluators shall be established by the PERA Joint Committee. The panel will consist of four (4) members:
  - Two (2) administrators appointed by the Superintendent. **Qualifications**: Must have successfully completed the Illinois State Board of Education evaluator training and did not participate in the evaluation under appeal.
  - Two (2) certified teachers appointed by the Union. **Qualifications**: Must be tenured teachers that have received an “excellent” rating on the last summative evaluation. The two teachers will be advisory only.

4. Hearing and Decision Process

- **Review Window**: The Appeals Panel shall convene and review the appeal within **ten (10) calendar days** of the submission deadline.
- **Standard of Review**: The panel will evaluate whether the "Unsatisfactory" rating was issued erroneously or in violation of the District's PERA Evaluation Plan.
- **Voting & Outcome**:
  - A majority vote of the panel is required to sustain an appeal.
  - **Appeal Sustained**: If the appeal is successful, the "Unsatisfactory" rating will be revoked. The panel will issue a recommended replacement rating of "Proficient" or "Needs Improvement" based on the retroactively corrected evidence. The recommendation will be provided to the Superintendent and Union President who will determine if further negotiation/bargaining is necessary. If necessary, the District and Union will bargain as required by the law.
  - **Appeal Denied**: If the appeal is denied, or if the panel results in a tie vote, the original "Unsatisfactory" rating will stand.
- **Final Notification**: The panel will issue its final binding decision in writing to the teacher, the evaluator, and the Superintendent within **five (5) school days** of completing the review.

XIII. Summative Evaluation Rating and Written Response

All formal observations, conferences and final summative evaluations must be completed by March 1st of the summative evaluation year. Teachers shall be provided with a copy of the Final Summative Evaluation Score and Rating Report (Appendix H) at least 24 hours prior to the meeting to review the final document with the evaluator. One final copy must be signed and dated at that meeting by both the teacher and the evaluator indicating receipt of the summative evaluation, and this original hard copy is to be placed in the teacher's personnel file.

Signing the summative evaluation by the teacher shall indicate receipt, but not agreement with, the contents of the evaluation. If the teacher disagrees with the summative evaluation and/or narrative, his/her written response to the evaluation must be submitted within ten (10) working days of its receipt. Any written response will be attached to the summative evaluation in the personnel file.

Personnel File

Each teacher's personnel file shall contain the following minimum items of information: signed copies of all summative teacher evaluations, required medical information, current transcripts and any other information which could be used as a basis for discipline, re employment, assignment, termination, transfer or determining salary.

The teacher may attach a written statement to any complaint or disciplinary action that is placed in the teacher's personnel file. If the complaint or disciplinary action is to be placed in the teacher's file, the teacher will receive verbal notice prior to written notice of the substance of the documentation.

XIV. Assignments, Representation, Training and Disclaimers

It is understood that the evaluator will generally be the principal at the particular building to which a teacher is assigned. In the event a teacher has a dual assignment, it will be clarified to the teacher at the beginning of the school term to which evaluator he/she is assigned. In the unlikely event an evaluator other than the building principal needs to be assigned, this will also be indicated at the beginning of the school term, or at the time this becomes necessary.

Association Representation

Upon request of the teacher, a representative of the teacher association will be present during post-observation and/or summative evaluation conferences.

Teacher Evaluation Plan Training

Once the Teacher Evaluation Plan is enacted, formal training and development on the new plan will be provided to all teachers. From that point on, new teachers in the district will be provided training on the evaluation plan prior to the completion of any formal observations or summative evaluations. It is ultimately the responsibility of each individual teacher to be completely familiar with the teacher evaluation process, timelines, forms and teacher responsibilities. Questions or clarification should be directed to the evaluator or the superintendent. Prior to conducting any formal observations or summative evaluations, evaluators must complete required training that is in compliance with current state statute.

Teacher Evaluation Plan Disclaimers

This Teacher Evaluation Plan is intended to be flexible and adaptable to all the various teaching positions within the district. Evaluators will consider the uniqueness of each teacher's assignment when making judgments about their effectiveness. Specific job variations such as the number of students taught and the instructional time available may impact such factors as the ability to individualize and differentiate instruction, communicate individually with parents and devote large amounts of time doing assessments.

Furthermore, any issues or conflicts that may arise within the Peru Elementary School District 124 Teacher Evaluation Plan or throughout the teacher evaluation process will be brought forth to the appropriate parties so that any issues may be resolved in writing.