

**Educator Evaluation and  
Professional Development  
Plan  
Eastford School District  
Teachers**



**Eastford Elementary School**

Revised June 2015  
Approved by Board of Education 6/11/15  
Revised after State Feedback 5/27/15

## Table of Contents

I. SEED: Connecticut’s System for Educator Evaluation and Development .....	3
System upon which the Eastford plan is based	
Context and Timeline.....	3
Purpose and Rationale of the Evaluation System.....	3
Design Principles.....	3
II. Evaluation System Overview.....	5
Evaluation System Overview .....	5
Teacher Evaluation Process .....	6
Primary and Complementary Observer/Evaluator.....	9
Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing.....	9
III. Support and Development.....	10
Evaluation-Based Professional Learning.....	10
Improvement and Remediation Plans .....	10
Career Development and Growth .....	10
IV. Teacher Practice Related Indicators .....	11
CATEGORY #1: Teacher Performance and Practice (40%) .....	11
CATEGORY #2: Parent Feedback (10%).....	20
V. Student Outcomes Related Indicators.....	22
CATEGORY #3: Student Growth and Development (45%) .....	22
CATEGORY #4: Whole-School Student Learning Indicator and/or Student Feedback (5%) .....	29
VI. Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring .....	30
Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness .....	32
Dispute Resolution Process .....	32
Appendix A: Template for Setting SMART Goals .....	34
Appendix B: Sample Parent Survey .....	35
Appendix C: CCT Rubric .....	36+

The Eastford teachers have unanimously agreed to amend the teacher evaluation plan that would allow Student and Educator Support Specialists (SESS) to use newly developed state guidance for SLOs and observation. This was approved by the Board of Education on October 10, 2013, June 12, 2014 and June 11, 2015.

Appendix D: SESS (Student and Educator Support Specialists CCT Rubric) Documents  
    SESS Social Work  
    SESS ELL/World Language  
    SESS Special Education

## I. System for Educator Evaluation and Development

### Context and Timeline

This document is Eastford's model for the evaluation and development of teachers is based on SEED, Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development. It is based on the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, developed by a diverse group of educators in June 2012, and on best practice research from around the country.

### Purpose and Rationale of the Evaluation System

When teachers succeed, students succeed. Research has proven that no school-level factor matters more to students' success than high-quality teachers. To support our teachers, we need to clearly define excellent practice and results; give accurate, useful information about teachers' strengths and development areas; and provide opportunities for growth and recognition. The purpose of the new evaluation model is to fairly and accurately evaluate teacher performance and to help each teacher strengthen his/her practice to improve student learning.

### Design Principles

The following principles guided the design of this model.

- *Consider multiple, standards-based measures of performance*  
An evaluation system that uses multiple sources of information and evidence results in fair, accurate and comprehensive pictures of teachers' performance. The new model defines four categories of teacher performance: student learning (45%), teacher performance and practice (40%), parent feedback (10%) and school-wide student learning or student feedback (5%). These categories are grounded in research-based, national standards: Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching*; the Common Core State Standards, as well as Connecticut's standards: The Connecticut Common Core of Teaching; the Connecticut Framework K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards; and locally developed curriculum standards.

- *Promote both professional judgment and consistency*

Assessing a teacher's professional practice requires evaluators to constantly use their professional judgment. No rubric or formula, however detailed, can capture all of the nuances in how teachers interact with students, and synthesizing multiple sources of information into performance ratings is inherently more complex than checklists or numerical averages. At the same time, teachers' ratings should depend on their performance, not on their evaluators' biases. Accordingly, the model aims to minimize the variance between school leaders' evaluations of classroom practice and support fairness and consistency within and across schools.
- *Foster dialogue about student learning*

This model hinges on improving the professional conversation between and among teachers and administrators who are their evaluators. The dialogue in the new model occurs more frequently and focuses on what students are learning and what teachers and their administrators can do to support teaching and learning.
- *Encourage aligned professional development, coaching and feedback to support teacher growth*

Novice and veteran teachers alike deserve detailed, constructive feedback and professional development, tailored to the individual needs of their classrooms and students. This evaluation and development plan promotes a shared language of excellence to which professional development, coaching, and feedback can align to improve practice.
- *Ensure feasibility of implementation*

Launching this new model will require hard work. Throughout each district, educators will need to develop new skills and to think differently about how they manage and prioritize their time and resources. The model aims to balance high expectations with flexibility for the time and capacity constraints in our districts.

## II. Evaluation System Overview

### Evaluation System Overview

The evaluation system consists of multiple measures to paint an accurate and comprehensive picture of teacher performance. All teachers will be evaluated in four categories, grouped in two major focus areas: Teacher Practice and Student Outcomes.

**1. Teacher Practice Related Indicators:** An evaluation of the core instructional practices and skills that positively affect student learning. This focus area is comprised of two categories:

- (a) **Observation of teacher performance and practice (40%)** as defined in the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching, which articulates domains and components of teacher practice
- (b) **Parent feedback (10%)** on teacher practice through surveys

**2. Student Outcomes Related Indicators:** An evaluation of teachers' contribution to student academic progress, at the school and classroom level. There is also an option in this focus area to include student feedback. This focus area is comprised of two categories:

- (a) **Student growth and development (45%)** as determined by the teachers' SLOs (student learning objective(s))
- (b) **Whole-school measure of student learning or student feedback (5%)** as determined by aggregate student learning indicators or student surveys


Scores from each of the four categories will be combined to produce a summative performance rating of Exemplary, Accomplished, Developing or Below Standard. The performance levels are defined as:

**Exemplary** – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance

**Accomplished** – Meeting indicators of performance

**Developing** – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others

**Below Standard** – Not meeting indicators of performance



### **Teacher Evaluation Process**

The annual evaluation process between a teacher and an evaluator (principal or designee) is anchored by three performance conversations at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. The purpose of these conversations is to clarify expectations for the evaluation process, provide comprehensive feedback to each teacher on his/her performance, set development goals and identify development opportunities. These conversations are collaborative and require reflection and preparation by both the evaluator and the teacher in order to be productive and meaningful.



### Goal-Setting and Planning:

Timeframe: Target is October 15; must be completed by November 15

1. *Orientation on Process*—To begin the evaluation process, evaluators meet with teachers, in a group or individually, to discuss the evaluation process and their roles and responsibilities within it. In this meeting, they will discuss any school or district priorities that should be reflected in teacher practice goals/focus areas and student learning objectives (SLOs) and they will commit to set time aside for the types of collaboration required by the evaluation process.
  
2. *Teacher Reflection and Goal-Setting*—The teacher examines student data, prior year evaluation and survey results, and the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching to draft proposed performance and practice focus areas, a parent feedback goal, and at least one student learning objective (SLO) for the school year. The teacher may collaborate in grade-level or subject-matter teams to support the goal-setting process.
  
3. *Goal-Setting Conference*—The evaluator and teacher meet to discuss the teacher’s proposed goals and objectives in order to arrive at mutual agreement about them. The teacher collects evidence about his/her practice and the evaluator collects evidence about the teacher’s practice to support the review. The evaluator may request revisions to the proposed goals and objectives if they do not meet approval criteria.

### Mid-Year Check-In:

Timeframe: January and February

*Reflection and Preparation*—The teacher and evaluator collect and reflect on evidence to-date about the teacher’s practice and student learning in preparation for the check-in.

1. *Mid-Year Conference*—The evaluator will complete at least one mid-year check-in conference with each teacher during which they review progress on teacher practice objectives and student learning objectives (SLOs) and performance to date. The mid-year conference is an important point in the year for addressing concerns and reviewing results for the first half of the year. Evaluators can deliver mid-year formative information on components of the evaluation framework for which evidence has been gathered and analyzed. If needed, teachers and evaluators can mutually agree to

revisions on the strategies or approaches used and/or mid-year adjustment of SLOs to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignment). They also discuss actions that teachers can take and supports the evaluator can provide to promote teacher growth in his/her development areas.

End-of-Year Summative Review:

Timeframe: May and June; must be completed by June 30

1. *Teacher Self-Assessment*—The teacher reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the evaluator. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the goal-setting conference.
2. *Scoring*—The evaluator reviews submitted evidence, self-assessments and observation data to generate category and focus area ratings. The category ratings generate the final, summative rating. After all data, including state test data, are available, the evaluator may adjust the summative rating if the state test data change the student-related indicators significantly to change the final rating. Such revisions should take place as soon as state test data are available, and before September 15.
3. *End-of-Year Conference*—The evaluator and the teacher meet to discuss all evidence collected to date and to discuss category ratings. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year (June 30 at the latest).



### **Complementary Observer**

The primary observer for most teachers will be the school principal or assistant principal, who will be responsible for the overall evaluation process, including assigning summative ratings. Eastford may also decide to use complementary observers to assist the primary evaluator. Complementary observers are certified teachers, although they may also have administrative certification. Complementary observers will only be used if it is agreeable to all parties involved, teachers and administrators.

Complementary observers may assist primary evaluators by conducting observations, collecting additional evidence, reviewing student learning objectives (SLOs), and providing additional feedback. A complementary observer should share his or her feedback with the primary evaluator as it is collected and shared with teachers.

Primary evaluators will have sole responsibility for assigning final summative ratings and must achieve proficiency on the training modules provided.

### **Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing**

All evaluators are required to complete extensive training on the evaluation model. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) will provide districts with training opportunities and tools throughout the year to support district administrators and evaluators in implementing the model across their schools. Districts will adapt and build on these tools to provide comprehensive training and support to their schools and to ensure that evaluators are proficient in conducting teacher evaluations.

At the request of a district or employee, the CSDE or a third-party designated by the CSDE will review evaluation ratings that include dissimilar ratings in different categories (i.e., include both exemplary and below standard ratings). In these cases, CSDE will determine a final summative rating.

In addition, CSDE will select districts at random annually to review evaluation evidence files for a minimum of two educators rated exemplary and two educators rated below standard.

### III. Support and Development

As a standalone, evaluation cannot hope to improve teaching practice and student learning. However, when paired with effective, relevant and timely support, the evaluation process has the potential to help move teachers along the path to exemplary practice.

#### Evaluation-Based Professional Learning

In any sector, people learn and grow by honestly co-assessing current performance, setting clear goals for future performance, and outlining the supports they need to close the gap. Throughout the Eastford plan, every teacher will be identifying their professional learning needs in mutual agreement between the teacher and his/her evaluator and serves as the foundation for ongoing conversations about the teacher's practice and impact on student outcomes. The professional learning opportunities identified for each teacher should be based on the individual strengths and needs that are identified through the evaluation process. The process may also reveal areas of common need among teachers, which can then be targeted with school-wide professional development opportunities.

#### Improvement and Remediation Plans

If a teacher's overall performance is rated as developing or below standard, it signals the need for the administrator to create an individual teacher improvement and remediation plan. The improvement and remediation plan should be developed in consultation with the teacher and his/her exclusive bargaining representative. Improvement and remediation plans must:

- identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided to address documented deficiencies;
- indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued; and
- include indicators of success including a summative rating of accomplished or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.

#### Career Development and Growth

Rewarding exemplary performance identified through the evaluation process with opportunities for career development and professional growth is a critical step in both building confidence in the evaluation system itself and in building the capacity of all teachers.

Examples of such opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring early-career teachers; participating in development of teacher improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is developing or below standard; leading Professional Learning Communities; differentiated career pathways; and focused professional development based on goals for continuous growth and development.

## IV. Teacher Practice Related Indicators

The Teacher Practice Related Indicators portion of this plan evaluates the teacher's knowledge of a complex set of skills and competencies and how these are applied in a teacher's practice. It is comprised of two categories:

- Teacher Performance and Practice, which counts for 40%; and
- Parent Feedback, which counts for 10%.

These categories will be described in detail below.

### **CATEGORY #1: Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)**

The Teacher Performance and Practice category of the model is a comprehensive review of teaching practice against a rubric of practice, based on multiple observations. It comprises 40% of the summative rating. Following observations, evaluators provide teachers with specific feedback to identify teacher development needs and tailor support to those needs.

#### ***Teacher Practice Framework***

In order to continue using *My Learning Plan* and have access to state-sponsored professional development, Eastford will use the CCT (Common Core of Teaching) as its framework for evaluating teacher performance and practice.

Since Eastford was part of the 2012-13 SEED pilot, it has become familiar and comfortable with the blending of the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching Standards with Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teaching*. The Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support was organized into four domains, each with 4-5 components, represents the most important skills and knowledge that teachers need to successfully educate each and every one of their students. It is included here so that Eastford teachers may reference the four domains with which they have gained familiarity.

## Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support

(Blended Danielson and CCT version)

### Domain 1: Planning for Active Learning

- 1a. Ensuring that content/curriculum is at an appropriate level of challenge and meets student learning needs
- 1b. Developing and organizing coherent and relevant units, lessons, and learning tasks
- 1c. Supporting content area literacy skills, and when appropriate, numeracy skills, across the curriculum
- 1d. Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to monitor student progress

### Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership

- 4a: Engaging in continuous professional growth to impact instruction
- 4b: Collaborating with colleagues to develop and sustain continuous improvement
- 4c: Communicating, collaborating with, and engaging appropriately with families about their students and the instructional program
- 4d: Demonstrating other professional behaviors

### 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

### *Observation Process*

Research, such as the Gates Foundation's *Measures of Effective Teaching* study, has shown that multiple snapshots of practice conducted by multiple observers provide a more accurate picture of teacher performance than one or two observations per year. These observations don't have to cover an entire lesson to be valid. Partial period observations can provide valuable information and save observers precious time.

Observations in and of themselves aren't useful to teachers – it's the feedback based on observations that helps teachers to reach their full potential. All teachers deserve the opportunity to grow and develop through observations and timely feedback. In fact, teacher surveys conducted nationally demonstrate that most teachers are eager for more observations and feedback that they can then incorporate into their practice throughout the year.

Therefore, in the Eastford model:

- Each teacher should be observed between 1 and 8 times per year through both formal and informal observations as defined below.
  - Formal: Scheduled observations or reviews of practice<sup>2</sup> that last at least 30 minutes and are followed by written feedback. A post-observation conference, is recommended; it is required if either the administrator or the teacher requests it.
  - Informal: Non-scheduled observations or reviews of practice that last at least 10 minutes and are followed by written and/or verbal feedback.
- All observations should be followed by feedback, either verbal (e.g., a post-conference, a quick conversation) or written (e.g., via email, comprehensive write-up, quick note in mailbox) or both, as soon as possible after an observation. Feedback will typically be provided within five school days that the teacher is present. Exceptions will be documented with reasons.
- In order to capture an authentic view of practice and to promote a culture of openness and comfort with frequent observations and feedback, it's recommended that some of the observations be unannounced.
- The principal and teacher can use their discretion to decide the right number of observations for each teacher based on school and staff needs and in accordance with the Guidelines for Educator Evaluation. A summary of requirements is below:

Teacher Category	Model Number of Observations	Conditions Needed To Meet Requirements
First and Second Year Novice Teachers	3 formal in-class observations, 2 of which include a pre-conference and 3 informal observations	<i>Minimum criteria: <b>Year 1 and 2 teachers</b> receive at least 3 formal in-class observations. Two of 3 include pre-conference and all include a post-conference.</i>
Below Standard and Developing	3 formal in-class observations, 2 of which include a pre-conference and 5 informal observations	<i>Teachers who receive a performance rating of <b>below standard or developing</b> receive a number of observations appropriate to their individual plan, but no fewer than 3 formal in-class observations.</i>
Accomplished and Exemplary	1 formal in-class observation once every three years. In all other years, at least three informal observations, including non-classroom <sup>2</sup> observations and reviews of practice. In all years, at least one review of practice <sup>2</sup> is required.	<p><i>Observation protocol involves multiple in-class visits throughout the year, including a combination of formal, informal, announced, and unannounced observations. Teachers who receive a performance rating of <b>proficient or exemplary</b> receive a combination of at least 3 formal observations/reviews of practice, 1 of which must be a formal in-class; to be agreed upon by teacher and evaluator.</i></p> <p><i>Flexibility Option: Teachers who receive and maintain a performance evaluation designation of proficient or exemplary shall be evaluated with a minimum of 1 formal in-class observation no less frequent than every 3 years and 3 informal in-class observations in all other years. One review of practice shall be completed every year.</i></p>

<sup>2</sup> Examples of non-classroom observations or reviews of practice include but are not limited to: observations of data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, review of lesson plans or other teaching artifacts.

**Please note:** The first year of implementation was 2012-13. During the second year of implementation, 2013-14, guidelines were changed midyear. When guidelines were changed, all teachers had had at least one formal in-class observation. Beginning with the 2014-15 school year, and continuing, teachers who receive and maintain an annual summative performance evaluation designation of proficient (accomplished) or exemplary during any subsequent school year and who are not first or second year teachers shall be evaluated with a minimum of one formal in-class observation no less frequently than once every three years. In all other years, there will be at least three informal in-class observations, one of which will be a review of practice. In all years, at least one review of practice is required. Pre-conferences and post-conferences

Pre-conferences are valuable for giving context for the lesson and information about the students to be observed and for setting expectations for the observation process. Pre-conferences are optional for observations except where noted in the requirements described above. If it is mutually

agreed upon, a pre-conference can be held with a group of teachers.

Post-conferences provide a forum for reflecting on the observation against the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching and for generating action steps that will lead to the teacher's improvement. A good post-conference:

- begins with an opportunity for the teacher to share his/her self-assessment of the lesson observed;
- cites objective evidence to paint a clear picture for both the teacher and the evaluator about the teacher's successes, what improvements will be made, and where future observations may focus;
- involves written and verbal feedback from the evaluator; and
- occurs as soon as possible after the observation.

**Data-Informed Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)*****Observation of Teacher Practice***

Observations, both formal and informal, provide valuable information to all professional staff about instructional practice. Data collected through observations  
Classroom observations provide the most evidence for the CCT Continuum, but both pre- and post-conferences provide the opportunity for discussion of all domains, including practice outside of classroom instruction (e.g., lesson plans, reflections on teaching).

**Non-Classroom Reviews of Practice**

Because the new evaluation model aims to provide teachers with comprehensive feedback on their practice as defined by the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching, all interactions with teachers that are relevant to their instructional practice and professional conduct may contribute to their performance evaluations. These interactions may include, but are not limited to, reviews of lesson/unit plans and assessments, planning meetings, data team meetings, professional learning community meetings, call-logs or notes from parent- teacher meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, and attendance records from professional development or school-based activities/events.

**Feedback**

The goal of feedback is to help teachers grow as educators and become more effective with each and every one of their students. With this in mind, evaluators should be clear and direct, presenting their comments in a way that is supportive and constructive. Feedback should include:

- specific evidence and ratings, where appropriate, on observed components of the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching;
- prioritized commendations and recommendations for development actions;
- next steps and supports the teacher can pursue to improve his/her practice; and
- a timeframe for follow up.

Providing both verbal and written feedback after an observation is ideal, but school leaders will discuss feedback preferences and norms with their staff.



SOURCES OF DATA	EXAMPLES OF DATA	IMPORTANCE OF DATA
Conferences	Data related to all 5 domains <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conversation and artifacts that reveal the teacher has an understanding of, content, students, strategies, and use of data</li> <li>• Teacher’s use of data to inform instruction, analyze student performance and set appropriate learning objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides opportunities for teachers to demonstrate cause and effect thinking.</li> <li>• Provides opportunities for evaluator learning in content; systems effectiveness; priorities for professional learning</li> <li>• Provides context for observations and evaluation</li> </ul>
In-class observations	Data related to Domains 2-5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher-student, student, student-student conversations, interactions, activities related to learning objectives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides evidence of teacher’s ability to improve student learning and promote growth</li> </ul>
Non-classroom reviews of practice	Data related to Domain 6 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher reflection, as evidenced in pre- and post-conference data.</li> <li>2. Engagement in professional development opportunities, involvement in action research.</li> <li>3. Collaboration with colleagues</li> <li>4. Teacher-family interactions</li> <li>5. Ethical decisions</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides evidence of teacher as learner, as reflective practitioner and teacher as leader.</li> </ul>

### *Teacher Performance and Practice; Professional Development*

Over the course of the year, teachers develop one to three professional development plans or focus areas that are aligned to the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching. These plans may provide a focus for observations and feedback conversations.

At the start of the year, each teacher who has been rated an average of “below standard’ or “developing,” in any of the domains will work with his or her evaluator to develop mutually agreed upon practice and performance goal(s) All should have a clear link to student achievement and should move the teachers towards Accomplished or Exemplary on the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching. The School may decide to create a school-wide goal or professional development focus area aligned to a particular component (i.e., Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques) that all teachers will use for focus.

Goals should be SMART:

S=Specific and Strategic

M=Measurable

A=Aligned and Attainable

R=Results-Oriented

T=Time-Bound

#### **SMART Goal Example for Teacher Performance and Practice (40%):**

By June 20\_\_, I will use higher-order thinking questioning and discussion techniques to actively engage at least 85% of my students in discussions that promote understanding of content, interaction among students and opportunities to extend thinking.

Additional information on SMART goals can be found in Appendix A: Template for Setting SMART Goals. Progress towards goals and action steps for achieving progress should be referenced in feedback conversations following observations throughout the year. Goals and action steps should be formally discussed during the mid-year conference and the end-of-year conference. Although performance and practice goals are not explicitly rated as part of the Teacher Performance and Practice component, progress on goals will be reflected in the scoring of Teacher Performance and Practice evidence.

### *Teacher Performance and Practice Scoring*

#### Individual Observations

Evaluators are not required to provide an overall rating for each observation, but they should provide ratings and evidence for the Framework components that were observed. During observations, evaluators should take evidence-based notes, capturing specific instances of what the teacher and students said and did in the classroom. Evidence-based notes are factual (e.g., The teacher asks: Which events precipitated the fall of Rome?) and not judgmental (e.g., The teacher asks good questions.). Once the evidence has been recorded, the evaluator can align the evidence with the appropriate component(s) on the rubric and then make a judgment about which performance level the evidence supports.

### Summative Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice Rating

At the end of the year, primary evaluators must determine a final teacher performance and practice rating and discuss this rating with teachers during the end-of-year conference. The final teacher performance and practice rating will be calculated by the evaluator in a three-step process:

- 1) Evaluator holistically reviews evidence collected through observations and interactions (e.g., team meetings, conferences) and uses professional judgment to determine component ratings for each of the 18 components.
- 2) Average components within each domain to a tenth of a decimal to calculate domain level scores of 1.0-4.0.
- 3) Apply domain weights to domain scores to calculate an overall Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice rating of 1.0-4.0

Each step is illustrated below:

- 1) Evaluator holistically reviews evidence collected through observations and interactions and uses professional judgment to determine component ratings for each of the 18 components.

By the end of the year, evaluators should have collected a variety of evidence on teacher practice from the year's observations and interactions. Evaluators then analyze the consistency, trends, and significance of the evidence to determine a rating for each of the 18 components. Some questions to consider while analyzing the evidence include:

**Consistency:** What rating have I seen relatively uniform, homogenous evidence for throughout the semester? Does the evidence paint a clear, unambiguous picture of the teacher's performance in this area?

**Trends:** Have I seen improvement over time that overshadows earlier observation outcomes? Have I seen regression or setbacks over time that overshadows earlier observation outcomes?

**Significance:** Are some data more valid than others? (Do I have notes or ratings from "meatier" lessons or interactions where I was able to better assess this aspect of performance?)

Once a rating has been determined, it is then translated to a 1 - 4 score. Below Standard = 1 and Exemplary = 4. See example below for Domain 1:

Domain 1	Rating	Evaluator's Score
1a	Developing	2
1b	Developing	2
1c	Accomplished	3
1d	Exemplary	4

- 2) Average components with each domain to a tenth of a decimal to calculate domain-level scores:

Domain	Averaged Score
1	2.8
2	2.6
3	3.0
4	2.8

- 3) Apply domain weights to domain scores to calculate an overall observation of Teacher Performance and Practice rating of 1.0-4.0.

Each of the domain ratings is weighted according to importance and summed to form one overall rating. Strong instruction and a positive classroom environment are major factors in improving student outcomes. Therefore, Domains 2 and 3 are weighted significantly more than the others at 35%. Planning and Professional Responsibilities are weighted 15%.

Domain	Score	Weighting	Weighted Score
1	2.8	15%	0.4
2	2.6	35%	0.9
3	3.0	35%	1.1
4	2.8	15%	0.4
Total			2.8

Steps 2 and 3 can be performed by district administrators and/or using tools/technology that calculates the averages for the evaluator. *My Learning Plan* will be used to assist in calculations.

The summative Teacher Performance and Practice rating and the component ratings will be shared and discussed with teachers during the end-of-year conference. This process can also be followed in advance of the mid-year conference to discuss progress toward Teacher Performance and Practice goals/outcomes.

## CATEGORY #2: Parent Feedback (10%)

Feedback from parents will be used to determine the remaining 10% of the Teacher Practice Indicators focus area of a teacher's evaluation.

### Whole-school Parent Survey

**The first process described below, in numbers 1 through 5, focuses on:**

- (1) conducting a whole-school parent survey (meaning data is aggregated at the school level),
- (2) determining several school-level parent goals based on the survey feedback,
- (3) teacher and evaluator identifying **one** related parent engagement goal and setting improvement targets,
- (4) measuring progress on growth targets, and
- (5) determining a teacher's summative rating. This parent feedback rating shall be based on four performance levels.

#### 1. Administration of a Whole-School Parent Survey

Parent surveys should be conducted at the whole-school level as opposed to the teacher-level, meaning parent feedback will be aggregated at the school level. This is to ensure adequate response rates from parents.

Parent surveys must be administered in a way that allows parents to feel comfortable providing feedback without fear of retribution. Surveys should be confidential, and survey responses should not be tied to parents' names. The parent survey will be administered every spring and trends analyzed from year-to-year.

Appendix C contains a model parent survey that can be used to collect parent feedback. Eastford may use that survey, use existing survey instruments, use surveys developed or distributed by EASTCONN or develop their own. The District will work closely with teachers to develop the survey and interpret results. Parent representatives may be included in the process, but if a school governance council exists, the council must be included in this process. Parent surveys deployed by the District should be valid (that is, the instrument measures what it is intended to measure) and reliable (that is, the use of the instrument is consistent among those using it and is consistent over time).

#### 2. Determining School-Level Parent Goals

The Principal and teachers should review the parent survey results at the beginning of the school year to identify areas of need and set general parent engagement goals based on the survey results. Ideally, this goal-setting process would occur between the principal and teachers (possibly during faculty meetings) in August or September so agreement could be reached on 2-3 improvement goals for the entire school.

#### 3. Selecting a Parent Engagement Goal and Improvement Targets

After these school-level goals have been set, teachers will determine through consultation and mutual agreement with their evaluators **one** related parent goal they would like to pursue as part of their evaluation. Possible goals include improving communication with parents, helping parents become more effective in support of homework, improving parent-teacher conferences, etc. See a sample state model survey in Appendix C for additional questions that can be used to inspire goals.

Teachers will also set improvement target(s) related to the goal they select. For instance, if the goal is to improve parent communication, an improvement target could be specific to sending more regular correspondence to parents such as sending bi-weekly updates to parents or developing a new website for their class. Part of the evaluator's job is to ensure (1) the goal is related to the overall school improvement parent goals, and (2) that the improvement targets are aligned and attainable.

#### 4. Measuring Progress on Growth Targets

Teachers and their evaluators should use their judgment in setting growth/improvement targets for the parent feedback category. There are two ways a teacher can measure and demonstrate progress on their growth targets. A teacher can (1) measure how successfully they implement a strategy to address an area of need (like the examples in the previous section), and/or (2) they can collect evidence directly from parents to measure parent-level indicators they generate. For example, a teacher could conduct interviews with parents or a brief parent survey to see if they improved on growth target(s).

#### 5. Arriving at a Parent Feedback Rating

The Parent Feedback rating should reflect the degree to which a teacher successfully reaches his/her parent goal and improvement targets. This is accomplished through a review of evidence provided by the teacher and application of the following scale:

Exemplary (4)	Accomplished (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Exceeded the goal	Met the goal	Partially met the goal	Did not meet the goal

## V. Student Outcomes Related Indicators

The Student Outcomes Related Indicators portion of this plan captures the teacher's impact on students. Every teacher is in the profession to help children learn and grow, and teachers already think carefully about what knowledge, skills and talents they are responsible to nurture in their students each year. As a part of the process, teachers will document those aspirations and anchor them in data.

Student Related Indicators includes two categories:

- Student growth and development, which counts for 45%; and
- Whole-school student learning, which counts for 5% of the total evaluation rating.


These categories will be described in detail below.

### CATEGORY #3: Student Growth and Development (45%)

#### *Overview of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)*

Each teacher's students, individually and as a group, are different from other teachers' students, even in the same grade level or subject at the same school. For student growth and development to be measured for teacher evaluation purposes, it is imperative to use a method that takes each teacher's assignment, students and context into account. Connecticut, like many other states and localities around the nation, has selected a goal-setting process called **Student Learning Objectives** (SLOs) as the approach for measuring student growth during the school year.

Student Learning Objectives support teachers in using a planning cycle that will be familiar to most educators:



While this process should feel generally familiar, teachers are being asked to set more specific and measurable targets than they may have done in the past, and to develop them through consultation with colleagues in the same grade level or teaching the same subject and through mutual agreement with supervisors. The four SLO phases are described in detail below:

SLO Phase 1: Learn  
about this year's  
students

This first phase is the discovery phase, just before the start of the school year and in its first few weeks. Once teachers know their rosters, they will access as much information as possible about their new students' baseline skills and abilities, relative to the grade level or course the teacher is teaching. End-of-year tests from the prior spring, prior grades, benchmark assessments and quick demonstration assessments are all examples of sources teachers can tap to understand both individual student and group strengths and challenges. This information will be critical for goal-setting in the next phase.

SLO Phase 2: Set 1 or more SLOs (Student Learning Objectives)

SLO Phase 2:  
Set at least one  
SLO

**PLEASE NOTE:** On October 10, 2013, the Eastford Board of Education agreed to waive the requirement to use state test data in SLOs (student learning objectives) for the 2013-14 school year. This was pending federal approval which has since been granted.

Connecticut was granted flexibility regarding the use of state test data in teacher evaluation for the 2014-2015 academic year. For the 2015-16 academic year, the required use of state test data is suspended, pending federal approval. Board of Education approval for adopting this flexibility was given on June 12, 2014 and June 11, 2015.

Each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select at least one goal/objective for student growth. For each goal/objective, each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select multiple Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD).

One half (or 22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goal/objective is met shall be based on standardized indicators other than the state test (CMT or SBAC) for the 2015-16 academic year, pending federal approval. Other standardized indicators for other grades and subjects, where available, may be used. For the other half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development, there may be:

- A maximum of one additional standardized indicator other than the state test (CMT or SBAC) for the 2015-16 academic year, pending federal approval, if there is mutual



- agreement, subject to the local dispute resolution procedure.
- o A minimum of one non-standardized indicator.

For any teacher whose primary responsibility is not the direct instruction of students, the mutually agreed upon goal/objective and indicators shall be based on the assigned role of the teacher.

In the event that a teacher works less than a full school year, the writing and evaluation of SLOs will be determined by mutual agreement of the teacher, administrator and bargaining unit representation.

As stated in the CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, a **standardized assessment** is characterized by the following attributes:

- o Administered and scored in a consistent – or “standard” – manner;
- o Aligned to a set of academic or performance “standards;”
- o Broadly-administered (e.g. nation- or state-wide);
- o Commercially-produced; and
- o Often administered only once a year, although some standardized assessments are administered two or three times per year.

To create SLOs, teachers will follow these four steps:

Step 1: Decide on the Student Learning Objective

Objectives will be broad goals for student learning. Any one objective should address a central purpose of the teacher’s assignment and it should pertain to a large proportion of his/her students. Each SLO should reflect high expectations for student learning—at least a year’s worth of growth (or a semester’s worth for shorter courses) - and should be aligned to relevant state, national (e.g. common core) or district standards for the grade level or course. Depending on the teacher’s assignment, the objective might aim for content mastery (more likely at the secondary level) or it might aim for skill development (more likely at the elementary level or in arts classes).

Teachers are encouraged to collaborate with grade-level and/or subject-matter colleagues in the creation of SLOs. Teachers with similar assignments may have identical objectives although they will be individually accountable for their own students’ results.

The following are examples of Student Learning Objectives based on student data:

Teacher Category	Student Learning Objective
Eighth Grade Science	My students will master critical concepts of science inquiry.
	All of my students will demonstrate _____

Step 2: Select Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs)

**An Indicator of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD)** is the specific evidence, with a quantitative target, that will demonstrate whether the objective was met. Each SLO must include multiple Indicators of Academic Growth.

Each indicator should make clear (1) what evidence will be examined, (2) what level of performance is targeted, and (3) what proportion of students is projected to achieve the targeted performance level. Indicators can also address student subgroups, such as high- or low-performing students or

ELL students. It is through the Phase I examination of student data that teachers will determine what level of performance to target for which students. The Template for Setting SMART Goals should be referenced as a resource for setting SLOs/IAGDs (Appendix A).

Since indicator targets are calibrated for the teacher’s particular students, teachers with similar assignments may use the same evidence for their indicators, but they would be unlikely to have identical targets. For example, all second grade teachers in a district might use the same reading assessment as their IAGD, but the performance target and/or the proportion of students expected to achieve proficiency would likely vary among second grade teachers.

Taken together, an SLO’s indicators, if achieved, would provide evidence that the objective was met. Here are some examples of indicators that might be applied to the previous SLO examples:

**Sample SLO- Standardized IAGD(s)**

Teacher Category	Student Learning Objective	Indicators of Academic Growth and Development ( <i>at least one is required</i> )
Eighth Grade Science	My students will master critical concepts of science inquiry.	1. 78% of my students will score at the Accomplished or higher level on the science _____ in (month), 20____.
Fourth Grade	My 22 students will demonstrate improvement in or mastery of reading comprehension skills by June 20__.	1. All 17 (77%) students assessed on the standard _____ will maintain proficiency, goal or advanced performance, or will gain a proficiency band on 4 <sup>th</sup> grade Reading in March 20____. 2. All 5 students (23%) assessed on the ____ for Reading _____ will achieve at the proficient or goal level on 4 <sup>th</sup> grade _____ Reading _____ in (month), 20__.

**Sample SLO-Non-Standardized IAGD(s)**

Teacher Category	Student Learning Objective	Indicators of Academic Growth and Development ( <i>at least one is required</i> )
Eighth Grade Science	My students will master critical concepts of science inquiry.	1. My students will design an experiment that incorporates the key principles of science inquiry. 90% will score a 3 or 4 on a scoring rubric focused on the key elements of science inquiry.
Visual Arts	My students will demonstrate proficiency in applying the five principles of drawing.	1. 85% of students will attain a 3 or 4 in at least 4 of 5 categories on the principles of drawing rubric designed by visual arts teachers in our district.

**Step 3: Provide Additional Information**

During the goal-setting process, teachers and evaluators will document the following:

- the rationale for the objective, including relevant standards;
- any important technical information about the indicator evidence (like timing or scoring plans);
- the baseline data that was used to set each IAGD;
- interim assessments the teacher plans to use to gauge students’ progress toward the SLO during the school year; and
- any training or support the teacher thinks would help improve the likelihood of meeting the SLO(optional).

**Step 4: Reach Mutual Agreement with Evaluator**

Evaluators and teachers must mutually agree on SLOs and Indicators. Evaluators may sign-off on goals once mutual agreement has been reached.

The evaluator and teacher will examine each SLO relative to three criteria described below. SLOs must meet all three criteria .

<b>Priority of Content</b>	<b>SLO Criteria Quality of Indicators</b>	<b>Rigor of Objective/ Indicators</b>
Objective is deeply relevant to teacher’s assignment and addresses a large proportion of his/her students.	Indicators provide specific, measurable evidence. The indicators provide evidence about students’ progress over the school year or semester during which they are with the teacher.	Objective and indicators are attainable but ambitious, and taken together, represent at least a year’s worth of growth for students (or appropriate growth for a shorter interval of instruction).

**SLO Phase 3:  
Monitor  
students'  
progress**

Once SLOs are approved, teachers should monitor students' progress towards the objectives. They can for example, examine student work products, administer interim assessments, and track students' accomplishments and struggles. Teachers can share their interim findings with colleagues during collaborative time, and they can keep their evaluator apprised of progress.

If a teacher's assignment changes or if his/her student population shifts significantly, the SLOs can be adjusted during the mid-year conference between the evaluator and the teacher.

**SLO Phase 4:  
Assess student  
outcomes relative to  
SLOs**

At the end of the school year, the teacher should collect the evidence required by their indicators and submit it to their evaluator. Along with the evidence, teachers will complete and submit a self-assessment which asks teachers to reflect on the SLO outcomes by responding to the following four statements:

1. Describe the results and provide evidence for each indicator.
2. Provide your overall assessment of whether this objective was met.
3. Describe what you did that produced these results.
4. Describe what you learned and how you will use that going forward.

Evaluators will review the evidence and the teacher's self-assessment and assign one of four ratings to each SLO: Exceeded (4 points), Met (3 points), Partially Met (2 points), or Did Not Meet (1 point). These ratings are defined as follows:

<b>Exceeded (4)</b>	All or most students met or substantially exceeded the target(s) contained in the indicator(s).
<b>Met (3)</b>	Most students met the target(s) contained in the indicators within a few points on either side of the target(s).
<b>Partially Met (2)</b>	Many students met the target(s) but a notable percentage missed the target by more than a few points. However, taken as a whole, significant progress towards the goal was made.
<b>Did Not Meet (1)</b>	A few students met the target(s) but a substantial percentage of students did not. Little progress toward the goal was made.

Since SLOs should have more than one indicator, the evaluator may score each indicator separately then average those scores for the SLO score, or, he/she can look at the results as a body of evidence regarding the accomplishment of the objective and score the SLO holistically.

If the teacher is evaluated on more than one SLO, the final student growth and development rating for a teacher is the average of their two SLO scores. For example, if one SLO was Partially Met, for 2 points, and the other SLO was Met, for 3 points, the student growth and development rating would be 2.5  $((2+3)/2)$ . The individual SLO ratings and the student growth and development rating will be shared and discussed with teachers during the end-of-year conference.

NOTE: For SLOs that include an indicator based on state standardized tests, results may not be available in time to score the SLO prior to the June 30 deadline. In this instance, if evidence for other indicators in the SLO is available, the evaluator can score the SLO on that basis. Or, if state tests are the basis for all indicators, then the teacher's student growth and development rating will be based only on the results of the SLO that is based on non-standardized indicators.

However, once the state test evidence is available, the evaluator is required to score or rescore the SLO, then determine if the new score changes the teacher's final (summative) rating. The evaluation rating can be amended at that time as needed, but no later than September 15 (see scoring section). See Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring for details.

**CATEGORY #4: Whole-School Student Learning Indicator and/or Student Feedback (5%)**

Eastford will use a whole-school student learning indicator to determine this fourth category of core requirements.

***Whole-school student learning indicator***


A teacher's indicator rating shall be equal to the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the principal's evaluation rating at that school. This will be based on the school performance index (SPI), which correlates to the whole-school student learning on a principal's evaluation.

NOTE: If the Whole-School Student Learning rating is not available when the summative rating is calculated, then Student Growth and Development score will be weighted 50 and Whole-School Student Learning will be weighted 0 (see Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring section). However, once the state data is available, the evaluator should revisit the final rating and amend at that time as needed, but no later than September 15).

## VI. Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring

### *Summative Scoring*

The individual summative teacher evaluation rating will be based on the four categories of performance, grouped in two major focus areas: Student Outcomes Related Indicators and Teacher Practice Related Indicators.



Every educator will receive one of four performance ratings:

**Exemplary** – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance

**Accomplished** – Meeting indicators of performance

**Developing** – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others

**Below Standard** – Not meeting indicators of performance

The rating will be determined using the following steps:

- 1) Calculate a Teacher Practice Related Indicators score by combining the Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice score and the Parent Feedback score
- 2) Calculate a Student Outcomes Related Indicators score by combining the Student Growth and Development score and Whole-School Student Learning or Student Feedback score
- 3) Use Summative Matrix to determine Summative Rating

Each step is illustrated below:

- 1) Calculate a Teacher Practice Related Indicators rating by combining the observation of teacher performance and practice score and the parent feedback score.

The observation of teacher performance and practice counts for 40% of the total rating and parent feedback counts for 10% of the total rating. Simply multiply these weights by the

category scores to get the category points, rounding to a whole number where necessary. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

Category	Score (1 - 4)	Weight	Points (score x weight)
Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice	2.8	40	112
Parent Feedback	3	10	30
<b>TOTAL TEACHER PRACTICE RELATED INDICATORS POINTS</b>			<b>142</b>

**Rating Table**

Teacher Practice Indicators Points	Teacher Practice Indicators Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-126	Developing
127-174	Accomplished
175-200	Exemplary

- 2) Calculate a Student Outcomes Related Indicators rating by combining the student growth and development score and whole-school student learning or student feedback score.

The student growth and development category counts for 45% of the total rating and the whole-school student learning or student feedback category counts for 5% of the total rating. Simply multiply these weights by the category scores to get the focus area points. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

Category	Score (1 - 4)	Weight	Points (score x weight)
Student Growth and Development (SLOs)	3.5	45	158
Whole-school Student Learning or Student Feedback	3	5	15
<b>TOTAL STUDENT OUTCOMES RELATED INDICATORS POINTS</b>			<b>173</b>

**Rating Table**

Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points	Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-126	Developing
127-174	Accomplished
175-200	Exemplary



3) Use the Summative Matrix to determine Summative Rating

Identify the rating for each focus area and follow the respective column and row to the center of the table. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. For the example provided, the Teacher Practice Related Indicators rating is accomplished and the Student Outcomes Related Indicators rating is accomplished. The summative rating is therefore accomplished. If the two focus areas are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of exemplary for Teacher Practice and a rating of below standard for Student Outcomes), then the evaluator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to make a summative rating.

		<i>Teacher Practice Related Indicators Rating</i>				
		Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard	
<i>Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating</i>	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	Proficient	<i>Gather further information</i>
	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	<i>Gather further information</i>
	Developing	Proficient	Developing	Developing	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	<i>Gather further information</i>	Below Standard	Below Standard	Below Standard	Below Standard

### **Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness**

Novice teachers shall generally be deemed effective if said educator receives at least two sequential “accomplished” ratings, one of which must be earned in the fourth year of a novice teacher’s career. A “below standard” rating shall only be permitted in the first year of a novice teacher’s career, assuming a pattern of growth of “developing” in year two and two sequential “accomplished” ratings in years three and four. Superintendents shall offer a contract to any educator he/she is deeming effective at the end of year four. This shall be accomplished through the specific issuance of that effect.

A post-tenure educator shall generally be deemed ineffective if said educator receives at least two sequential “developing” ratings or one “below standard” rating.

### **Dispute Resolution Process**

A panel, composed of the superintendent, teacher union president and a neutral third person, shall resolve disputes where the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on objectives/goals, the evaluation period, feedback on performance and practice, or final summative rating. A pre-approved expert from a Regional Educational Service Center (RESC) may be chosen in any given year so long as the superintendent and teacher union president agree to such alternative. Resolutions must be topic specific and timely. Should the process established not result in resolution of a given issue, the determination regarding that issue may be made by the superintendent.

## Appendix A: Template for Setting SMART Goals

The SMART goal-setting process ensures that every goal is measurable and clear. The advantages of the SMART goal-setting process are:

- Provides a structured approach to a complex task
- Gives a clear framework for creating meaningful and achievable goals
- Accommodates all kinds of goals
- Is easy to teach others how to develop
- Helps to define goals in terms that can be widely understood
- Requires thinking through the implementation as well as the outcome

The characteristics of SMART goals are:

- **Specific and Strategic**
  - The goal should be well defined enough that anyone with limited knowledge of your intent should understand what is to be accomplished.
- **Measurable**
  - Goals need to be linked to some form of a common measure that can be used as a way to track progress toward achieving the goal.
- **Aligned and Attainable**
  - The goal must strike the right balance between being attainable and aligned to standards but lofty enough to impact the desired change.
- **Results-Oriented**
  - All goals should be stated as an outcome or result.
- **Time-Bound**
  - The time frame for achieving the goal must be clear and realistic.

### SMART goals Dos and Don'ts

#### **DO:**

Create a plan  
Start Small  
Write it down  
Be specific  
Track your progress  
Celebrate your success  
As for support sooner than later  
Make commitments

#### **DON'T:**

Expect to accomplish without effort  
Focus on too much at once  
Forget to make a deadline  
Deal in absolutes  
Expect perfection  
Keep your goal on a shelf  
Beat yourself up over shortcomings  
Try to accomplish it alone  
Forget that you CAN DO IT!

## Appendix B: Sample Parent Survey

The survey included is an example survey for parents/guardians

### Parent Feedback Survey, All Grades

<b>Part I: School Feedback</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>I Don't Know</b>
1. I talk with my child's teacher(s) about my child's schoolwork.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. I talk with my child's teacher(s) about what I can do to help my child learn.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. I know how my child is doing in school before I get my child's report card.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. I have attended at least one meeting or event at school this year.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. I feel welcome at this school.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. My child is learning a lot in school this year.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. My child's teacher(s) have high expectations for my child.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. My child's teacher(s) talk to me about how my child is doing in class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. My child's teacher(s) care about my child.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Part II: Background

10. What is your child's gender?

- Male  Female

11. My child's grades are...

- Mostly A's  Mostly B's  Mostly C's  Mostly D's  Mostly F's  I Don't Know / Does Not Apply

12. What is the highest level of education that you have attained?

- Not a high school graduate  Some college  Graduate school  
 High school graduate  College graduate

13. What is your child's race or ethnicity?

- White  Black or African American  Asian  Hispanic or Latino  
 American Indian or Alaska Native  Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
 Two or More Races/Ethnicities

# **Educator Evaluation and Professional Development Plan Eastford School District Administrators**



**Eastford Elementary School**


Revised June 2015  
The following pages represent the plan issued by the State of Connecticut  
SEED 4/27/2015

<b>ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Purpose and Rationale .....	5
<b>System Overview .....</b>	<b>5</b>
Administrator Evaluation and Support Framework.....	4
System Overview.....	6
<b>Process and Timeline .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Step 1:</b> Orientation and Context-Setting .....	8
<b>Step 2:</b> Goal-Setting and Plan Development .....	8
<b>Step 3:</b> Plan Implementation and Evidence Collection.....	11
<b>Step 4:</b> Mid-Year Formative Review .....	12
<b>Step 5:</b> Self-Assessment .....	12
<b>Step 6:</b> Summative Review and Rating.....	13
Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing .....	13
<b>Support and Development .....</b>	<b>15</b>
Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning.....	15
Improvement and Remediation Plans .....	16
Career Development and Growth .....	17
<b>Leadership Practice Related Indicators .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Component #1:</b> Observation of Leadership Practice (40%) .....	<b>18</b>
Arriving at a Leadership Practice Summative Rating .....	21`
<b>Component #2:</b> Stakeholder Feedback (10%) .....	<b>23</b>
Stakeholder Feedback Summative Rating .....	26
<b>Student Outcomes Related Indicators .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Component #3:</b> Student Learning (45%) .....	<b>28</b>
State Measures of Academic Learning.....	28
Locally-Determined Measures (Student Learning Objectives).....	30
Arriving at a Student Learning Summative Rating.....	33
<b>Component #4:</b> Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%).....	<b>34</b>
<b>Summative Administrator Evaluation Rating .....</b>	<b>34</b>
Summative Scoring.....	34
Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness.....	38
Dispute Resolution Process.....	39
<b>Appendix 1 .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Appendix 2.....</b>	<b>43</b>

# Administrator Evaluation and Support

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE)-designed model for the evaluation and support of administrators in Connecticut is based on the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (Core Requirements), developed by a diverse group of educators in June 2012 and based upon best practice research from around the country. The contents of this document are meant to guide districts in the implementation of Connecticut’s System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED) Administrator Evaluation and Support model. The CSDE, in consultation with PEAC and the SBE, may continue to refine the tools provided in this document for clarity and ease of use.

## The SEED model for administrator evaluation and support includes specific guidance for the four components of administrator evaluation:



## Additional Requirements for Administrator Evaluation and Support Plans

In addition, this document includes “Points for District Consideration” to assist district Professional Development and Evaluation Committees (PDECs) in developing processes or enhancing existing processes necessary for ongoing development and support of teachers in the following areas:

- Evaluator Training and Ongoing Proficiency/Calibration
- Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning
- Improvement and Remediation Plans
- Career Development and Growth

**PLEASE NOTE:** In electing to implement the SEED model, your district is expected to implement the four components of evaluation and support, as well as the additional requirements outlined above, with fidelity as outlined in this handbook. In response to requests from districts for further clarification on these requirements, we have provided “Points for Consideration” to assist districts and their PDEC in plan development. In addition, evaluators of teachers are expected to participate in the multi-day CSDE-sponsored training as described within this document.

Any variation from the components of teacher evaluation and support as written within this document is no longer the SEED model and would be considered a “district-developed” evaluation and support plan. Districts are required to submit an educator evaluation and support plan annually to the CSDE.



# Administrator Evaluation and Development

## Purpose and Rationale

This section of the 2015 SEED Handbook outlines the state model for the evaluation of school and school district administrators in Connecticut. A robust administrator evaluation system is a powerful means to develop a shared understanding of leader effectiveness for the state of Connecticut. The Connecticut administrator evaluation and support model defines administrator effectiveness in terms of (1) administrator practice (the actions taken by administrators that have been shown to impact key aspects of school life); (2) the results that come from this leadership (teacher effectiveness and student growth & development); and (3) the perceptions of the administrator's leadership among key stakeholders in his/her community.

**The model describes four levels of performance for administrators and focuses on the practices and outcomes of *Proficient* administrators. These administrators can be characterized as:**

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader;
- Meeting expectations in at least 3 other areas of practice;
- Meeting 1 target related to stakeholder feedback;
- Meeting state accountability growth targets on tests of core academic subjects<sup>6</sup>;
- Meeting and making progress on 3 Student Learning Objectives aligned to school and district priorities; and
- Having more than 60% of teachers proficient on the student growth portion of their evaluation.

The model includes an *exemplary* performance level for those who exceed these characteristics, but *exemplary* ratings are reserved for those who could serve as a model for leaders across their district or even statewide. A *proficient* rating represents fully satisfactory performance, and it is the rigorous standard expected of most experienced administrators.

This model for administrator evaluation has several benefits for participants and for the broader community. It provides a structure for the ongoing development of principals and other administrators to establish a basis for assessing their strengths and growth areas so they have the feedback they need to get better. It also serves as a means for districts to hold themselves accountable for ensuring that every child in their district attends a school with effective leaders.

<sup>1</sup> Smarter Balanced Assessments will be administered for the first time in the 2014-15 academic year. These assessments are administered in Grades 3-8 and Grade 11. Pending approval of the waiver submitted to the United States Department of

Education (USED) the CSDE has requested continued flexibility, through at least the 2015-16 school year, regarding the requirement to incorporate the state test as a measure of student growth in educator evaluation.

As noted, the model applies to all administrators holding an 092 endorsement. Because of the fundamental role that principals play in building strong schools for communities and students, and because their leadership has a significant impact on outcomes for students, the descriptions and examples focus on principals. However, where there are design differences for assistant principals and central office administrators, the differences are noted.

# System Overview

## Administrator Evaluation and Support Framework

The evaluation and support system consists of multiple measures to paint an accurate and comprehensive picture of administrator performance. All administrators will be evaluated in four components, grouped into two major categories: Leadership Practice and Student Outcomes.

- 1. Leadership Practice Related Indicators:** An evaluation of the core leadership practices and skills that positively affect student learning. This category is comprised of two components:
  - (a) Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)** as defined in the Common Core of Leading (CCL): Connecticut School Leadership Standards.
  - (b) Stakeholder Feedback (10%)** on leadership practice through surveys.
- 2. Student Outcomes Related Indicators:** An evaluation of administrator's contributions to student academic progress, at the school and classroom level. This area is comprised of two components:
  - (a) Student Learning (45%)** assessed in equal weight by: (a) progress on the academic learning measures in the state's accountability system for schools; and (b) performance and growth on locally-determined measures.
  - (b) Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%)** as determined by an aggregation of teachers' success with respect to Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).

Scores from each of the four components will be combined to produce a summative performance rating designation of *Exemplary*, *Proficient*, *Developing* or *Below Standard*. The performance levels are defined as:

- **Exemplary** – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
- **Proficient** – Meeting indicators of performance
- **Developing** – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
- **Below Standard** – Not meeting indicators of performance

\*As of Spring 2015, the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric is undergoing a validation study. Substantive revisions are expected to be made to the rubric prior to its expected release in June 2015.

## Process and Timeline

This section describes the process by which administrators and their evaluators collect evidence about practice and results over the course of a year, culminating with a final rating and recommendations for continued improvement. The annual cycle (see **Figure 1** below) allows for flexibility in implementation and lends itself well to a meaningful and doable process. Often the evaluation process can devolve into a checklist of compliance activities that do little to foster improvement and leave everyone involved frustrated. To avoid this, the model encourages two things:

1. That evaluators prioritize the evaluation process, spending more and better time in schools observing practice and giving feedback; and
2. That both administrators and evaluators focus on the depth and quality of the interactions that occur in the process, not just on completing the steps.

Each administrator participates in the evaluation process as a cycle of continuous improvement. The cycle is the centerpiece of state guidelines designed to have all educators play a more active, engaged role in their professional growth and development. For every administrator, evaluation begins with goal-setting for the school year, setting the stage for implementation of a goal-driven plan. The cycle continues with a mid-year formative Review, followed by continued implementation. The latter part of the process offers administrators a chance to self-assess and reflect on progress to date, a step that informs the summative evaluation. Evidence from the summative evaluation and self-assessment become important sources of information for the administrator's subsequent goal setting, as the cycle continues into the subsequent year.

Superintendents can determine when the cycle starts. For example, many will want their principals to start the self-assessment process in the spring in order for goal-setting and plan development to take place prior to the start of the next school year. Others may want to concentrate the first steps in the summer months.

**Figure 1:** This is a typical timeframe:



\* Summative assessment to be finalized in August.

## Step 1: Orientation and Context-Setting

To begin the process, the administrator needs five things to be in place:

1. Student learning data are available for review by the administrator and the state has assigned the school a School Performance Index (SPI) rating<sup>7</sup>.
2. Stakeholder survey data are available for review by the administrator.
3. The superintendent has communicated his/her student learning priorities for the year.
4. The administrator has developed a school improvement plan that includes student learning goals.
5. The evaluator has provided the administrator with this document in order to orient her/him to the evaluation process.

## Step 2: Goal-Setting and Plan Development

Before a school year starts, administrators identify three Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and one survey target, drawing on available data, the superintendent's priorities, their school improvement plan and prior evaluation results (where applicable). They also determine two areas of focus for their practice. This is referred to as "3-2-1 goal-setting."

Figure 2:



<sup>2</sup> Smarter Balanced Assessments will be administered for the first time in the 2014-15 academic year. These assessments are administered in Grades 3-8 and Grade 11. Pending approval of the waiver submitted to the United States Department of Education (USED) the CSDE has requested continued flexibility, through at least the 2015-16 school year, regarding the requirement to incorporate the state test as a measure of student growth in educator evaluation.

Administrators should start with the outcomes they want to achieve. This includes setting three SLOs (see page 69 for details) and one target related to stakeholder feedback (see page 62 for details).

Then administrators identify the areas of focus for their practice **that will help them accomplish** their SLOs and survey targets, choosing from among the elements of the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. While administrators are rated on all six Performance Expectations, administrators are not expected to focus on improving their practice in all areas in a given year. Rather, they should identify two specific focus areas of growth to facilitate professional conversation about their leadership practice with their evaluator. It is likely that at least one and perhaps both, of the practice focus areas will be in instructional leadership, given its central role in driving student achievement. What is critical is that the administrator can connect improvement in the practice focus areas to the outcome goals and survey targets, creating a logical through-line from practice to outcomes.

Next, the administrator and the evaluator meet to discuss and agree on the selected outcome goals and practice focus areas. This is an opportunity to discuss the administrator's choices and to explore questions such as:

- Are there any assumptions about specific goals that need to be shared because of the local school context?
- Are there any elements for which proficient performance will depend on factors beyond the control of the principals? If so, how will those dependencies be accounted for in the evaluation process?
- What are the sources of evidence to be used in assessing an administrator's performance?

The evaluator and administrator also discuss the appropriate resources and professional learning needs to support the administrator in accomplishing his/her goals. Together, these components – the goals, the practice areas and the resources and supports – comprise an individual's evaluation and support plan. In the event of any disagreement, the evaluator has the authority and responsibility to finalize the goals, supports and sources of evidence to be used. The completed form on page 49 represents a sample evaluation and support plan.

The focus areas, goals, activities, outcomes and time line will be reviewed by the administrator's evaluator prior to beginning work on the goals. The evaluator may suggest additional goals as appropriate.

**Here are some questions to consider in assessing whether an administrator's evaluation and support plan is likely to drive continuous improvement:**

1. Are the goals clear and measurable so that an evaluator will know whether the administrator has achieved them?
2. Can the evaluator see a through line from district priorities to the school improvement plan to the evaluation and support plan?
3. Do the practice focus areas address growth needs for the administrator?  
Does at least one of the focus areas address instructional leadership?

# Sample Evaluation and Support Plan

Administrator's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator's Name \_\_\_\_\_

School \_\_\_\_\_

Key Findings from Student Achievement and Stakeholder Survey Data	Outcome Goals – 3 SLOs and 1 Survey	Leadership Practice Focus Areas (2)	Strategies	Evidence of Success	Additional Skills, Knowledge and Support Needed	Timeline for Measuring Goal Outcomes
EL Cohort Graduation Rate is 65% and the extended graduation rate is 70%.	<b>SLO 1:</b> Increase EL cohort graduation rate by 2% and the extended graduation rate by 3%.	<b>Focus Area 1:</b> Use assessments, data systems and accountability strategies to improve achievement, monitor and evaluate progress, close achievement gaps and communicate progress. (PE: 2, E: C)	Develop Support Service SLOs to address intervention needs and strategies.	EL graduation rate increases by 2% over last year and the extended graduation rate increases by 3%.	Support needed in reaching out to the EL student population and families to increase awareness of the graduation requirements and benefits.	Credit status will be determined after summer school.
80% of students complete 10th grade with 12 credits.	<b>SLO 2:</b> 90% of students complete 10th grade with 12 credits.	<b>Focus Area 2:</b> Improve instruction for the diverse needs of all students; and collaboratively monitor and adjust curriculum and instruction. (PE: 2, E B) Use current data to monitor EL student progress and to target students for intervention.	Develop content teacher SLOs to address CT Core standards reading strategies and expectations	90% of students have at least 12 credits when entering the 11th grade.	Work with school counselors to ensure students are enrolled in credit earning courses in 9th and 10th grades and that deficient students are contacted re: summer remedial offerings.	
87% of 10th graders are proficient in reading, as evidenced by STAR assessment scores (if available).	<b>SLO 3:</b> 95% of students are reading at grade level at the end of 10th grade.		Provide teacher PL experiences as needed to target skills in differentiation of instruction.	STAR assessments indicate that 95% of students are reading on grade level at the end of 10th grade.		
75% of students report that teachers present material in a way that is easy for them to understand and learn from. EL Cohort Graduation Rate is 65% and the extended graduation rate is 70%.	<b>Survey 1:</b> 90% of students report that teachers present material in a way that makes it easy for them to understand and learn.			90% of students report by survey response that teachers present material in a way they can understand and learn from.		

## Step 3: Plan Implementation and Evidence Collection

As the administrator implements the plan, he/she and the evaluator both collect evidence about the administrator's practice. For the evaluator, this must include at least two and preferably more, school site visits. Periodic, purposeful school visits offer critical opportunities for evaluators to observe, collect evidence and analyze the work of school leaders. At a minimum, fall, winter and spring visits to the school leader's work site will provide invaluable insight into the school leader's performance and offer opportunities for ongoing feedback and dialogue.

Unlike visiting a classroom to observe a teacher, school site visits to observe administrator practice can vary significantly in length and setting. It is recommended that evaluators plan visits carefully to maximize the opportunity to gather evidence relevant to an administrator's practice focus areas. Further, central to this process is providing meaningful feedback based on observed practice: see the [SEED website](#) for forms that evaluators may use in recording observations and providing feedback. Evaluators should provide timely feedback after each visit.

Besides the school site visit requirement, there are no prescribed evidence requirements. The model relies on the professional judgment of the administrator and evaluator to determine appropriate sources of evidence and ways to collect evidence.

Building on the sample evaluation and support plan on page 49, this administrator's evaluator may want to consult the following sources of evidence to collect information about the administrator in relation to his or her focus areas and goals:

- Data systems and reports for student information
- Artifacts of data analysis and plans for response
- Observations of teacher team meetings
- Observations of administrative/leadership team meetings
- Observations of classrooms where the administrator is present
- Communications to parents and community
- Conversations with staff
- Conversations with students
- Conversations with families
- Presentations at Board of Education meetings, community resource centers, parent groups etc.

Further, the evaluator may want to establish a schedule of school site visits with the administrator to collect evidence and observe the administrator's work. The first visit should take place near the beginning of the school year to ground the evaluator in the school context and the administrator's evaluation and support plan. Subsequent visits might be planned at two-to three-month intervals.



## A note on the frequency of school site observations:

State guidelines call for an administrator's evaluation to include:

- 2 observations for each administrator.
- 4 observations for any administrator new to their district, school, the profession or who has received a summative rating of *developing* or *below standard* in the previous year.

School visits should be frequent, purposeful and adequate for sustaining a professional conversation about an administrator's practice.

## Step 4: Mid-Year Formative Review

Midway through the school year (especially at a point when interim student assessment data are available for review) is an ideal time for a formal check-in to review progress. In preparation for meeting:

- The administrator analyzes available student achievement data and considers progress toward outcome goals.
- The evaluator reviews observation and feedback forms to identify key themes for discussion.

The administrator and evaluator hold a mid-year formative review, with explicit discussion of progress toward student learning targets, as well as any areas of performance related to standards of performance and practice. The meeting is also an opportunity to surface any changes in the context (e.g., a large influx of new students) that could influence accomplishment of outcome goals; goals may be changed at this point. **Mid-Year Review Discussion Prompts** are available on the [SEED website](#).

## Step 5: Self-Assessment

In the spring, the administrator takes an opportunity to assess his/her practice on all 18 elements of the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards. For each element, the administrator determines whether he/she:

- Needs to grow and improve practice on this element;
- Has some strengths on this element but needs to continue to grow and improve;
- Is consistently effective on this element; or
- Can empower others to be effective on this element.

The administrator should also review his/her focus areas and determine if he/she considers him/herself on track or not.

In some evaluation systems, self-assessment occurs later in the process after summative ratings but before goal setting for the subsequent year. In this model the administrator submits a self-assessment prior to the end-of-year summative review as an opportunity for the self-reflection to inform the summative rating.



## Step 6: Summative Review and Rating

The administrator and evaluator meet in the late spring to discuss the administrator's self-assessment and all evidence collected over the course of the year. While a formal rating follows this meeting, it is recommended that evaluators use the meeting as an opportunity to convey strengths, growth areas and their probable rating. After the meeting, the evaluator assigns a rating based on all available evidence.

## Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing

All evaluators are required to complete training on the SEED evaluation and support model. The purpose of training is to provide evaluators of administrators with the tools that will result in evidence-based school site observations, professional learning opportunities tied to evaluation feedback, improved teacher effectiveness and student performance.

The CSDE will provide districts with training opportunities to support evaluators of administrators in implementation of the model across their schools. Districts can adapt and build on these tools to provide comprehensive training and support to ensure that evaluators are proficient in conducting administrator evaluations.

**School districts who have adopted the SEED model will be expected to engage in the CSDE-sponsored multi-day training. This comprehensive training will give evaluators the opportunity to:**

- Understand the various components of the SEED administrator evaluation and support system;
- Understand sources of evidence that demonstrate proficiency on the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric;\*
- Establish a common language that promotes professionalism and a culture for learning through the lens of the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric;
- Establish inter-rater reliability through calibrations of observer interpretations of evidence and judgments of leadership practice; and
- Collaborate with colleagues to deepen understanding of the content.

**Participants in the training will have opportunities to interact with colleagues and engage in practice and *optional* proficiency exercises to:**

- Deepen understanding of the evaluation criteria;
- Define proficient leadership;
- Collect, sort and analyze evidence across a continuum of performance; and
- Determine a final summative rating across multiple indicators.

---

\*As of Spring 2015, the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric is undergoing a validation study. Substantive revisions are expected to be made to the rubric prior to its expected release in June 20

**PLEASE NOTE:** School districts who have a locally-developed evaluation and support plan can also choose to participate in the CSDE-sponsored training opportunities for evaluators, however if training opportunities are internally-developed or contracted with a reputable vendor, the following are points for consideration:

### Points for District Consideration

- Development or selection of an evaluation framework/rubric to measure and provide feedback on leader performance and practice
- Identification of criteria to demonstrate proficiency (optional)
- Provision of ongoing calibration activities
- Determination of frequency for proficiency status renewal, if applicable

The evaluator completes the summative evaluation report, shares it with the administrator and adds it to the administrator's personnel file with any written comments attached that the administrator requests to be added within two weeks of receipt of the report.

Summative ratings must be completed for all administrators by June 30 of a given school year. Should state standardized test data not yet be available at the time of a final rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. When the summative rating for an administrator may be significantly impacted by state standardized test data or teacher effectiveness outcomes ratings, the evaluator should recalculate the administrator's summative rating when the data is available and submit the adjusted rating no later than September 15.

Initial ratings are based on all available data and are made in the spring so that they can be used for any employment decisions as needed. Since some components may not be completed at this point, here are rules of thumb to use in arriving at a rating:

- If stakeholder survey results are not yet available, then the observation of practice rating should count for 50% of the preliminary rating.
- If the teacher effectiveness outcomes ratings are not yet available, then the student learning measures should count for 50% of the preliminary rating.
- If the state accountability measures are not yet available, then the Student Learning Objectives should count for the full assessment of student learning.
- If none of the summative student learning indicators can yet be assessed, then the evaluator should examine the most recent interim assessment data to assess progress and arrive at an assessment of the administrator's performance on this component.

# Support and Development

Evaluation alone cannot hope to improve leadership practice, teacher effectiveness and student learning. However, when paired with effective, relevant and timely support, the evaluation process has the potential to help move administrators along the path to exemplary practice.

## Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning

Student success depends on effective teaching, learning and leadership. The CSDE vision for professional learning is that each and every Connecticut educator engages in continuous learning every day to increase professional effectiveness, resulting in positive outcomes for all students. For Connecticut's students to graduate college and career ready, educators must engage in strategically planned, well supported, standards-based, continuous professional learning focused on improving student outcomes.

Throughout the process of implementing Connecticut's SEED model, in mutual agreement with their evaluators, all administrators will identify professional learning needs that support their goals and objectives. The professional learning opportunities identified for each administrator should be based on the individual strengths and needs that are identified through the evaluation process. The process may also reveal areas of common need among administrators, which can then be targeted with school-wide or district-wide professional learning opportunities.

### Points for District Consideration

**Connecticut's Definition for Professional Learning:** High-quality professional learning is a process that ensures all educators have equitable access throughout their career continuum to relevant, individual and collaborative opportunities to enhance their practice so that all students advance towards positive academic and non-academic outcomes. Best practices include:

- Creating learning communities committed to continuous improvement, collective responsibility, accountability and goal alignment;
- Prioritizing, monitoring, and coordinating resources tied to goals /objectives and evidence-based feedback provided as part of the evaluation process; and
- Aligning job-embedded professional learning with school and district goals and priorities, curriculum and assessments.

**Another key component of success is the development of leadership capacity in these alignment and coherence efforts.**

**This is accomplished by:**

- Developing well-supported and effective coaches, teacher leaders and principals who are strategically selected based on valid indicators of effectiveness; empowered to support and monitor teacher learning; and provide meaningful, evidence-based, actionable feedback that supports teachers' reflection and analysis of their practice.
- Creating structures and systems that enable teams of educators to engage in job-embedded professional learning on an ongoing basis.

**Connecticut's Standards for Professional Learning will be available in Spring 2015 and can be found [here](#) when released.**

## Improvement and Remediation Plans

If an administrator's performance is rated as *developing* or *below standard*, it signals the need for focused support and development. Districts must develop a system to support administrators not meeting the proficiency standard. Improvement and remediation plans should be developed in consultation with the administrator and his/her exclusive bargaining representative, when applicable, and be differentiated by the level of identified need and/or stage of development.

Districts may develop a system of stages or levels of support. For example:

- 1. Structured Support:** An administrator would receive structured support when an area(s) of concern is identified during the school year. This support is intended to provide short-term assistance to address a concern in its early stage.
- 2. Special Assistance:** An administrator would receive special assistance when he/she earns an overall performance rating of *developing* or *below standard* and/or has received structured support. An educator may also receive special assistance if he/she does not meet the goal(s) of the structured support plan. This support is intended to assist an educator who is having difficulty consistently demonstrating proficiency.
- 3. Intensive Assistance:** An administrator would receive intensive assistance when he/she does not meet the goal(s) of the special assistance plan. This support is intended to build the staff member's competency.

### Points for District Consideration

#### Well-articulated Improvement and Remediation Plans:

- Clearly identify targeted supports, in consultation with the administrator, which may include specialized professional development, collegial assistance, increased supervisory observations and feedback, and/or special resources and strategies aligned to the improvement outcomes.
- Clearly delineate goals linked to specific indicators and domains within the observation of practice framework/rubric that specify exactly what the administrator must demonstrate at the conclusion of the Improvement and Remediation Plan in order to be considered *proficient*.
- Indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is developed. Determine dates for interim and final reviews in accordance with stages of support.
- Include indicators of success, including a rating of *proficient* or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.

# Career Development and Growth

Rewarding exemplary performance identified through the evaluation process with opportunities for career development and professional growth is a critical step in both building confidence in the evaluation and support system itself and in building the capacity and skills of all leaders.

Examples of such opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring aspiring and early-career administrators; participating in development of administrator improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is *developing* or *below standard*; leading Professional Learning Communities; differentiated career pathways; and focused professional learning based on goals for continuous growth and development.

## Points for District Consideration

- Align job descriptions to school leadership standards.
- Identify replicable practices and inform professional learning.
- Support high-quality evaluation that aligns school accountability with teacher and administrator evaluation and support.
- Provide focused targeted professional learning opportunities identified through the evaluation process and school/district needs.
- Ensure that the new principal role is sustainable. Explore ways to alleviate administrative and operational duties to allow for greater focus on the role of instructional leader.
- Recognize and reward effective principals/administrators.

# Leadership Practice Related Indicators

The Leadership Practice Related Indicators evaluate the administrator's knowledge of a complex set of skills and competencies and how these are applied in leadership practice. It is comprised of two components:

- Observation of Leadership Practice, which counts for 40%; and
- Stakeholder Feedback, which counts for 10%.

## Component #1: Observation of Leadership Practice (40%)

An assessment of an administrator's leadership practice – by direct observation of practice and the collection of other evidence – is 40% of an administrator's summative rating.

Leadership practice is described in the Common Core of Leading (CCL) Connecticut School Leadership Standards adopted by the Connecticut State Board of Education in June of 2012, which use the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards as their foundation and define effective administrative practice through six performance expectations.\*

- 1. Vision, Mission and Goals:** Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, a strong organizational mission and high expectations for student performance.
- 2. Teaching and Learning:** Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by monitoring and continuously improving teaching and learning.
- 3. Organizational Systems and Safety:** Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by managing organizational systems and resources for a safe, high-performing learning environment.
- 4. Families and Stakeholders:** Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by collaborating with families and stakeholders to respond to diverse community interests and needs and to mobilize community resources.
- 5. Ethics and Integrity:** Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by being ethical and acting with integrity.
- 6. The Education System:** Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students and advocate for their students, faculty and staff needs by influencing systems of political, social, economic, legal and cultural contexts affecting education.

All six of these performance expectations contribute to successful schools, but research shows that some have a bigger impact than others. In particular, improving teaching and learning is at the core of what effective educational leaders do. As such, **Performance Expectation 2 (Teaching and Learning)** comprises approximately half of the leadership practice rating and the other five performance expectations are equally weighted.

\*In 2014, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) released revised ISSLC Standards to better incorporate an expanding body of research and best practices from the field for public comment. The CCSSO anticipates publication of revised standards in the coming year.

**Figure 3:** Leadership Practice – 6 Performance Expectations



These weightings should be consistent for all principals. For assistant principals and other school or district-based 092 certificate holders in non-teaching roles, the six performance expectations are weighed equally, reflecting the need for emerging leaders to develop the full set of skills and competencies in order to assume greater responsibilities as they move forward in their careers. While assistant principals' roles and responsibilities vary from school to school, creating a robust pipeline of effective principals depends on adequately preparing assistant principals for the principalship.

In order to arrive at these ratings, administrators are measured against the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric which describes leadership actions across four performance levels for each of the six performance expectations and associated elements. The four performance levels are:

- **Exemplary:** The Exemplary Level focuses on the concepts of developing capacity for action and leadership beyond the individual leader. Collaboration and involvement from a wide range of staff, students and stakeholders is prioritized as appropriate in distinguishing Exemplary performance from Proficient performance.
- **Proficient:** The rubric is anchored at the Proficient Level using the indicator language from the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The specific indicator language is highlighted in bold at the Proficient level.
- **Developing:** The Developing Level focuses on leaders with a general knowledge of leadership practices but most of those practices do not necessarily lead to positive results.
- **Below Standard:** The Below Standard Level focuses on a limited understanding of leadership practices and general inaction on the part of the leader.

Two key concepts, indicated by bullets, are often included as indicators. Each concept demonstrates a continuum of performance across the row, from *below standard* to *exemplary*.



**Examples of Evidence** are provided for each element of the rubric. While these Examples of Evidence can be a guide for evaluator training and discussion, they are only examples and should not be used as a checklist. As evaluators learn and use the rubric, they should review these Examples of Evidence and generate additional examples from their own experience that could also serve as evidence of Proficient practice.

## Strategies for Using the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric:\*

**Helping administrators get better:** The rubric is designed to be developmental in use. It contains a detailed continuum of performance for every indicator within the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards in order to serve as a guide and resource for school leaders and evaluators to talk about practice, identify specific areas for growth and development, and have language to use in describing what improved practice would be.

**Making judgments about administrator practice:** In some cases, evaluators may find that a leader demonstrates one level of performance for one concept and a different level of performance for a second concept within a row. In those cases, the evaluator will use judgment to decide on the level of performance for that particular indicator.

**Assigning ratings for each performance expectation:** Administrators and evaluators will not be required to complete this rubric at the Indicator level for any self-assessment or evaluation process. Evaluators and administrators will review performance and complete evaluation detail at the Performance Expectation level and may discuss performance at the Element level, using the detailed Indicator rows as supporting information as needed. As part of the evaluation process, evaluators and school leaders should identify a few specific areas for ongoing support and growth.

**Assessing the practice of administrators other than principals:** All indicators of the evaluation rubric may not apply to assistant principals or central office administrators. Districts may generate ratings using evidence collected from applicable indicators in the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards<sup>3</sup>.

\*In Spring 2015, the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric will undergo a validation study. In response to stakeholder feedback, revisions are expected to be made to the rubric and it's expected to be released in June 2015.

---

<sup>3</sup> Central Office Administrators were given an additional year before being required to participate in Connecticut's new evaluation and support system while further guidance was being developed. All Central Office Administrators will be required to participate in the new system in the 2015-2016 school year. Special considerations for the evaluation of Central Office Administrators are available [here](#).



## Performance Expectation 1: Vision, Mission and Goals

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, a strong organizational mission and high expectations for student performance.

### Element A: High Expectations for All

Leaders\* ensure that the creation of the vision, mission and goals establishes high expectations for all students and staff\*\*.

## The Leader\*...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
1. Information & analysis shape vision, mission and goals	relies on their own knowledge and assumptions to shape school-wide vision, mission and goals.	uses data to set goals for students. shapes a vision and mission based on basic data and analysis.	uses varied sources of information and analyzes data about current practices and outcomes to shape a vision, mission and goals.	uses a wide range of data to inform the development of and to collaboratively track progress toward achieving the vision, mission and goals.
2. Alignment to policies	does not align the school's vision, mission and goals to district, state or federal policies.	establishes school vision, mission and goals that are partially aligned to district priorities.	aligns the vision, mission and goals of the school to district, state and federal policies.	builds the capacity of all staff to ensure the vision, mission and goals are aligned to district, state and federal policies.

\*Leader: Connecticut School Leaders who are employed under their immediate administrator 092 certificate (e.g., curriculum coordinator, principal, assistant principal, department head and other supervisory positions.)

\*\*Staff: All educators and non-certified staff

\*Given potential changes to the rubric, these indicators and performance descriptors may be subject to change.

## Arriving at a Leadership Practice Summative Rating

Summative ratings are based on the evidence for each performance expectation in the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric. Evaluators collect written evidence about and observe the administrator's leadership practice across the performance expectations described in the rubric. Specific attention is paid to leadership performance areas identified as needing development.

This is accomplished through the following steps, undertaken by the administrator being evaluated and by the evaluator completing the evaluation:

The administrator and evaluator meet for a Goal-Setting Conference to identify focus areas for development of the administrator’s leadership practice.

1. The administrator collects evidence about his/her practice and the evaluator collects evidence about administrator practice with a particular emphasis on the identified focus areas for development. **Evaluators of administrators must conduct at least two school site observations for any administrator and should conduct at least four school site observations for administrators who are new to their district, school, the profession or who have received ratings of *developing* or *below standard*.**
2. The administrator and evaluator hold a Mid-Year Formative Conference with a focused discussion of progress toward proficiency in the focus areas identified as needing development.
3. Near the end of the school year, the administrator reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a summative self-assessment for review by the evaluator, identifying areas of strength and continued growth, as well as progress on the focus areas.
4. The evaluator and the administrator meet to discuss all evidence collected to date. Following the conference, the evaluator uses the preponderance of evidence to assign a summative rating of *exemplary*, *proficient*, *developing* or *below standard* for each performance expectation. Then the evaluator assigns a total practice rating based on the criteria in the chart below and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.

## Principals and Central Office Administrators\*:

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
<i>Exemplary</i> on Teaching and Learning +	At least <i>Proficient</i> on Teaching and Learning +	At least <i>Developing</i> on Teaching and Learning +	<i>Below Standard</i> on Teaching and Learning  or
<i>Exemplary</i> on at least 2 other performance expectations +	At least <i>Proficient</i> on at least 3 other performance expectations +	At least <i>Developing</i> on at least 3 other performance expectations	<i>Below Standard</i> on at least 3 other performance expectations
No rating below <i>Proficient</i> on any performance expectation	No rating below <i>Developing</i> on any performance expectation		

\*Given potential changes to the rubric, this rating scale may be subject to change.

## Assistant Principals and Other School-Based Administrators:

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
<p><i>Exemplary</i> on at least half of measured performance expectations +</p> <p>No rating below <i>Proficient</i> on any performance expectation</p>	<p>At least <i>Proficient</i> on at least a majority of performance expectations +</p> <p>No rating below <i>Developing</i> on any performance expectation</p>	<p>At least <i>Developing</i> on at least a majority of performance expectations</p>	<p><i>Below Standard</i> on at least half of performance expectations</p>

### Component #2: Stakeholder Feedback (10%)

Feedback from stakeholders – assessed by administration of a survey with measures that align to the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards – is 10% of an administrator’s summative rating.

For each administrative role, the stakeholders surveyed should be those in the best position to provide meaningful feedback. For school-based administrators, stakeholders solicited for feedback must include teachers and parents, but may include other stakeholders (e.g., other staff, community members, students, etc.). If surveyed populations include students, they can provide valuable input on school practices and climate for inclusion in evaluation of school-based administrative roles.

#### Applicable Survey Types

There are several types of surveys – some with broader application for schools and districts – that align generally with the areas of feedback that are relevant for administrator evaluation. These include:

- **Leadership practice surveys** focus directly on feedback related to a leader’s performance and the impact on stakeholders. Leadership Practice Surveys for principals and other administrators are available and there are also a number of instruments that are not specific to the education sector, but rather probe for information aligned with broader leadership competencies that are also relevant to Connecticut administrators’ practice. Typically, leadership practice surveys for use in principal evaluations collect feedback from teachers and other staff members.

- **School practice surveys** capture feedback related to the key strategies, actions and events at a school. They tend to focus on measuring awareness and impact from stakeholders, which can include faculty and staff, students and parents.
- **School climate surveys** cover many of the same subjects as school practice surveys but are also designed to probe for perceptions from stakeholders on the school's prevailing attitudes, standards and conditions. They are typically administered to all staff as well as to students and their family members.

To ensure that districts use effective survey instruments in the administrator evaluation process, and to allow educators to share results across district boundaries, the CSDE has adopted recommended survey instruments as part of the SEED state model for administrator evaluation and support. Panorama Education developed the surveys for use in the State of Connecticut, and districts are strongly encouraged to use these state model surveys.

See the SEED website for examples of each type of survey as well as sample questions that align to the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards. See the [SEED website](#) for Panorama Education surveys.

The survey(s) selected by a district for gathering feedback must be valid (that is, the instrument measures what it is intended to measure) and reliable (that is, the use of the instrument is consistent among those using it and is consistent over time). In order to minimize the burden on schools and stakeholders, the surveys chosen need not be implemented exclusively for purposes of administrator evaluation, but may have broader application as part of teacher evaluation systems, school-or district-wide feedback and planning or other purposes. Adequate participation and representation of school stakeholder population is important; there are several strategies districts may choose to use to ensure success in this area, including careful timing of the survey during the year, incentivizing participation and pursuing multiple means of soliciting responses.

Any survey selected must align to some or all of the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards, so that feedback is applicable to measuring performance against those standards. In most cases, only a subset of survey measures will align explicitly to the Leadership Standards, so administrators and their evaluators are encouraged to select relevant portions of the survey's results to incorporate into the evaluation and support model.

For each administrative role, stakeholders providing feedback might include:

## SCHOOL-BASED ADMINISTRATORS

### Principals:

- All family members
- All teachers and staff members
- All students

### Assistant Principals and other school-based administrators:

- All or a subset of family members
- All or a subset of teachers and staff members
- All or a subset of students

## CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS

### Line managers of instructional staff (e.g., Assistant/Regional Superintendents):

- Principals or principal supervisors
- Other direct reports
- Relevant family members

### Leadership for offices of curriculum, assessment, special services and other central academic functions:

- Principals
- Specific subsets of teachers
- Other specialists within the district
- Relevant family members

### Leadership for offices of finance, human resources and legal/employee relations offices and other central shared services roles:

- Principals
- Specific subsets of teachers
- Other specialists within the district

## Stakeholder Feedback Summative Rating

Ratings should reflect the degree to which an administrator makes growth on feedback measures, using data from the prior year or beginning of the year as a baseline for setting a growth target.

### Exceptions to this include:

- Administrators with high ratings already, in which case, the rating should reflect the degree to which measures remain high.
- Administrators new to the role, in which case, the rating should be based on a reasonable target, using district averages or averages of schools in similar situations.

This is accomplished in the following steps, undertaken by the administrator being evaluated and reviewed by the evaluator:

Step 1 - Select appropriate survey measures aligned to the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.

Step 2 - Review baseline data on selected measures, which may require a fall administration of the survey in year one.

Step 3 - Set 1 target for growth on selected measures (or performance on selected measures when growth is not feasible to assess or performance is already high).

Step 4 - Later in the school year, administer surveys to relevant stakeholders.

Step 5 - Aggregate data and determine whether the administrator achieved the established target.

Step 6 - Assign a rating, using this scale:

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Substantially exceeded target	Met target	Made substantial progress but did not meet target	Made little or no progress against target

Establishing what results in having “substantially exceeded” the target or what constitutes “substantial progress” is left to the discretion of the evaluator and the administrator being evaluated in the context of the target being set. However, more than half of the rating of an administrator on stakeholder feedback must be based on an assessment of improvement over time.

# Examples of Survey Applications

## Example #1:

**School #1** has mid-range student performance results and is working diligently to improve out-comes for all students. As part of a district-wide initiative, the school administers a climate survey to teachers, students and family members. The results of this survey are applied broadly to inform school and district planning as well as administrator and teacher evaluations. Baseline data from the previous year’s survey show general high performance with a few significant gaps in areas aligned to the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The principal, district superintendent and the school leadership team selected one area of focus – building expectations for student achievement – and the principal identified leadership actions related to this focus area which are aligned with the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards. At the end of the year, survey results showed that, although improvement was made, the school failed to meet its target.

Measure and Target	Results (Target met?)
Percentage of teachers and family members agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement “ <i>Students are challenged to meet high expectations at the school</i> ” would increase from 71% to 77%.	No; results at the end of the year showed an increase of 3% to 74% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement.
<b>Stakeholder Feedback Rating: “Developing”</b>	

## Example #2:

**School #2** is a low-performing school in a district that has purchased and implemented a 360° tool measuring a principal’s leadership practice which collects feedback from teachers, the principal and the principal’s supervisor. The resulting scores from this tool are incorporated in the district’s administrator evaluation and support system as stakeholder input.

Baseline data from the prior year reflects room for improvement in several areas and the principal, her supervisor and the school leadership team decides to focus on ensuring a safe, high performing learning environment for staff and students. Together, the principal and her supervisor focus on the principal’s role in establishing a safe, high-performing environment and identify skills to be developed that are aligned to this growth area. They then set a target for improvement based on specific measures in the survey, aiming for an increase of 7% in the number of stakeholders who agreed or strongly agreed that that there was growth in the identified area. Results at the end of the school year show that the principal had met her target, with an increase of 9%.

Measure and Target	Results (Target met?)
Percentage of teachers, family members and other respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing that the principal had taken effective action to establish a safe, effective learning environment would increase from 71% to 78%.	Yes; results at the end of the year showed an increase of 9% to 80% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing.
<b>Stakeholder Feedback Rating: "Proficient"</b>	

The Student Outcomes Related Indicators capture the administrator’s impact on student learning and comprise half of the final rating.

## Student Outcomes Related Indicators includes two components:

- Student Learning, which counts for 45%; and
- Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes, which counts for 5%.

### Component #3: Student Learning (45%)

Student learning is assessed in equal weight by: (a) performance and progress on the academic learning measures in the state’s accountability system for schools and (b) performance and growth on locally-determined measures. Each of these measures will have a weight of 22.5% and together they will account for 45% of the administrator’s evaluation.

#### State Measures of Academic Learning

With the state’s new school accountability system, a school’s SPI—an average of student performance in all tested grades and subjects for a given school—allows for the evaluation of school performance across all tested grades, subjects and performance levels on state tests. The goal for all Connecticut schools is to achieve an SPI rating of 88, which indicates that on average all students are at the ‘target’ level.

#### Currently, the state’s accountability system<sup>9</sup> includes two measures of student academic learning:

1. **School Performance Index (SPI) progress** – changes from baseline in student achievement on Connecticut’s standardized assessments.

***PLEASE NOTE:** SPI calculations may not be available for the 2015-16 school year due to the transition from state legacy tests to the Smarter Balanced Assessment. Therefore, 45% of an administrator’s rating for Student Learning will be based on student growth and performance on locally-determined measures.*

2. **SPI progress for student subgroups** – changes from baseline in student achievement for subgroups on Connecticut’s standardized assessments.

<sup>4</sup> All of the current academic learning measures in the state accountability system assess status achievement of students or changes in status achievement from year to year. There are no true growth measures. If the state adds a growth measure to the accountability model, it is recommended that it count as 50% of a principal’s state academic learning rating in Excelling schools, 60% in Progressing and Transition schools, and 70% in Review and Turnaround schools.



Yearly goals for student achievement should be based on approximately 1/12 of the growth needed to reach 88, capped at 3 points per year. See below for a sample calculation to determine the SPI growth target for a school with an SPI rating of 52.

$$\frac{88 - 52}{12} = 3$$

**Evaluation ratings for administrators on these state test measures are generated as follows:**

Step 1: Ratings of SPI Progress are applied to give the administrator a score between 1 and 4, using the table below:

**SPI Progress (all students and subgroups)**

SPI ≥ 88	Did not Maintain	Maintain		
	1	4		
SPI < 88	< 50% target progress	50-99% target progress	100-125% target progress	> 125% target progress
	1	2	3	4

**PLEASE NOTE:** Administrators who work in schools with two SPIs will use the average of the two SPI ratings to apply for their score.

**Step 2:** Scores are weighted to emphasize improvement in schools below the State’s SPI target of 88 and to emphasize subgroup progress and performance in schools above the target. While districts may weigh the two measures according to local priorities for administrator evaluation, the following weights are recommended:

SPI Progress	100% minus subgroup %
SPI Subgroup Progress*	10% per subgroup; up to 50%

\*Subgroup(s) must exist in year prior and in year of evaluation

Below is a sample calculation for a school with two subgroups:

Measure	Score	Weight	Summary Score
SPI Progress	3	.8	2.4
SPI Subgroup 1 Progress	2	.1	.2
SPI Subgroup 2 Progress	2	.1	.2
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>2.8</b>

**Step 3:** The weighted scores in each category are summed, resulting in an overall state test rating that is scored on the following scale:

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
At or above 3.5	2.5 to 3.4	1.5 to 2.4	Less than 1.5

All protections related to the assignment of school accountability ratings (e.g., the minimum number of days a student must be enrolled in order for that student’s scores to be included in an accountability measure) shall apply to the use of state test data for administrator evaluation.

For any school that does not have tested grades (such as a K-2 school), the entire 45% of an administrator’s rating on student learning indicators is based on the locally-determined indicators described below.

## Locally-Determined Measures (Student Learning Objectives)

Administrators establish three Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) on measures they select. In selecting measures, certain parameters apply:

- All measures must align to Connecticut Core Standards and other Connecticut content standards. In instances where there are no such standards that apply to a subject/grade level, districts must provide evidence of alignment to research-based learning standards.
- At least one of the measures must focus on student outcomes from subjects and/or grades not assessed on state-administered assessments.
- For administrators in high school, one measure must include the cohort graduation rate and the extended graduation rate, as defined in the State’s approved application for flexibility under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. All protections related to the assignment of school accountability ratings for cohort graduation rate and extended graduation rate shall apply to the use of graduation data for principal evaluation.
- For administrators assigned to a school in “review” or “turnaround” status, indicators will align with the performance targets set in the school’s mandated improvement plan.

	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3
<b>Elementary or Middle School Principal</b>	Non-tested subjects or grades	Broad discretion	
<b>High School Principal</b>	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement)	Broad discretion	
<b>Elementary or Middle School AP</b>	Non-tested subjects or grades	Broad discretion: Indicators may focus on student results from a subset of teachers, grade levels or subjects, consistent with the job responsibilities of the assistant principal being evaluated.	
<b>High School AP</b>	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement)	Broad discretion: Indicators may focus on student results from a subset of teachers, grade levels or subjects, consistent with the job responsibilities of the assistant principal being evaluated.	
<b>Central Office Administrator</b>	(meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement) Indicators may be based on results in the group of schools, group of students or subject area most relevant to the administrator's job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.		

Beyond these parameters, administrators have broad discretion in selecting indicators, including, but not limited to:

- Student performance or growth on state-administered assessments and/or district-adopted assessments not included in the state accountability measures (e.g., commercial content area assessments, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations).
- Students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation.

- Students’ performance or growth on school-or classroom-developed assessments in subjects and grade levels for which there are not available state assessments. Below are a few examples of SLOs for administrators:

Grade Level/Role	SLO
<b>2nd Grade</b>	Among second graders who remain enrolled in school and in good attendance from September to May, 80% will make at least one year’s growth in reading as measured by MAP/NWEA assessments.
<b>Middle School Science</b>	78% of students will attain <i>proficient</i> or higher on the science inquiry strand of the CMT in May.
<b>High School</b>	9th grade students will accumulate sufficient credits to be in good standing as sophomores by June.
<b>Central Office Administrator</b>	By June 1, 2016, the percentage of grade 3 students across the district (in all 5 elementary schools) reading at or above grade level will improve from 78% to 85%. (Curriculum Coordinator)

The process for selecting measures and creating SLOs should strike a balance between alignment to district student learning priorities and a focus on the most significant school-level student learning needs. To do so, it is critical that the process follow a pre-determined timeline.

- First, the district establishes student learning priorities for a given school year based on available data. These may be a continuation for multi-year improvement strategies or a new priority that emerges from achievement data.
- The administrator uses available data to craft an improvement plan for the school/area. This is done in collaboration with other stakeholders and includes a manageable set of clear student learning targets.
- The administrator chooses student learning priorities for her/his own evaluation that are
  - (a) aligned to district priorities (unless the school is already doing well against those priorities) and
  - (b) aligned with the school improvement plan.
- The administrator chooses measures that best assess the priorities and develops clear and measurable SLOs for the chosen assessments/indicators (see the Administrator’s SLO Handbook, SLO Form and SLO Quality Test).

- The administrator shares the SLOs with her/his evaluator, informing a conversation designed to ensure that:
  - The objectives are adequately ambitious.
  - There is adequate data that can be collected to make a fair judgment about whether the administrator met the established objectives.
  - The objectives are based on a review of student characteristics (e.g., mobility, attendance, demographic and learning characteristics) relevant to the assessment of the administrator against the objective.
  - The professional resources are appropriate to supporting the administrator in meeting the performance targets.
- The administrator and evaluator collect interim data on the SLOs to inform a mid-year conversation (which is an opportunity to assess progress and, as needed, adjust targets) and summative data to inform summative ratings.

**Based on this process, administrators receive a rating for this portion, as follows**

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Met all 3 objectives and substantially exceeded at least 2 targets	Met 2 objectives and made at least substantial progress on the 3rd	Met 1 objective and made substantial progress on at least 1 other	Met 0 objectives OR Met 1 objective and did not make substantial progress on either of the other 2

**Arriving at a Student Learning Summative Rating**

To arrive at an overall student learning rating, the ratings for the state assessment and the locally-determined ratings in the two components are plotted on this matrix:

		State Measures of Academic Learning			
		4	3	2	1
Locally Determined Measures of Academic Learning	4	Rate Exemplary	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	Gather further information
	3	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing
	2	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing	Rate Developing
	1	Gather further information	Rate Developing	Rate Developing	Rate Below Standard

## Component #4: Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%)

Teacher effectiveness outcomes – as measured by an aggregation of teachers’ student learning objectives (SLOs) – make up 5% of an administrator’s evaluation.

Improving teacher effectiveness outcomes is central to an administrator’s role in driving improved student learning. That is why, in addition to measuring the actions that administrators take to increase teacher effectiveness – from hiring and placement to ongoing professional learning to feedback on performance – the administrator evaluation and support model also assesses the outcomes of all of that work.

As part of Connecticut’s teacher evaluation state model, teachers are assessed in part on their accomplishment of SLOs. This is the basis for assessing administrators’ contribution to teacher effectiveness outcomes. In order to maintain a strong focus on teachers setting ambitious SLOs for their evaluation, it is imperative that evaluators of administrators discuss with the administrator their strategies in working with teachers to set SLOs. Without attention to this issue, there is a substantial risk of administrators not encouraging teachers to set ambitious SLOs.

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
> 80% of teachers are rated <i>proficient</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	> 60% of teachers are rated <i>proficient</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	> 40% of teachers are rated <i>proficient</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	< 40% of teachers are rated <i>proficient</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation

- Central Office Administrators will be responsible for the teachers under their assigned role.
- All other administrators will be responsible for the teachers they directly evaluate.

# Summative Administrator Evaluation Rating

## Summative Scoring

Every educator will receive one of four performance\* ratings:

1. **Exemplary:** Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
2. **Proficient:** Meeting indicators of performance
3. **Developing:** Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
4. **Below standard:** Not meeting indicators of performance

\*The term "performance" in the above shall mean "progress as defined by specified indicators. "Such indicators shall be mutually agreed upon, as applicable. Such progress shall be demonstrated by evidence (see Appendix 2).

A rating of *proficient* represents fully satisfactory performance. It is the rigorous standard expected for most experienced administrators. Specifically, proficient administrators can be characterized as:

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader;
- Meeting expectations in at least 3 other areas of practice;
- Meeting and making progress on 1 target related to stakeholder feedback;
- Meeting state accountability growth targets on tests of core academic subjects;
- Meeting and making progress on 3 student learning objectives aligned to school and district priorities; and
- Having more than 60% of teachers proficient on the student growth portion of their evaluation.

### **Supporting administrators to reach proficiency is at the very heart of this evaluation model.**

Exemplary ratings are reserved for performance that significantly exceeds proficiency and could serve as a model for leaders district-wide or even statewide. Few administrators are expected to demonstrate exemplary performance on more than a small number of practice elements.

A rating of *developing* means that performance is meeting proficiency in some components but not others. Improvement is necessary and expected and two consecutive years at the developing level is, for an experienced administrator, a cause for concern. On the other hand, for administrators in their first year, performance rating of *developing* is expected. If, by the end of three years, performance is still rated *developing*, there is cause for concern.

A rating of *below standard* indicates performance that is below proficient on all components or unacceptably low on one or more components.

## **Determining Summative Ratings**

### **The rating will be determined using the following steps:**

1. Determining a Leader Practice Rating;
2. Determining an Student Outcomes Rating; and
3. Combining the two into an overall rating using the Summative Matrix.

Each step is illustrated below:

## A. PRACTICE: Leadership Practice (40%) + Stakeholder Feedback (10%) = 50%

The practice rating derives from an administrator’s performance on the performance expectations of the Common Core of Leading Evaluation Rubric (CCL) and the one stakeholder feedback target. The observation of administrator performance and practice counts for 40% of the total rating and stakeholder feedback counts for 10% of the total rating. Simply multiply these weights by the component scores to get the category points. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

Component	Score (1-4)	Weight	Summary Score
Observation of Leadership Practice	2	40	80
Stakeholder Feedback	3	10	30
<b>TOTAL LEADER PRACTICE-RELATED POINTS</b>			<b>110</b>

Leader Practice-Related Points	Leader Practice-Related Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-126	Developing
127-174	Proficient
175-200	Exemplary

## B. OUTCOMES: Student Learning (45%) + Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%) = 50%

The outcomes rating is derived from student learning – student performance and progress on academic learning measures in the state’s accountability system (SPI) and student learning objectives – and teacher effectiveness outcomes. As shown in the **Summative Rating Form**, state reports provide an assessment rating and evaluators record a rating for the student learning objectives agreed to in the beginning of the year. Simply multiply these weights by the component scores to get the category points. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table page 76.



Component	Score (1-4)	Weight	Points (score x weight)
Student Learning (SPI Progress and SLOs)	3	45	135
Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes	2	5	10
<b>TOTAL STUDENT OUTCOMES-RELATED POINTS</b>			<b>145</b>

Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points	Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-126	Developing
127-174	Proficient
175-200	Exemplary

### C. OVERALL: Leader Practice + Student Outcomes

The overall rating combines the practice and outcomes ratings using the matrix below. Using the ratings determined for each major category: Student Outcomes-Related Indicators and Leader Practice-Related Indicators, follow the respective column and row to the center of the matrix. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. For the example provided, the Leader Practice-Related rating is *developing* and the Student Outcomes-Related rating is *proficient*. The summative rating is therefore *proficient*.

If the two major categories are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of *exemplary* for Leader Practice and a rating of *below standard* for Student Outcomes), then the evaluator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to determine a summative rating.

		Overall Leader Practice Rating			
		4	3	2	1
Overall Student Outcomes Rating	4	Rate Exemplary	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	<i>Gather further information</i>
	3	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing
	2	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing	Rate Developing
	1	<i>Gather further information</i>	Rate Developing	Rate Developing	Rate Below Standard

## Adjustment of Summative Rating:

Summative ratings must be completed for all administrators by June 30 of a given school year. Should state standardized test data not yet be available at the time of a summative rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. When the summative rating for an administrator may be significantly affected by state standardized test data, the evaluator should recalculate the administrator’s final summative rating when the data is available and submit the adjusted rating not later than September 15. These adjustments should inform goal setting in the new school year.

## Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

Each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system. A pattern may consist of a pattern of one rating. The state model recommends the following patterns:

Novice administrators shall generally be deemed effective if said administrator receives at least two sequential proficient ratings, one of which must be earned in the fourth year of a novice administrator’s career. A *below standard* rating shall only be permitted in the first year of a novice administrator’s career, assuming a pattern of growth of developing in year two and two sequential proficient ratings in years three and four.

An experienced administrator shall generally be deemed ineffective if said administrator receives at least two sequential *developing* ratings or one *below standard* rating at any time.

## Dispute-Resolution Process

The local or regional board of education shall include a process for resolving disputes in cases where the evaluator and administrator cannot agree on goals/objectives, the evaluation period, feedback or the professional development plan. When such agreement cannot be reached, the issue in dispute will be referred for resolution to a subcommittee of the professional development and evaluation committee (PDEC). The superintendent and the respective collective bargaining unit for the district will each select one representative from the PDEC to constitute this subcommittee, as well as a neutral party, as mutually agreed upon between the superintendent and the collective bargaining unit. In the event that the designated committee does not reach a unanimous decision, the issue shall be considered by the superintendent whose decision shall be binding (*see Appendix 2*).

# Appendix 1

## Flexibilities to the Guidelines for Educator Evaluation Adopted by Connecticut State Board of Education on February 6, 2014

### Section 2.9: Flexibility Components

Local and regional school districts may choose to adopt one or more of the evaluation plan flexibility components described within Section 2.9, in mutual agreement with district's professional development and evaluation committee pursuant to 10-151b(b) and 10-220a(b), to enhance implementation. Any district that adopts flexibility components in accordance with this section in the 2013-14 school year shall, within 30 days of adoption of such revisions by its local or regional board of education, and no later than March 30, 2014, submit their plan revisions to the State Department of Education (SDE) for its review and approval. For the 2014-15 and all subsequent school years, the submission of district evaluation plans for SDE review and approval, including flexibility requests, shall take place no later than the annual deadline set by the SDE.

- a. Each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select 1 goal/objective for student growth. For each goal/objective, each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select multiple Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD) and evidence of those IAGDs based on the range of criteria used by the district. For any teacher whose primary responsibility is not the direct instruction of students, the mutually agreed upon goal/objective and indicators shall be based on the assigned role of the teacher.
- b. One half (or 22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goal/objective is met shall be based on standardized indicators other than the state test (CMT, CAPT, or SBAC) for the 2014-15 academic year, pending federal approval. Other standardized indicators for other grades and subjects, where available, may be used. For the other half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development, there may be:
  1. A maximum of one additional standardized indicator other than the state test (CMT, CAPT or SBAC) for the 2014-15 academic year, pending federal approval, if there is mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute resolution procedure as described in 1.3.
  2. A minimum of one non-standardized indicator.
- c. Teachers who receive and maintain an annual summative performance evaluation designation of proficient or exemplary (or the equivalent annual summative ratings in a pre-existing district evaluation plan) during the 2012-13 or any subsequent school year and who are not first or second year teachers shall be evaluated with a minimum of one formal in-class observation no less frequently than once every three years, and three informal in-class observations conducted in accordance with Section 2.3(2)(b)(1) and 2.3(2)(b)(2) in all other years, and shall complete one review of practice every year. Teachers with proficient or exemplary designations may receive a formal in-class observation if an informal

observation or review of practice in a given year results in a concern about the teacher's practice. For non-classroom teachers, the above frequency of observations shall apply in the same ways, except that the observations need not be in-classroom (they shall instead be conducted in appropriate settings). All other teachers, including first and second year teachers and teachers who receive a performance evaluation designation of below standard or developing, will be evaluated according to the procedures in 2.3(2)(c) and 2.3(2)(d). All observations shall be followed with timely feedback. Examples of non-classroom observations or reviews of practice include but are not limited to: observations of data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, reviews of lesson plans or other teaching artifacts.

## Flexibilities to the Guidelines for Educator Evaluation Adopted by Connecticut State Board of Education on February 6, 2014

### Section 2.10: Data Management Protocols

- a. On or before September 15, 2014 and each year thereafter, professional development and evaluation committees established pursuant to 10-220a shall review and report to their board of education the user experience and efficiency of the district's data management systems/platforms being used by teachers and administrators to manage evaluation plans.
- b. For implementation of local evaluation plans for the 2014-15 school year, and each year thereafter, data management systems/platforms to be used by teachers and administrators to manage evaluation plans shall be selected by boards of education with consideration given to the functional requirements/needs and efficiencies identified by professional development and evaluation committees.
- c. For implementation of local evaluation plans for the 2014-15 school year, and each year thereafter, educator evaluation plans shall contain guidance on the entry of data into a district's data management system/platform being used to manage/administer the evaluation plan and on ways to reduce paperwork and documentation while maintaining plan integrity. Such guidance shall:
  1. Limit entry only to artifacts, information and data that is specifically identified in a teacher or administrator's evaluation plan as an indicator to be used for evaluating such educators, and to optional artifacts as mutually agreed upon by teacher/administrator and evaluator;
  2. Streamline educator evaluation data collection and reporting by teachers and administrators;
  3. Prohibit the SDE from accessing identifiable student data in the educator evaluation data management systems/platforms, except as needed to conduct the audits mandated by C.G.S. 10-151b(c) and 10-151i, and ensure that third-party organizations keep all identifiable student data confidential;

4. Prohibit the sharing or transference of individual teacher data from one district to another or to any other entity without the teacher or administrator's consent, as prohibited by law;
  5. Limit the access of teacher or administrator data to only the primary evaluator, superintendent or his/her designee, and to other designated professionals directly involved with evaluation and professional development processes. Consistent with Connecticut General Statutes, this provision does not affect the SDE's data collection authority;
  6. Include a process for logging the names of authorized individuals who access a teacher or administrator's evaluation information.
- d. The SDE's technical assistance to school districts will be appropriate to the evaluation and support plan adopted by the district, whether or not the plan is the state model.

# Appendix 2

## CT State Board of Education-Adopted Revisions: Guidelines for Educator Evaluation

May 7, 2014

### Dispute-Resolution Process

(3) In accordance with the requirement in the 1999 Connecticut Guidelines for Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development, in establishing or amending the local teacher evaluation plan, the local or regional board of education shall include a process for resolving disputes in cases where the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on goals/objectives, the evaluation period, feedback or the professional development plan. As an illustrative example of such a process (which serves as an option and not a requirement for districts), when such agreement cannot be reached, the issue in dispute may be referred for resolution to a subcommittee of the professional development and evaluation committee (PDEC). In this example, the superintendent and the respective collective bargaining unit for the district may each select one representative from the PDEC to constitute this subcommittee, as well as a neutral party as mutually agreed upon between the superintendent and the collective bargaining unit. In the event the designated committee does not reach a unanimous decision, the issue shall be considered by the superintendent whose decision shall be binding. This provision is to be utilized in accordance with the specified processes and parameters regarding goals/objectives, evaluation period, feedback, and professional development contained in this document entitled "Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation." Should the process established as required by the document entitled "Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation," dated June 2012 not result in resolution of a given issue, the determination regarding that issue shall be made by the superintendent. An example will be provided within the State model.

### Rating System

#### 2.1: 4-Level Matrix Rating System

(1) Annual summative evaluations provide each teacher with a summative rating aligned to one of four performance evaluation designators: Exemplary, Proficient, Developing and Below Standard.

(a) The performance levels shall be defined as follows:

- Exemplary – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
- Proficient – Meeting indicators of performance
- Developing – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
- Below standard – Not meeting indicators of performance

The term “performance” in the above shall mean “progress as defined by specified indicators.” Such indicators shall be mutually agreed upon, as applicable. Such progress shall be demonstrated by evidence. The SDE will work with PEAC to identify best practices as well as issues regarding the implementation of the 4-Level Matrix Rating System for further discussion prior to the 2015-16 academic year.

## CT State Board of Education-Adopted Revisions: Guidelines for Educator Evaluation

### 45% Student Growth Component

- (c) One half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goals/objectives are met shall not be determined by a single, isolated standardized test score, but shall be determined through the comparison of data across assessments administered over time, including the state test for those teaching tested grades and subjects or another standardized indicator for other grades and subjects where available. A state test can be used only if there are interim assessments that lead to that test, and such interim assessments shall be included in the overall score for those teaching tested grades and subjects. Those without an available standardized indicator will select, through mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute-resolution procedure as described in section 1.3, an additional non-standardized indicator.
- a. For the 2015-16 academic year, the required use of state test data is suspended, pending USED approval, pursuant to PEAC’s flexibility recommendation on January 29, 2014 and the State Board of Education’s action on February 6, 2014.
  - b. Prior to the 2015-16 academic year, the SDE will work with PEAC to examine and evolve the system of standardized and non-standardized student learning indicators, including the use of interim assessments that lead to the state test to measure growth over time.

### For the other half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development, there may be:

- a. A maximum of one additional standardized indicator, if there is mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute resolution procedure as described in section 1.3.
- b. A minimum of one non-standardized indicator.
- c. standardized indicator.