

**Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE)  
Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) Meeting  
March 30, 2015  
1-3 p.m.**

**PRESENT:** Sarah Barzee, Gary Maynard, Shannon Marimón, Catherine O’Callaghan, Paula Colen, Patrice McCarthy, Robert Rader, Michael Galluzzo, Karissa Niehoff, Mark Waxenberg, Dianna Roberge-Wentzell, Sheila Cohen, Melodie Peters, Joe Cirusuolo, Bruce Douglas, Linette Branham

**ABSENT:** Stephen McKeever

**FACILITATOR:** Mary Broderick

*Welcome/Introductions*

Sarah Barzee began the meeting thanking everyone for their attendance. She introduced Dianna Roberge-Wentzell, Interim Commissioner. She also introduced Catherine O’Callaghan to the Council. Dr. O’Callaghan replaces Dr. Ed Malin as the representative from American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).

*Discussion of Meeting Protocols and Scheduling of PEAC Quarterly Meetings: 2015-16.*

Sarah introduced Mary Broderick who will facilitate the meeting. Going forward, PEAC meetings will be regularly scheduled rather than scheduled “as needed.” Alternates will be welcomed if an individual PEAC member is not able to attend. The following norms were discussed and the group agreed to them for this and all future PEAC meetings: be open to listening; disagree with ideas, not with people; bring voices not in the room; bring all perspectives as appropriate; share air time; and participate fully. For all future meetings, key topics for further discussion and an outline of agendas will be established.

Members were asked for additional items. Sarah and Shannon developed and would (later in the meeting) share a list of proposed topics for future meetings. Mr. Waxenberg said he prefers a majority vote vs consensus so that acceptance or rejection can be by majority. Dr. Cirusuolo asked for clarification on the role of the member – are they the voice of their organization? Ms. Peters talked about a bill in the legislature to charge the department with a strategic plan and if PEAC would have a role in helping to frame the discussion. Mary said that this item would be tabled for further discussion.

*Quarterly meeting dates:*

Going forward, the Talent Office will assume responsibility for all meeting arrangements, including parking arrangements, material distribution, etc. Ms. Colen asked if the agendas could be emailed in advance.

The following quarterly meeting schedule was shared:

- June 10, 2015; 9am-12pm
- September 16, 2015; 9am-12pm
- December 9, 2015; 9am-12pm
- March 9, 2016; 9am-12pm

### **Updates on Educator Evaluation and Support: 2015-16**

ESEA Flexibility Renewal Application – Principle 3 – is being worked on and is due by early April. The CSDE will ask for continued flexibility. Only two groups will not be included in the request for flexibility – charter school administrators and central office administrators. These educators will be expected to implement fully in 2015-16.

While continued flexibility is sought for Pre-Kindergarten, Unified School District #1, Unified School District #2, Adult Education Programs and Approved Private Special Education Programs, they will be required to take part in an implementation pilot in 2015-16.

Mr. Waxenberg asked for clarification of what we asked for in the previous year.

Commissioner Wentzell requested another year of required incorporation of student results on the state test within teacher evaluation. She would like to wait and see what growth looks like before we project our target. Growth is what we care about, and it is too early in the system to make that determination.

Sarah also mentioned that other resources may need to be tapped. Commissioner Wentzell said we have delivered well in Principal 1 and almost on time – good compared to other states. We are using our credit of doing a good job in order to use that flexibility in a couple of areas – Principal 2 and in Principal 3. Changes may also happen at national level.

The US Department of Education has outlined two options for Principle 3 – a state is either fully on track with implementation for all educators or a state can request some additional flexibility. We feel good in that Connecticut is taking this seriously and requesting flexibility where appropriate.

Dr. Cirasuolo recently had a conversation with the Assistant Secretary of Education and was surprised to hear how much flexibility is being granted.

### *ESEA Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership*

The CSDE plans to propose the following in relation to Principle 3 of the ESEA Waiver Renewal Application: 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 for teachers and administrators in tested grades and subjects; and adding additional one-year waiver for full implementation of CT's Educator Evaluation and Support System in the following settings:

pre-K, Adult Ed, Unified School District #1, Unified School District #2 and approved private special education facilities.

#### *2015-16 Educator Evaluation and Support Plan Review Timeline*

Shannon said that submission is now open with a closing date of May 15, 2015. There are over 200 plans to review. All LEAs must go through an electronic submission process using a secured system and that both teacher and administrator plans be submitted at that same time. There is an optional questionnaire – which is a pilot of the monitoring process – level 1. This year, the completion of the questionnaire is optional and only being used for feedback.

Dr. Cirusuolo asked how many districts have asked to use the state model. He would suggest removing the intermediate step of considering the state model as part of the approval process.

#### *Rubric Validation Process and Evidence Guides*

Shannon explained that the *CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric* and the *CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery* are both undergoing a review/refinement process as part of a validation study the CSDE is conducting in partnership with Pro-Examination Services. The *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* is also going through a validation study after a full year of implementing the revised version from 2014.

We are looking at the evidence to see what the results show, training on the revised rubrics will be robust. With input from Connecticut educators, new versions of both of the rubrics should be ready for districts by June 15.

Pro-Examination Services has started going through focus groups, job analyses, and the Connecticut Common Core of Leading and Connecticut Common Core of Teaching standards and other methods in their review so that rubrics can be refined. They are very involved in the training program. The Council asked if Pro-Examination Services can be invited to discuss their process. An invitation will be sent to them to do a presentation to PEAC in the future.

#### *CT Evidence Guides*

Shannon said that the Development Team, along with practitioners from districts from around the state (total of over 70) met over the summer to develop over 30 sets of Evidence Guides.

The Evidence Guides provide grade-level, content- and discipline-specific examples of evidence aligned with the four performance levels of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* and the *CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2014*. They are meant to illustrate what student and teacher/service provider behaviors might look or sound like in specific content areas/grade levels/service areas and are aligned to the CT Common Core of Teaching and appropriate content standards. A discussion followed.

Ms. Peters asked what will happen if a teacher chooses not to use these guides. Shannon said they are completely optional. Whether to use these guides is a part of a conversation that takes place

in the beginning of the year as part of the goal-setting process. Ms. Peters said that although it may be great to have guides, she is uncomfortable agreeing to this because it's taking out the flexibility of the teacher and the relationship with their students.

Discussion followed on the process and the importance of both sides paying attention to that process.

#### *Professional Learning Update*

Sarah talked about the CSDE engaging a group of stakeholders to collaborate on the development of a new system for professional learning to support educators across their career continuum. They convened the CT Academy for Professional Learning and the Professional Learning Advisory Council (PLAC). In collaboration with the PLAC, the CSDE has developed a new definition of professional learning consistent with the vision outlined in PA 12-116; reached consensus on CT Standards for Professional Learning; developed the Connecticut Guidance for a Professional Learning System and started to plan for communicating this work at a statewide level.

\*Bruce Douglas left meeting at 2:00.

Seven of the eight proposed standards align to Learning Forward's Standards for Professional Learning. The PLAC proposed to add an eighth standard on equity. This new standard was brought to the March 4 SBE meeting and Board members were accepting of everything except they asked that the newly-proposed standard emphasize cultural competence. As well, the SBE asked whether student growth and development be changed to student growth and learning. Sarah reiterated that this is guidance not guidelines or requirements.

#### *Updating the Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (June 2012) Document*

Shannon explained that the plan is to draft an updated version of the Guidelines for Education Evaluation to integrate the following: PEAC Flexibilities-February 2014 and SBE Adopted Revisions-May 2014.

#### *Topics for Further Discussion*

In addition to the ones previously listed. The following were mentioned:

- Designator Descriptions/Performance Levels
- Tested grades and subjects and use of interim assessments
- Expectations for partial year employment
- Expectations for ongoing proficiency and calibration of evaluators
- Educator evaluation and support plan review process
- Waiver review and approval process
- PDEC training and support
- Other?

Dr. Cirasuolo asked for clarification of whether we were going to look at the matrix – look at use of testing, benchmarks, etc. Sarah referred to the May 13<sup>th</sup> correspondence to the committee which explained this further.

Ms. Branham said she has a problem with the expectations for partial year employment. Feels that “recommendations” would be better than “expectations.”

\*Bruce Douglas returned to the meeting at 2:40.

Mr. Douglas mentioned that CREC has seen the benefits of using complementary evaluators/observers as part of the evaluation and support process.

Mr. Waxenberg said that since we created a system that allows it and administrators’ time is limited, we need to examine the process of evaluation and alternative ways to evaluate other than teachers evaluating teachers.

Dr. Cirusuolo agreed that lack of time for administrators is not new but when a problem exists and is known about, the administrator will handle. Otherwise, complementary evaluator work is fine.

Ms. Cohen feels that although complementary observers may work for some –they do not necessarily work for all.

Ms. Branham stated that she feels very few people know what the guidelines require – there is flexibility but they really don’t understand them.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Fran Marotta

<b>QUESTIONS/CONCERNS</b>
Decision-making going forward – vote vs consensus – check with new Commissioner
Who speaks for organization?
Role of PEAC in CSDE strategic planning process
Remove intermediate step in the approval process (SEED) Mutual agreement (LEA)
Pro-Examination presentation
Development Team meeting Evidence Guides – use locally- permissive control factors – admin. training. What is productive use? What is teacher role? Both need attention
Use of testing in evaluation process – work group
Central office positions,092, business manager, flexibility in guideline implementation
Training Period – sufficiency/consistency
Complementary evaluator/manager update
Administrators having so much to do, they need to have teachers evaluate teachers
Clarify what guidelines require