Educator Evaluation & Support 2022

October 20, 2022
CAS
8:30 – 3:30
Welcome Back Everyone

I. Who is in the room today?

II. Don’t get too comfortable, we are once again going to create groups and move folks around....
Today’s Agenda and Objectives

I. Welcome & Intro – Agenda, Vision, Norms and Process

II. Consensus Protocol Process and Parking Lot - Form Discussion Groups

III. Review the Design Principles for Next Generation Continuous Advancement Structures

IV. Work to build design elements that are aligned with design principles.

Today’s Objectives:
• Review of best practice models
• Work collaboratively in a round-robin structure (everyone will touch each design element) to build parts of a potential model that are consistent with the priority design principles you identified last session.
Today’s Grouping Challenge

Arrange yourselves in a line according to the number of years/months you have served in the role you are representing here today!
Vision

All Connecticut educators have the opportunity for continuous learning and feedback, to develop and grow, both individually and collectively, through the educator evaluation and support system so that all Connecticut students experience growth and success.
Council Member Norms

• Be present and focused (avoid incoming distractions like incoming emails, text messages, phone calls, etc.).
• Position yourself as a learner and a collaborator.
• Be open to multiple perspectives.
• Monitor your airtime and encourage others so that all voices are heard.
• Use the parking lot for questions, thoughts, ideas that need follow-up or additional input as we meet.
ESS Council Design Process Steps

1. Background Explorations.

2. Identify and prioritize design principles.

3. Model review, selection or creation based on design principles alignment.

4. Model enhancement and final design.

5. Guideline and legislative alignment.
Two big ideas that work together...

Pareto - 20/80 – focus – just a few causes drive most of your results...

Systems - 85/15 – most of what drives the quality of those few causes is HOW they are done.
Consensus Rating

1. Complete Endorsement
2. Support with Minor Reservations
3. More Information Needed
4. Don’t Like But Will Support
5. Significant Disagreement-Veto
## Consensus Results

### Design Principles / Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Principles / Participants</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific, timely, concrete, accurate, and actionable feedback that is mutual and reciprocal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected to meaningful PD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action research orientation, educator reflection</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator growth and agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused on things that matter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplify and reduce the burden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow for differentiation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Punitive intentionally separate professional discipline (support) from professional growth with clear evidence/criteria for what constitutes the need to be in over the other (Trust/no ratings)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embed equity in all aspects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained, ongoing process that promotes reflection and reviso of the process itself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District and building level support to implement principles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual/reciprocal accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards connected to best practice in delivery of content and the development on the whole child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**CSDE**

**Connecticut State Department of Education**
Design Principle Priorities

- Allow for differentiation of roles (teachers, counselors, support staff and leaders - Central office, principal, vice principal)
- Simplify and reduce the burden (eliminate the technical challenge, reduce the number of steps, paperwork)
- Focus on things that matter (Identify high leverage, mainstream goal focus areas)
- Connected to best practices aimed at the development of the whole child (Academic, social, emotional, and physical)
- Focus on educator growth and agency (meaningfully engage professionals by focusing on growth and practice in partnership with others aligned to a strategic focus (see above, focus on things matter))
- Meaningful connections to professional learning (there are pathways for participants to improve their own practice in a way that is meaningful and impactful).
- Specific, timely, accurate, actionable, and reciprocal feedback.
Design Elements

- Process
- Educator Practice
- Student Growth
- Feedback
Design Elements

1. Educator Practice -
   1. Standards and criteria - what is the frame of reference for quality and shared language regarding effective practice?
   2. Goal setting process - through what mechanism will goals be set in the process?
   3. Professional practice and performance - what role will adult actions and performance play and how will it be compared to quality standards (standards and criteria) in the process?

2. Student Growth -
   4. Student growth and development - what role will the work and results of students play in the process?
   5. Evidence/Artifacts & Observations - through what mechanism will professional practice be captured - what artifacts, observations, and evidence will be part of the process?

3. Professional and Stakeholder Feedback -
   6. Evaluator/observer feedback - through what process will specific, timely, accurate, actionable, and reciprocal feedback be provided?
   7. External feedback - will there be a process from which feedback beyond direct supervision will be included in the process?

4. Process -
   8. Process Timeline/Outline (including training and support meetings) - what guidance is there for how the timeline of the process will play out?
   9. Differentiation/Dispute resolution - Under what circumstances will the process be differentiated and what process will be used to resolve disputes that arise throughout the process?
Design Element Protocol –First Round.

1. Discuss the meaning and intent of the design elements you are working with.
2. Navigate to the location of the element in the Googledoc.
3. Consider the way each of the shared models we have looked at addresses that group of elements.
4. Work as a team to describe how you want your elements to play out in Connecticut going forward.
5. Be sure to filter your thinking, discussion and outcomes through the lens of the priority design principles (some are more pertinent than others depending on the element).
Design Element Protocol – Additional Rounds.

1. Discuss the meaning and intent of the design elements you are working with.
2. Consider the way each of the shared models we have looked at addresses those elements.
3. Consider the work of the group that came before you. Make suggestions – provide warm and cool feedback – and/or suggest alternative approaches.
4. Be sure to filter your thinking and outcomes through the lens of the priority design principles.
A Review of Models

- Iowa
- Ohio
- Massachusetts
- Mansfield
- Farmington
- PEROP – Professional Educator Review of Practice
- CEA, AFT, CAPSS Presentation (design principles)
Some Key Takeaways

**Massachusetts:**

- Holistic multiple-measures approach:  
  "Evidence of student learning is just one of several types of evidence that inform an educator’s evaluation. The MA framework for educator evaluation promotes a holistic, multi-dimensional view of educator performance based on multiple sources of evidence. No single type of individual piece of evidence can be the sole factor when determining a rating."

- 5-step evaluation cycle that starts with self-assessments (what happened last year, what do I think this year)

**Iowa:**

- Clear guidance around designing learning opportunities in the context of informing a professional learning plan;

- Ability to center the evaluation experience around the needs of specific educators role; instructional coaching, content-specific, etc.

- Clear cycle starting with self-assessment
Some Key Takeaways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mansfield</th>
<th>Farmington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation informed professional learning plan</td>
<td>• Team Action Research/Collaborative Inquiry Cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student outcomes integrates teacher led professional learning</td>
<td>• Goal Focus: Vision of a Graduate (Global Citizen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Action research approach (Seek/Discover/Confirm/Share)</td>
<td>• Self assessment and reflective critique protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educator Choice aligned to District/Building Goals</td>
<td>• Team observations, co-planning, reflection of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Team Collaboration Encouraged</td>
<td>• Professional Learning self-directed to aligned district/building goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some Key Takeaways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Educator Review of Practice</th>
<th>CAPPS/CEA/AFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Focused on the Vision of a Graduate</td>
<td>The priority design principles that the group selected are well represented in the CAPPS/CEA/AFT presentation. There is significant alignment in the group’s thinking here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inquiry Cycle (CAPA- Collect, Analyze, Process, Act)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaborative Professional Learning Plans and Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Based in Reflection on Teacher Practice to impact student learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>