

GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TEACHER EVALUATION PLAN



Table of Contents

Vision of the Graduate	3
Members of TEPL I Committee.....	4
Connecticut State Statutes.....	6
Teacher Evaluation and Professional Learning.....	7
Teacher Evaluation Plan Pilot, Training and Implementation.....	8
Teacher Evaluation System.....	15
Teacher Evaluation Plan Overview.....	16
Teacher Evaluation Plan Timeline.....	30
Appendix A: Indicators of Professional Practice Overview.....	33
Appendix B: Rubrics for Indicators of Professional Practice.....	35
Appendix C: Forms for Teacher Evaluation.....	44
Appendix D: Structured Support and Intensive Assistance.....	74
Appendix E: Correlation of CCT and GPS Indicators of Professional Practice.....	87
Appendix F: Support Documents and Guides	89

The Greenwich Public Schools is committed to complying with federal, state and local equal opportunity and non-discrimination laws that prohibit that school district from making any employment decision, excluding any person from any of its educational programs or activities, or denying any person the benefits of any of its educational programs or activities, on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability or genetic information, ancestry, age, religion, sexual orientation, marital status, economic status or any other basis prohibited by applicable law, except in the case of a bona fide occupational qualification and/or subject to conditions and limitations established by law. Inquiries regarding the Greenwich Public Schools' nondiscrimination policies should be directed to the Director of Human Resources, Greenwich Public Schools, 290 Greenwich Avenue, Greenwich, CT 06830.

VISION OF THE GRADUATE

The Greenwich Public Schools are committed to preparing students to function effectively in an interdependent global community. Therefore, in addition to acquiring a core body of knowledge*, all students will develop their individual capacities to:

- Pose and pursue substantive questions
- Critically interpret, evaluate, and synthesize information
- Explore, define, and solve complex problems
- Communicate effectively for a given purpose
- Advocate for ideas, causes, and actions
- Generate innovative, creative ideas and products
- Collaborate with others to produce a unified work and/or heightened understanding
- Contribute to community through dialogue, service, and/or leadership
- Conduct themselves in an ethical and responsible manner
- Recognize and respect other cultural contexts and points of view
- Pursue their unique interests, passions and curiosities
- Respond to failures and successes with reflection and resilience
- Be responsible for their own mental and physical health

*The core body of knowledge is established in local curricular documents which reflect national and state standards as well as workplace expectations.

3/31/09

GREENWICH TEPL I COMMITTEE

2014-2015 Co-Chairs

Ellen Flanagan, Director of Human Resources, Deputy Superintendent

Faith Sweeney, Literacy Coach, Glenville School/ North Mianus School

2014-2015 Committee Members

Celeste Antonucci, Special Education Teacher, Greenwich High School

Luz Desrouilleres, World Language Teacher, Western Middle School

Mary Forde, Director of Pupil Personnel Services/Special Education

Jason Goldstein, House Administrator, Greenwich High School

Dolores Kenny, Early Childhood Program Coordinator

Marjorie Klar, World Language Teacher, Personnel Specialist

Ralph Mayo, Principal, Eastern Middle School

Bonnie O'Regan, Program Facilitator, Advanced Learning Program

Barbara Oxer, Assistant Principal, Cos Cob School

Lillian Perone, Program Associate, Physical Education /Health, Greenwich High School

Annette Ready, Language Arts Teacher, Central Middle School

Carol Sutton, President – GEA

Past Committee Members

Joe Baske, Social Studies Teacher, Greenwich High School

Bonnie Butera, Principal, North Mianus School

Janess Coffina, Program Associate, Staff Development

John Curtin, Special Projects Manager

Cathy Delehanty, Physical Education Teacher, President – GEA

Kathleen Greider, Deputy Superintendent

Steve Kinner, Technology Teacher, Greenwich High School

Kevin Krois, ALP/Language Arts, Central Middle School

Ellen Murdock, Teacher, Cos Cob School, Past Vice-President, GEA

Barbara O'Neill, Program Coordinator, Advanced Learning Program

Megan Roby, Social Studies Teacher, Greenwich High School

Scott Saalborn, ALP Teacher, North Mianus School

Marcia Schenker, Program Coordinator, World Languages/FLES Pre-K-12

Gene Schmidt, Teacher, Assistant Principal, International School at Dundee, Assistant
Principal, Julian Curtiss

Charles Smith, Program Coordinator, Special Education, Principal, North Street School

Chris Winters, Director of Curriculum, Instruction and Professional Learning

Connecticut State Statutes – Evaluation and Professional Learning

The Connecticut State Statute Section 10-151b governs evaluation by superintendents of certain education personnel. “The superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall, in accordance with guidelines established by the State Board of Education for the development of evaluation programs and such other guidelines as may be established by mutual agreement between the local or regional board of education and the teachers’ representative chosen pursuant to section 10-153b, continuously evaluate or cause to be evaluated each teacher. An evaluation pursuant to this subsection shall include, but not be limited to, strengths, areas needing improvement and strategies for improvement. The superintendent shall report the status of teacher evaluations to the local or regional board of education on or before June first of each year.”

Amendments to Connecticut State Statute Section 10-151b – June 2012

Subsection (a) of Section 10-151b of the 2012 Supplemental to the Connecticut State Statutes (C.G.S), as amended by Sec.51 of P.A. 12-116, requires, in part that the “superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall continuously evaluate or cause to be evaluated each teacher, in accordance with guidelines established by the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section.” Subsection (c) of Section 10-151b, as amended by Sec.51 of P.A. 12-116 (C.G. S.) requires that “on or before July 1, 2012, the State Board of Education shall adopt, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee established pursuant to section 10-151d, guidelines for a model teacher evaluation program. Such guidelines shall provide guidance on the use of multiple indicators of student academic growth in teacher evaluations. Such guidelines shall include, but are not limited to: 1) methods for assessing student academic growth; 2) a consideration of control factors tracked by a state-wide public school system, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-10a, that may influence teacher performance ratings, including, but not limited to student characteristics, student attendance and student mobility; and 3) minimum requirement for teacher evaluation instruments and procedures.”

Public Act 12-2 Sec.138 (Section 39 of P.A.12-116 is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof effective July 1, 2012).

“For the school year commencing July1, 2013, and each year thereafter, each certified employee shall participate in a program of professional development. Such program of professional development shall: (1) be a comprehensive, sustained approach to improving teacher and administrator effectiveness in increasing student knowledge achievement, (2) focus on refining and improving various effective teaching methods that are shared among and between educators, (3) foster collective responsibility for improved student performance, and (4) be comprised of professional learning that (A) is aligned with rigorous state student academic achievement standards, (B) is conducted among educators at the school and facilitated by principals, coaches, mentors, distinguished educators or other appropriate teachers, (C) occurs frequently on an individual basis or among groups of teachers in a job-embedded process of continuous improvement, and

(D) includes a repository of best practices for teaching methods developed by educators within each school that is continuously available to educators for comment and updating.”

Teacher Evaluation and Professional Learning

Teacher evaluation and professional learning are mutually supportive and beneficial. Through the evaluation process, teacher performance is assessed, clear goals for future performance are developed based on the performance assessment, and the support needed to “close the gap” is identified.

The purpose of the Teacher Evaluation and Professional Learning (TEPL) process is to create and maintain a culture for continuous learning. The teacher evaluation plan fosters collaboration and reflection and focuses on effective instruction, student learning outcomes, and professional responsibilities. Professional learning supports the components of the evaluation plan through systematic and differentiated activities that target both the individual and common/collective needs of the professional staff.

Teachers, in collaboration with their prime evaluator, develop a professional growth plan with goals linked to teacher practice and student learning outcomes. The teacher practice and student learning outcomes are referenced to the Greenwich Indicators of Professional Practice rubric. The professional growth plan delineates all professional learning and appropriate resources needed to ensure goal attainment. These expressed needs serve as the blueprint for the professional learning provided at the district, building and program levels. Teacher goals are reviewed, refined and documented as part of each teacher’s mid-year check-in and annual summative evaluation and this data in turn serves as a foundation for future goals.

The professional learning activities are evaluated through an ongoing process, which includes an evaluation survey at the end of each training session and a systematic review of survey results. Survey data, teacher goals, and identified professional learning needs are all used to determine future professional learning and to ensure that programs are linked to the improvement of instruction and student learning.

NOTES:

For the purposes of this section, "teacher" means a person who is applying for, who holds or who is employed under a teaching certificate, or other equivalent certificate, issued by the state board of education. (Connecticut Code of Professional Responsibility for Teachers, Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, Section 10-145d-400a)

Teacher Evaluation Pilot Program 2007 – 2008

Goal: The purpose of the 2007-2008 pilot program was to field test the new teacher evaluation plan in order to gather data on its use and effectiveness. The information gathered informed the TEPL I committee's work. The revisions that were made are reflected in the current document.

Schools where the pilot was field tested:

- Julian Curtiss Elementary School
- North Mianus Elementary School
- Eastern Middle School
- Clark House at Greenwich High School

Administrators involved in the pilot program:

- Bonnie Butera, Principal
- Nancy Carbone, Principal
- Richard Alessi, Program Administrator-Social Studies
- Marie Jordan-Whitney, Program Coordinator-Reading/ Language Arts
- Ralph Mayo, Principal
- Barbara O'Neill, Program Coordinator-Advanced Learning Program
- Charles Smith, Program Coordinator-Special Education
- David Walko, Housemaster
- Jeffrey Spector, Program Coordinator-Music
- Lizette Dauval, Program Coordinator-ESL/FLES

Teachers: There were approximately 18 non-tenured teachers who were evaluated using the plan in 2007-2008.

Training: During the 2007-2008 school year, the administrators and teachers involved in the pilot program received training related to the new plan at their schools. Two consultants from Cooperative Educational Services, Donna de Recinos and Lyn Nevins, assisted the district with training needs. Ms. Nevins led the year long training of all pilot program administrators, while Ms. de Recinos served as an individual coach for each secondary administrator, working to assist them in the day to day implementation of the program. Ellen Flanagan served as the elementary administrator coach.

Both Dr. Flanagan and Ms. de Recinos worked with the teachers at each of the pilot schools to ensure their understanding of the program. At the beginning of the year, an individualized meeting was scheduled with each teacher involved in the pilot.

Feedback gathered from the training implemented in 2007-2008, informed plans for the 2008-2009 school year, when all teachers and administrators will participate in professional learning related to the new teacher evaluation plan throughout the year.

Teacher Evaluation Training Year 2008-2009

Goal: To provide the Greenwich Public Schools administrators and teachers with direct and explicit training on how to use the revised TEPL I plan and provide them with an opportunity to implement the plan with a small group (3 to 5) of teachers at every school in the district.

Administrators: All administrators attended a two day workshop in August, 2008 and another two day workshop in January, 2009. Dr. John Schacter, a nationally recognized consultant, conducted the workshops and provided professional learning, using the revised Teacher Evaluation plan. As a result of these workshops, administrators were able to:

- deepen their understanding of effective classroom instruction,
- extend their capacity to provide constructive feedback to help teachers improve their teaching, and
- learn new strategies on how to collect and communicate effective teaching evidence such that teachers value administrator coaching, evaluations, and professional input.

Two consultants from Cooperative Educational Services, Donna de Recinos and Lyn Nevins, continued their work with the district, supporting administrators throughout the year with the day to day implementation of the TEPL I plan.

Teachers: All teachers attended a half day workshop, again conducted by Dr. Schacter and his associates, to introduce them to the revised Teacher Evaluation plan and the performance indicators, process and timeline that will be used during the 2009-2010 school year.

Teachers and Administrators: Each school in the district formed a TEPL I Turnkey Training Team. These teams, composed of teachers and administrators, attended three full day training sessions during the 2008-2009 school year. Two sessions provided training on two indicators from the Teacher Evaluation plan that have been identified as “leverage indicators.” Leverage indicators are those that research has shown have a significant positive impact on student performance. The leverage indicators for 08-09 were content organization and delivery and discussion/group work. A third session on the TEPL I process was also conducted. After each session, the Teams returned to their school and trained their own staff.

TEPL I Committee: The committee, which was formed in the spring of 2006, met three times during the 2008-2009 year to develop plans for the full implementation of the TEPL I plan in 2009-2010.

TEPL Training and Implementation 2009-2010

In the 2009-2010 school year, the TEPL I plan was implemented throughout the district and training and support were provided for both administrators and teachers.

Administrators: All Administrators participated in three Leadership Council Meetings devoted to TEPL I. These sessions provided the opportunity to examine in-depth case studies related to different components of the TEPL I plan, including informal observations, the unit of instruction and the end-of-year report.

In addition, all administrators new to the district were required to attend six TEPL I administrator support sessions during the school year. Dr. Todd White also provided modeling and individual coaching for administrators in five elementary schools, each middle school and the high school on the entire formal observation process, including the pre-observation conference, post observation conference and formal observation write-up. A debrief session for administrators was conducted after the coaching days.

Online resources for facilitating the implementation of the TEPL I plan were developed and posted in the TEPL Administrators' Documents folder.

Teachers: Dr. Todd White, a national consultant, provided two workshops on differentiation (a TEPL indicator) for TEPL Turnkey Teams (teachers/administrator) from each building/program. These teams turnkeyed the training to all teachers in their building/program. The first workshop was on differentiation of Content and the second on differentiation of Process.

TEPL I Committee: The committee met twice during the 2009-2010 school year to discuss implementation feedback from teachers and administrators, to design surveys to gather data from staff about the TEPL I process (including the process, rubric and training), to review survey data, and to modify the TEPL I documents in response to survey data and feedback. Modifications to the TEPL I plan included: the unit of instruction timeframe and forms, the professional growth goal form and the pre-observation conference worksheet.

TEPL Training and Support 2010-2011

In 2010-2011, administrators and teachers received on-going training and support in the implementation of the TEPL I plan.

Administrators: All administrators participated in a two day workshop focused on four TEPL indicators: Discussion/Group Work, Differentiation, Thinking/Problem Solving and Questioning. GPS administrators planned and delivered discrete workshops designed to enhance their ability to offer meaningful support to teachers in these areas. The workshops were differentiated for elementary and secondary staff.

In addition, all administrators participated in three Leadership Council meetings devoted to training in Instructional Rounds. This professional learning was conducted by Dr. Flanagan and Dr. Gross. Three school visits were conducted across the district. The visits focused on a problem of practice developed by the school which related to one of the TEPL indicators

Administrators and Teachers: Dr. Todd White offered one day of coaching for each elementary and middle school and three days at the high school. Each school was able to organize the time per building needs. Several schools involved teachers in classroom visits and many had Dr. White conduct after-school workshops on a TEPL indicator.

Dr. White conducted one workshop on Differentiation of Product (the third in a series of three started in 2009-2010) for TEPL Turnkey Teams of teachers and administrators from each building/program. These teams turnkeyed the training to all teachers in their building/program.

TEPL I Committee: The Committee met four times during the 2010-2011 school year to review data from the TEPL I surveys related to the end-of-year process and to modify the TEPL I plan as per survey data and feedback meetings with staff and administrators. Modifications to the TEPL I plan included: the language of the Differentiation and Student Engagement indicators, the professional growth goal setting and reflection forms, the end-of-year process and forms for tenured staff, including the End-of-Year Summative Report, and the formal observation form. In addition, the CCT and GPS Indicators of Professional Practice crosswalk was updated to reflect the revised CCT and several supportive documents and guides were developed for both teachers and administrators.

TEPL Training and Support 2011-2012

In 2011-2012, administrators and teachers received on-going training and support in the implementation of the TEPL I plan.

Administrators: All administrators participated in a three part workshop focused on Feedback. GPS administrators were offered an additional workshop on Questioning as part of the administrator Professional Learning Activities (PLA).

In addition, all administrators participated in Instructional Rounds which were hosted at six schools across the district. The Instructional Rounds were facilitated by Dr. Flanagan and focused on a problem of practice developed by the school which related to one of the TEPL indicators.

Teachers: Based on the Professional Growth focus determined at the end of year conferences in 2011, workshops on two TEPL indicators, Questioning and Feedback, were developed and offered as Professional Learning Activities (PLA). The three part workshops were offered in the fall and repeated again in the winter and spring.

For the first time, on-line professional learning was offered for a TEPL indicator – Differentiation. These short learning modules were designed to be completed by individual teachers or by Instructional Data Team members. Discrete topics within the topic of Differentiation were offered for CEUs or simply as a resource for further growth.

Administrators and Teachers: Dr. Todd White offered one day of coaching for each elementary and middle school and three days at the high school. Each school was able to organize the time per building needs. Several schools had Dr. White work with staff to conduct peer observations.

The district launched a new TEPL support this year in the form of the *TEPL Resource Handbook*. This electronic document provides administrators and teachers with a more in-depth explanation of the thirteen TEPL indicators; includes a synopsis of the research supporting the indicators; gives specific examples of the indicators for both elementary and secondary classrooms; and lists references and resources for further exploration of the indicators.

TEPL I Committee: The committee met six times during the 2011-2012 school year and used surveys and focus groups to gather staff feedback. A survey related to the unit of instruction component was administered and analyzed in the fall. In the spring, teachers

and administrators participated in focus group sessions. Data from the surveys and focus groups was used to determine areas of the plan that would be modified in 2012-2013. Modifications included the development of a streamlined process for tenured teachers in Years 1-3, the development of narratives, guides and forms to support the streamlined process for tenured teachers, and the refinement of several forms related to the unit of instruction. In addition, TEPL I indicators (Engagement, Differentiation, Thinking and Problem Solving) were reviewed and refined.

TEPL Training and Support 2012-2013

In 2012-2013, administrators and teachers continued to receive on-going training and support in the implementation of the TEPL I plan.

Administrators: All administrators participated in Instructional Rounds which were hosted at schools across the district. The Instructional Rounds were facilitated by Dr. Flanagan and focused on a problem of practice developed by the school related to instruction. During the summer of 2012 all administrators were required to complete a TEPL recertification task conducted by an outside consultant. The completed tasks were reviewed and evaluated by the consultant against a district standard. Administrators were given written feedback. Any administrator who failed to meet the district standard was provided with in-person coaching on the areas in need of improvement.

Administrators and Teachers: Dr. Todd White offered coaching for each elementary and middle school and three days at the high school. Each school was able to organize the time per building needs. Several schools had Dr. White work with staff to conduct peer observations. The District purchased a teacher evaluation data management system, *TalentEd*, and trained all administrators and teachers at the start of the school year. The system eliminates all “paper” associated with evaluations and prompts both teachers and evaluators in the TEPL processes.

The District continued to develop and expand the *TEPL Resource Handbook*. This electronic document has provided administrators and teachers with a more in-depth explanation of the TEPL indicators, including a synopsis of the research supporting the indicators; specific examples of the indicators for both elementary and secondary classrooms; and lists references and resources for further exploration of the indicators.

TEPL I Committee: The committee met eight times during the 2012-13 school year to review the new educator evaluation system adopted by the State Board of Education in June 2012; to gather information related to the components of the revised system; and to align the TEPL I document with the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) core requirements. In November 2012, the committee developed a packet (TEPL I document and history of the plan development 2006-2012) which was sent to the CSDE for review and feedback. In January 2013, the committee met with representatives from the CSDE and the Director of Professional Learning from Cooperative Educational Services to review the feedback and to clarify the state expectations. From January through April, the committee made modifications to the TEPL I document in response to CSDE feedback and additional information provided by the CSDE through newsletters

and seminars on the educator evaluation procedures and processes. In March, the committee discussed and came to consensus on an implementation plan for 2013-14 as required by the CSDE. In April and May, committee also developed a plan to inform teachers and administrators of the modifications to the TEPL I plan made in 2012-13. A brochure was published and distributed in May and a narrated power point presentation was made available for viewing online on the district website. The committee also solicited questions from staff and developed a FAQ document. In addition, committee members met with faculty from all schools in the district to provide an overview of the revised teacher evaluation plan. The development of short videos/PowerPoint presentations related to discrete elements of the revised plan (e.g., Student Learning Objectives) will be developed during the summer of 2013. In May, the committee submitted the revised TEPL I plan to the CSDE for final review and approval.

TEPL Training and Support 2013-2015

In 2013-2014, administrators and teachers continued to receive on-going training and support in the implementation of the TEPL I plan.

Administrators: A significant amount of time and energy was spent on training administrators in the new Educator Evaluation requirements so they could be a resource for teachers. All administrators participated in Instructional Rounds which were hosted at schools across the district. The Instructional Rounds were facilitated by Dr. Flanagan and focused on a problem of practice developed by the school related to instruction.

Administrators and Teachers: Dr. Todd White offered coaching for each elementary and middle school and three days at the high school. Each school was able to organize the time per building needs. Several schools collaborated with Dr. White to support staff in conducting peer observations.

TEPL I Committee: The committee met four times during the 2013-14 school year to review, monitor and support the implementation of changes to TEPL required by CSDE. A significant portion of the nine committee meetings in 14-15 were devoted to revising the TEPL rubric to incorporate expectations around Creating a Rigorous Environment that included technology when appropriate.

TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM

The model evaluation and support system developed by the Connecticut State Department of Education in response to the amendments to the Connecticut State Statutes related to teacher evaluation include the use of multiple measures in the comprehensive assessment 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 TEPL I Rubrics for Indicators of Professional 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. This focus area is comprised of two categories:

(a) **Student growth and development (45%)** as determined by the teacher's student learning objective (SLO)

(b) **Whole-school measures of student learning (5%)** as determined by the administrator's progress on student learning objectives (SLOs)

Scores from each of the four categories will be combined to produce a summative performance rating of **Exemplary, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations or Unsatisfactory**.

The performance levels are defined as:

Exemplary – Exceeding indicators of performance

Meets Expectations – Meeting indicators of performance

Below Expectations– Meeting some indicators of performance but not others

Unsatisfactory – Not meeting indicators of performance

Teacher Evaluation Plan Overview

NON-TENURED TEACHERS

The Induction Phase is designed for beginning teachers, non-tenured teachers entering the system from another school district, or previously tenured Connecticut teachers entering within five years. Teachers in the Induction I and Induction II phases will be observed formally and informally during their forty/twenty month probationary period leading to tenure. They will also be involved in the development of professional goals and collaboration with colleagues. In addition, during the third year of Induction I and the first year of Induction II, teachers will develop and implement a unit of instruction as part of the evaluation process. Induction ensures that teachers meet or exceed the professional practice expectations of the Greenwich Public Schools.

Induction Level I: *Teachers in their first four years of service, non-tenured teachers entering from another school district or teachers entering the district with tenure from another state (not Connecticut).*

INDUCTION LEVEL I - YEAR 1

In Year 1, the following procedures will be in place:

- There will be a minimum of three formal observations with written feedback (first before Thanksgiving, second by 2/15 and third by 4/30). Two formal observations will be completed by the prime evaluator and one formal observation will be done by the contributing evaluator. Ongoing informal observations by the prime and/or contributing evaluator will also occur and written feedback from the informal observations will be communicated to the teacher.
- Pre- and post- observation conferences will be part of all formal observations. The teacher will come to the post-observation conference with samples of student work to be utilized during the discussion and be prepared to discuss her/his reflection on the observed lesson.
- Professional growth plans will be developed solely based on TEAM requirements. New staff will meet with the evaluator to establish goals by October 15.
- At the goal setting conference, the teacher will meet with evaluator to become familiar with the TEPL I process, forms and procedures and to establish goals. For staff new to the district, a full orientation to district policies and procedures, including TEPL I, will take place during the hiring process. Annually, a general orientation to the TEPL I plan will occur during the first faculty meeting of the school year.
- A mid-year check-in will take place at least once during the school year. The timing of the check-in will be determined by the teacher and the evaluator.
- The teacher will engage in reflective conversations with evaluators/ administrators/peers.
- Mentor support will be provided as per state requirements.
- An end-of-year conference will take place prior to June 1.
- The End-of-Year Summative Report will be completed by June 15*.

* This date may be adjusted by the administration due to school closings such as snow days.

INDUCTION LEVEL I -YEAR 2

In Year 2, the following procedures will be in place:

- There will be a minimum of two formal observations with written feedback (first before Thanksgiving, second by 4/30). Both formal observations will be conducted by the prime evaluator. Ongoing informal observations by the prime and/or contributing evaluator will also occur and written feedback from the informal observations will be communicated to the teacher.
- Pre- and post-observation conferences will be part of all formal observations. The teacher will come to the post-observation conference with samples of student work to be utilized during the discussion and be prepared to discuss her/his reflection on the observed lesson.
- Professional growth plans will be developed solely based on TEAM requirements. Goal setting will take place at the end-of-year conference in June and be reviewed again in the fall, by October 15. New staff/staff with a change of assignment will meet with the evaluator to establish goals by October 15.
- At the goal setting conference, the teacher will meet with the evaluator to review the TEPL I process, forms and procedures and to establish goals. Annually, a general orientation to the TEPL I plan will occur during the first faculty meeting of the school year.
- A mid-year check-in will take place at least once during the school year. The timing of the check-in will be determined by the teacher and the evaluator.
- The teacher will engage in reflective conversations with evaluators/ administrators/peers.
- Mentor support will be provided as per state requirements.
- An end-of-year conference will take place prior to June 1.
- The End-of-Year Summative Report will be completed by June 15*.

* This date may be adjusted by the administration due to school closings such as snow days.

INDUCTION LEVEL I - YEAR 3

In Year 3, the following procedures will be in place:

- There will be a minimum of one formal observation with written feedback, which will take place during the unit of instruction. There will be a minimum of three, 20-minute informal observations with written feedback by the prime and/or contributing evaluator. The contributing evaluator will also conduct formal observations as requested/ needed. Written feedback from all observations will be communicated to the teacher. **NOTE:** If the unit of instruction is not conducted during year 3, 2 formal observations are required.
- Pre- and post- observation conferences will be part of all formal observations. The teacher will come to the post-observation conference with samples of student work to be utilized during the discussion and be prepared to discuss her/his reflection on the observed lesson.
- Professional growth plans will be developed. Goal setting will take place at the end-of-year conference in June and be reviewed again in the fall, by October 15. New staff/staff with a change of assignment will meet with the evaluator to establish goals by October 15.
- At the goal setting conference, the teacher will meet with the evaluator to review the TEPL I process, forms and procedures and establish goals. Annually, a general orientation to the TEPL I plan will occur during the first faculty meeting of the school year.
- A mid-year check-in will take place at least once during the school year. The timing of the check-in will be determined by the teacher and the evaluator.
- The teacher will engage in reflective conversations with evaluators/ administrators/peers.
- A unit of instruction will be developed and implemented. The recommended timeframe for the unit is a minimum of two weeks. The unit must be completed by April 30. The focus of the unit and the timeframe will be established collaboratively by the teacher and evaluator at the initial planning meeting.
- The end-of-unit conference will include an analysis of pre- and post- data related to student work that was part of the unit of instruction.
- An end-of-unit written reflection will be prepared by the teacher.
- The evaluator will provide written feedback to the teacher within fifteen school days of the completion of the end-of-unit conference.
- An end-of-year conference will take place prior to June 1.
- The End-of-Year Summative Report will be completed by June 15*.

* This date may be adjusted by the administration due to school closings such as snow days.

INDUCTION LEVEL I - YEAR 4

In Year 4, the following procedures will be in place:

- There will be a minimum of one formal observation with written feedback, which will take place before Thanksgiving. There will be a minimum of three, 20-minute informal observations with written feedback by the prime and/or contributing evaluator. The contributing evaluator will also conduct formal observations as requested/ needed. Written feedback from all observations will be communicated to the teacher.
- Pre- and post- observation conferences will be part of all formal observations. The teacher will come to the post-observation conference with samples of student work to be utilized during the discussion and be prepared to discuss her/his reflection on the observed lesson.
- Professional growth plans will be developed. Goal setting will take place at the end-of-year conference in June and be reviewed again in the fall, by October 15. New staff/staff with a change of assignment will meet with the evaluator to establish goals by October 15.
- At the goal setting conference, the teacher will meet with the evaluator to review the TEPL I process, forms and procedures and to establish goals. Annually, a general orientation to the TEPL I plan will occur during the first faculty meeting of the school year.
- A mid-year check-in will take place at least once during the school year. The timing of the check-in will be determined by the teacher and the evaluator.
- The teacher will engage in reflective conversations with evaluators/ administrators/peers.
- The prime evaluator, after consulting with the contributing evaluator, will write a letter of recommendation for or against tenure, give a copy to the teacher, and send the original to the office of Human Resources by December 15.
- An end-of-year conference will take place prior to June 1.
- The End-of-Year Summative Report will be completed by June 15*.
*This date may be adjusted by the administration due to school closings such as snow days.

NOTE: In cases where the Unit of Instruction was not completed in year 3, it must be completed in the fall of year 4.

Teacher Evaluation Plan Overview

NON-TENURED TEACHERS

The Induction Phase is designed for beginning teachers, non-tenured teachers entering the system from another school district, or previously tenured Connecticut teachers entering within five years. Teachers in the Induction I and Induction II phases will be observed formally and informally during their forty/twenty month probationary period leading to tenure. They will also be involved in the development of professional goals and collaboration with colleagues. In addition, during the third year of Induction I and the first year of Induction II, teachers will develop and implement a unit of instruction as part of the evaluation process. Induction ensures that teachers meet or exceed the professional practice expectations of the Greenwich Public Schools.

Induction Level II: *Teachers who enter the district as tenured teachers from another district in Connecticut within five years.*

INDUCTION LEVEL II - YEAR 1

In Year 1, the following procedures will be in place:

- There will be a minimum of three formal observations with written feedback (first before Thanksgiving, second by 2/15 and third by 4/30). Two formal observations will be completed by the prime evaluator and one formal observation will be done by the contributing evaluator. Ongoing informal observations by the prime and/or contributing evaluator will also occur and written feedback from the informal observations will be communicated to the teacher.
- Pre- and post- observation conferences will be part of all formal observations. The teacher will come to the post-observation conference with samples of student work to be utilized during the discussion and be prepared to discuss her/his reflection on the observed lesson.
- Professional growth plans will be developed. New staff will meet with the evaluator to establish goals by October 15.
- At the goal setting conference, the teacher will meet with the evaluator to become familiar with the TEPL I process, forms and procedures and to establish goals. For staff new to the district, a full orientation to district policies and procedures, including TEPL I, will take place during the hiring process. Annually, a general orientation to the TEPL I plan will occur during the first faculty meeting of the school year.
- A mid-year check-in will take place at least once during the school year. The timing of the check-in will be determined by the teacher and the evaluator.
- The teacher will engage in reflective conversations with evaluators/administrators/peers.
- Peer support will be provided as appropriate.
- A unit of instruction will be developed and implemented. The recommended timeframe for the unit is a minimum of two weeks. The unit must be completed by April 30. The focus of the unit and the timeframe will be established collaboratively by the teacher and evaluator at the initial planning meeting.
- The end-of-unit conference will include an analysis of pre- and post- data related to student work that was part of the unit of instruction.
- An end-of-unit written reflection will be prepared by the teacher.
- The evaluator will provide written feedback to the teacher within fifteen school days of the completion of the end-of-unit conference.
- An end-of-year conference will take place prior to June 1.
- The End-of-Year Summative Report will be completed by June 15*.

INDUCTION LEVEL II - YEAR 2

In Year 2, the following procedures will be in place:

- There will be a minimum of two formal observations with written feedback (first before Thanksgiving and second by 2/15) and ongoing informal observations by the prime and contributing evaluators. Written feedback from the informal observations will be communicated to the teacher. The contributing evaluator will also conduct formal observations as requested/needed.
- Pre- and post- observation conferences will be part of all formal observations. The teacher will come to the post-observation conference with samples of student work to be utilized during the discussion and be prepared to discuss her/his reflection on the observed lesson.
- Professional growth plans will be developed. Goal setting will take place at the end-of-year conference in June and be reviewed again in the fall, by October 15. New staff/staff with a change of assignment will meet with the evaluator to establish goals by October 15.
- At the goal setting conference, the teacher will meet with the evaluator to review the TEPL I process, forms and procedures and to establish goals. Annually, a general orientation to the TEPL I plan will occur during the first faculty meeting of the school year.
- A mid-year check-in will take place at least once during the school year. The timing of the check-in will be determined by the teacher and the evaluator.
- The teacher will engage in reflective conversations with evaluators/ administrators/ peers.
- The prime evaluator, after consulting with the contributing evaluator, will write a letter of recommendation for or against tenure, give a copy to the teacher, and send the original to the office of Human Resources by December 15.
- An end-of-year conference will take place prior to June 1.
- The End-of-Year Summative Report will be completed by June 15*.
This date may be adjusted by the administration due to school closings such as snow days.

NOTE: In cases where the Unit of Instruction was not completed in year 1, it must be completed in the fall of year 2.

Teacher Evaluation Plan Overview

TENURED TEACHERS

Tenured teachers are evaluated annually in a four year cycle. Tenured teachers will be observed formally and/or informally in all four years. Formal observations may be conducted at any time as deemed appropriate by the evaluator. During the first three years, teacher will be involved in the development of professional goals and collaboration with colleagues. During the fourth year, teachers will continue to be involved in ongoing professional growth activities and in addition, they will develop, implement and analyze a unit of instruction as part of the evaluation process. The professional activities of the teacher evaluation process ensure that teachers meet or exceed the professional practice expectations of the Greenwich Public Schools.

TENURED TEACHERS

Years 1, 2 and 3

In Years 1, 2 and 3, the following procedures will be in place:

- There will be ongoing informal observations, with at least one thirty minute informal observation conducted by the prime evaluator annually. Written feedback from the informal observations will be communicated to the teacher.
- Professional growth plans will be developed and/or continued. Goal setting will take place at the end-of-year conference in June and be reviewed again in the fall, by October 15. Staff with a change of assignment will meet with the evaluator to establish goals by October 15.
- At the goal setting conference, the teacher will meet with the evaluator to review the TEPL I process, forms and procedures and to establish goals. Annually, a general orientation to the TEPL I plan will occur during the first faculty meeting of the school year.
- A mid-year check-in will take place at least once during the school year. The timing of the check-in will be determined by the teacher and the evaluator.
- The teacher will engage in reflective conversations with evaluators/ administrators/peers.
- An end-of-year conference will take place prior to June 1.
- The End-of-Year Summative Report will be completed by June 15*.

* This date may be adjusted by the administration due to school closings such as snow days.

TENURED TEACHERS **STREAMLINED PROCESS***

Years 1, 2 and 3

In Years 1, 2 and 3, the following procedures will be in place:

- There will be ongoing informal observations, with at least one thirty minute informal observation conducted by the prime evaluator annually. The majority of informal feedback will be focused to the area targeted for professional growth; however, feedback on any aspect of the teacher's performance will be acceptable.
- Written feedback from the informal observations will be communicated to the teacher.
- Professional growth plans will be developed and/or continued. The professional growth goal, linked to a TEPL I indicator, identified at the end of Year 4 for year 1 of the new cycle, may be continued or a new professional growth goal may be established in years 2 and/or 3. Goal setting will take place at the end-of-year conference in June and be reviewed again in the fall, by October 15. Staff with a change of assignment will meet with the evaluator to establish goals by October 15.
- At the goal setting conference, the teacher will meet with the evaluator to review the TEPL I process, forms and procedures and to establish goals. Annually, a general orientation to the TEPL I plan will occur during the first faculty meeting of the school year.
- A mid-year check-in will take place at least once during the school year. The timing of the check-in will be determined by the teacher and the evaluator.
- The teacher will engage in reflective conversations with evaluators/ administrators/peers.
- An end-of-year conference will take place prior to June 1.
- The End-of-Year Summative Report will be completed by June 15*.

* This date may be adjusted by the administration due to school closings such as snow days.

Please note: In order to be eligible for placement in the streamlined tenured teachers' process, a tenured teacher must receive a performance continuum rating of at least "Meets Expectations" for **all** TEPL indicators on the end-of-year summative report in year 4 or on the end-of-year summative report in Years 1 or 2 if the teacher is not already in the streamlined process.

TENURED TEACHERS

Year 4

In Year 4, the following procedures will be in place:

- There will be one formal observation with written feedback conducted by the prime evaluator during the unit of instruction. Ongoing informal observations will also occur and written feedback from the informal observations will be communicated to the teacher.
- Pre- and post-observation conferences will be part of all formal observations. The teacher will come to the post-observation conference with samples of student work to be utilized during the discussion and be prepared to discuss her/his reflection on the observed lesson.
- Professional growth plans will be developed and/or continued. The professional growth goal, linked to a TEPL I indicator, will be identified at the end-of-year conference in June and be reviewed again in the fall, by October 15. Staff with a change of assignment will meet with the evaluator to establish goals by October 15.
- At the goal setting conference, the teacher will meet with the evaluator to review the TEPL I process, forms and procedures and to establish goals. Annually, a general orientation to the TEPL I plan will occur during the first faculty meeting of the school year.
- A mid-year check-in will take place at least once during the school year. The timing of the check-in will be determined by the teacher and the evaluator.
- The teacher will engage in ongoing reflective conversations with evaluators/administrators/peers.
- A unit of instruction will be developed and implemented. The recommended timeframe for the unit is a minimum of two weeks. The unit must be completed by April 30. The focus of the unit and the timeframe will be established collaboratively by the teacher and evaluator at the initial planning meeting.
- The end-of-unit conference will include an analysis of pre- and post-data related to student work that was part of the unit of instruction.
- An end-of-unit written reflection will be prepared by the teacher.
- The evaluator will provide written feedback to the teacher within fifteen school days of the completion of the end-of-unit conference.
- An end-of-year conference will take place prior to June 1.

- **An End-of-Year Summative Report and Rubric Checklist will be completed by June 15*.**

*This date may be adjusted by the administration due to school closings such as snow days.

Sample Professional Growth Activities

- **Study Group** – Participants meet with a group of 3-5 colleagues to learn new strategies, experiment with these strategies, analyze the resulting student work from these strategies, and to problem solve. Study groups can be formed to focus on content that supports a teacher’s goal or to support the implementation of a program goal.
- **Action Research** - The teacher develops a hypothesis and a research project to test that hypothesis. The teacher would then identify lessons or a unit in which to test the hypothesis and measure student achievement. Findings would be briefly presented in a paper and discussed with other faculty.
- **Analysis of Classroom Artifacts** - The teacher would maintain a file of instructional materials (e.g., lesson plan, handout, quiz, test, etc.) related to an area of instruction from the TEPL I rubric. The analysis might include the congruency between what is taught and how it is tested and the relationship between instructional strategies used and student achievement.
- **Preparing and Presenting a Staff Development Program** - The teacher, with interest and expertise in an area of instruction, would develop and present a program on the topic to staff. The presentation should include what participants will know or be able to do as a result of participation in the program, why it is important to learn, and how it relates to student learning. (Non-stipend)
- **Portfolio** - The teacher would develop a detailed representation of work over a significant period of time to demonstrate various aspects of district performance standards.
- **Work toward National Certification** – The teacher would complete the requirements of national certification by developing an extensive portfolio that demonstrates the majority of the criteria in the GPS Indicators of Professional Practice and the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching with significant emphasis on providing evidence of effective analysis of student learning and student growth over time.
- **Peer Coaching** - Peers agree to observe each other’s classes a minimum of two times during the school year. The purpose is to provide and receive feedback pertaining to their goal. The peer should be someone who is helpful, supportive, and knowledgeable. The teacher may choose to have more than one peer observer at the same time or a series of peer observers over a period of time. With peer observation, two teachers may be working on similar growth plans or be working on different plans.
- **Collaborative Projects** - A teacher works with another teacher to develop units of learning, implement the units, and analyze and reflect on their impact on student learning.
- **Submission of articles for publication** - A teacher prepares and presents an article for publication in a professional journal.
- **Co-Teaching** - A teacher and a colleague collaboratively plan, implement, and evaluate a unit. Both share the responsibility for developing, presenting, and assessing the unit and identifying challenges and successes.
- **Curriculum development and adaptation** – The teacher creates new instructional materials and strategies or tailors existing ones to meet the learning needs of students and demonstrates/shares these materials with the grade level/department.

ROLES

Prime evaluator

The prime evaluator's role is to provide intense supervision and support to beginning teachers. She/he conducts ongoing informal observation with brief written/oral feedback and conducts a minimum of two formal observations each year in Induction I and Induction II. This individual also writes the End-of-Year Report and, in consultation with the contributing evaluator, notifies the teacher of progress toward tenure at the end of the year. *Appointed by building principal for those members assigned to evaluation in that building.*

Contributing evaluator

The contributing evaluator's role is to become familiar with the teacher's performance during the non-tenured years and to provide continuity in the event that the teacher's prime evaluator changes during that period. This individual will contribute to the decision to award tenure and will consult with the prime evaluator on the notice of progress toward tenure. She/he will conduct at least one formal observation during the first year and may conduct informal observations in subsequent years. Additional formal observations may be conducted as needed.

This individual may be a program coordinator or administrator, director or building administrator. The contributing evaluator shall not be the prime evaluator. All administrators in the district are eligible to serve as contributing evaluators. Contributing evaluators will be assigned teachers at the appropriate level. *Appointed by superintendent or his/her designee in consultation with the principal.*

Complementary evaluator

The District may decide to use Complementary evaluators who conduct formal observations, including pre and post conferences. The Complementary evaluator will share feedback with the primary evaluator assigned to the teacher, however, the primary evaluator will have sole responsibility for assigning final summative ratings. *Appointed by superintendent or his/her designee in consultation with the principal.*

Mentor

The role of the mentor is to help the beginning teacher make a successful entry into the teaching profession and a successful adjustment to the policies and practices of the school to which she/he is assigned. The mentor helps the beginning teacher meet State of Connecticut TEAM requirements and is assigned by the GPS Human Resources department.

PHASE	WHO	WHEN	PURPOSE	PROCESS
INDUCTION LEVEL I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning teachers • Non-tenured teachers entering the district 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-tenured years of teaching • First two years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve teaching, learning and student performance • To ensure adequate job performance • To demonstrate teaching standards • To provide support for new teachers • To provide data for employment decisions 	<p>YEAR 1 <u>Observations:</u> A minimum of three formal with written feedback (first before Thanksgiving; the second by 2/15 and the third by 4/30); 2 formal observations by prime evaluator; 1 formal observation by contributing evaluator; ongoing informals with written feedback to teacher <u>*Professional Learning/Teacher Performance and Practice Goal:</u> Determined by evaluator and teacher; goal setting by 10/15. <u>Unit of Instruction:</u> No <u>Summative Evaluation:</u> Based on GPS Indicators of Professional Practice completed by June 15.</p> <p>YEAR 2 <u>Observations:</u> A minimum of two formal observations with written feedback (first before Thanksgiving, second by 4/30) conducted by prime evaluator; ongoing informals by prime evaluator and contributing evaluator with written feedback to teacher <u>*Professional Learning/Teacher Performance and Practice Goal:</u> Determined by evaluator and teacher; goal setting by 10/15 <u>Unit of Instruction:</u> No <u>Summative Evaluation:</u> Based on GPS Indicators of Professional Practice completed by June 15.</p>
<p>NOTE: For more detailed information regarding Induction Level I, please refer to the Teacher Evaluation Plan Overview narrative on pages 15 - 16. * In years 1 and 2 of Induction Level I, <u>Professional Learning/Teacher Performance and Practice Goal</u> will be based on the requirements of TEAM. A mid-year check-in will take place at least once during the school year. The teacher and the evaluator will determine the timing. Summative Evaluation date may be extended by administration due to snow days.</p>				

PHASE	WHO	WHEN	PURPOSE	PROCESS
INDUCTION LEVEL I and INDUCTION LEVEL II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beginning teachers • Non-tenured teachers entering the district • Tenured teachers who enter Greenwich from another CT district within five years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-tenured years of teaching • Years 3 and 4 for Induction I; Years 1 and 2 for Induction II (previously tenured CT teachers) • Until tenure is achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve teaching, learning and student performance • To ensure adequate job performance • To demonstrate teaching standards • To provide support for new teachers • To provide data for employment decisions 	<p>YEAR 3 (Induction I) /YEAR 1 (Induction II) <u>Observations:</u> A minimum of one (Induction I) or three (Induction II – first before Thanksgiving, second by 2/15 and third by 4/30) formal observations with written feedback); minimum of three, 20-minutes informal observations (Induction I) and ongoing informals (Induction II) by prime and contributing evaluators with written feedback to teacher and formal observation by contributing evaluator as requested/needed. <u>Professional Learning/Teacher Performance and Practice Goal:</u> Determined by evaluator and teacher; goal setting by 10/15 <u>Unit of Instruction:</u> Yes; topic, scope, focus and timeframe established in collaboration with evaluator; end-of-unit conference, teacher end-of-unit reflection (written); evaluator end of unit feedback (written) <u>Summative Evaluation:</u> Based on GPS Indicators of Professional Practice completed by June 15.</p> <p>YEAR 4 (Induction I) / Year 2 (Induction II) <u>Observations:</u> A minimum of one formal (Induction I); two formal observations (Induction II) with written feedback (first before Thanksgiving and the second by 2/15); minimum of three, 20-minutes informal observations (Induction I) and on-going informals (Induction II) by prime and contributing evaluators with written feedback to teacher. Formal observations by contributing evaluator as requested/needed. <u>Professional Learning/Teacher Performance and Practice Goal:</u> Determined by evaluator and teacher; goal setting by 10/15. <u>Unit of Instruction:</u> No, if completed in year 3 <u>Summative Evaluation:</u> Based on GPS Indicators of Professional Practice completed by June 15.</p>
<p>NOTE: For more detailed information, please refer to the Teacher Evaluation Plan Overview narrative on pages 17 -18 (Induction Level I), pages 20-21 (Induction Level II). A mid-year check-in will take place at least once during the school year. The teacher and the evaluator will determine the timing. Summative Evaluation date may be extended by administration due to snow days.</p>				

PHASE	WHO	WHEN	PURPOSE	PROCESS
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH	Experienced, tenured teachers, who consistently demonstrate competence	One to three year plan, dependent on goals and objectives, with annual analysis and assessment, unit of instruction in year four	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve student learning through effective teaching • To promote continuous growth, collaboration, teacher leadership, and reflective practices • To promote district, department, school and SIT goals and continuous school improvement. • To encourage collaboration, using multiple sources of data, and taking action. 	<p>YEAR 1, YEAR 2, and YEAR 3 <u>Observations:</u> Ongoing informal observations with written feedback to teacher; at least one thirty-minute informal observation annually. <u>Professional Learning/Teacher Performance and Practice:</u> Determined by evaluator and teacher; goal setting by 10/15. <u>Unit of Instruction:</u> No <u>Summative Evaluation:</u> Based on GPS Indicators of Professional Practice, completed by June 15.</p> <p>YEAR 4 <u>Observations:</u> One formal as part of unit of instruction; ongoing informals with written feedback to teacher <u>Professional Learning/Teacher Performance and Practice:</u> Determined by evaluator and teacher; goal setting by 10/15. <u>Unit of Instruction:</u> Yes; topic, scope, focus and timeframe established in collaboration with evaluator; end of unit conference, teacher end-of-unit reflection (written); evaluator end-of-unit feedback (written). <u>Summative Evaluation:</u> Based on GPS Indicators of Professional Practice, completed by June 15.</p>
<p>Note: For more detailed information regarding the Professional Growth Phase, please refer to the Teacher Evaluation Plan Overview narrative on pages 23 -25. For more detailed information regarding the Tenured Teachers’ Streamlined Process, please refer to the Teacher Evaluation Overview Narrative on page 24. A mid-year check-in will take place at least once during the school year. The teacher and the evaluator will determine the timing. Summative Evaluation date may be extended by administration due to snow days.</p>				

Appendix A: Indicators of Professional Practice Overview

LEARNING	TEACHING	PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES
<p>INDICATORS:</p> <p>Student Work</p> <p>Engagement</p> <p>Discussion/ Group Work</p>	<p>INDICATORS:</p> <p>Planning and Assessment</p> <p>Learning Outcomes</p> <p>Content Organization and Delivery</p> <p>Questioning</p> <p>Feedback</p> <p>Differentiation</p> <p>Thinking and Problem Solving</p> <p>Efficiency and Procedures</p> <p>Classroom Management</p> <p>Reflection</p>	<p>INDICATORS:</p> <p>Record Keeping</p> <p>Communication</p> <p>School and District Contributions</p> <p>Professional Growth</p> <p>Professionalism</p>

Appendix B: Rubrics for Indicators of Professional Practice

For purposes of CSDE reporting, the Exemplary and Exceeds Expectations performance categories will be reported as an EXEMPLARY (4) rating.

TEACHING AND LEARNING

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<p>INDICATOR: <u>PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT</u></p> <p><i>ARTIFACT</i></p>	<p>Teacher plans include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ daily objectives that specify student performance outcomes aligned with district curricula. ▪ weekly assessments with clear measurement criteria aligned to the district curricula. ▪ evidence of the use of assessment to adjust planning for students that do not meet the objective and for those that exceed them. ▪ evidence of more than 3 assessment practices (e.g., essay, project, portfolio, oral report/performance, short answer & multiple choice, etc.) that measure the performance outcome in different ways. 	<p>Exceeds Expectations (Must include all Meets Expectations and at least one (1) Exemplary element.)</p>	<p>Teacher plans include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ daily objectives that are aligned with the district curricula. ▪ monthly assessments aligned to the district curricula. ▪ evidence of the use of 2 assessment practices (e.g., essay, project, portfolio, oral report/performance, short answer & multiple choice, etc.) to adjust planning for students who do not meet objectives. 	<p>Below Expectations (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)</p>	<p>Teacher plans include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ objectives that are not aligned with district curricula and lack clear student performance outcomes. ▪ little evidence of assessments that measure performance outcomes. ▪ little evidence of how assessment is used to adjust planning for student learning.
<p>INDICATOR: <u>STUDENT WORK</u></p> <p><i>ARTIFACT</i></p>	<p>Students complete assignments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ organize, interpret, analyze, create, and evaluate information. ▪ draw conclusions, make generalizations, and produce extended written arguments. ▪ make connections to prior learning, big ideas, life experiences, and other disciplines. 		<p>Students complete assignments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ organize, analyze, and interpret information. ▪ draw conclusions and support them through writing. ▪ make connections to prior learning. 		<p>Students complete assignments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ mostly reproduce information. ▪ rarely draw conclusions and support them through writing. ▪ rarely connect what they are learning to prior learning or life experiences.
<p>INDICATOR: <u>REFLECTION</u></p> <p><i>ARTIFACT</i></p>	<p>Prior to each instructional evaluation conference, the teacher writes a reflection that accurately identifies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the lesson's strengths and weaknesses. ▪ specific alternatives to improve unsuccessful teaching. ▪ professional learning opportunities that can improve an area of his or her instruction. 		<p>Prior to each instructional evaluation conference, the teacher writes a reflection that accurately identifies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ his or her teaching strengths and weaknesses. ▪ alternatives to improve unsuccessful teaching. 		<p>Prior to each instructional conference, the teacher writes a reflection that inaccurately identifies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ his or her teaching strengths and weaknesses. ▪ alternatives to improve unsuccessful teaching.

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<p><u>INDICATOR:</u> <u>LEARNING OUTCOMES</u></p> <p><i>OBSERVATION</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The learning outcome is specific, measurable, aligned to district content standards, and meaningful (e.g. Meaning is connections to background knowledge, or using manipulatives, organizers, problems, visual representations, games, etc.). ▪ All aspects of the lesson (e.g. review, introduction, presentation, activity, closure) are focused on a limited set of skills to help students reach the outcome. ▪ Teacher provides both additional feedback/teaching to students who have not achieved the outcome and additional challenges for those that have. 	<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Exceeds Expectations (Must include all Meets Expectations and at least one (1) Exemplary element.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The learning outcome is specific, measurable and aligned to district content standards. ▪ Most aspects of the lesson (e.g. review, introduction, presentation, activity, closure) are focused on a limited set of skills to help students reach the outcome. ▪ Teacher provides either additional feedback/teaching for students who have not achieved the outcome, or additional challenges for those that have. 	<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Below Expectations (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The learning outcome is ambiguous or too simple or too advanced for the majority of students. ▪ Few aspects of the lesson (e.g., review, introduction, presentation, activity, closure) are focused on a limited set of skills. ▪ Teacher does not provide additional feedback/teaching to students who have not achieved the outcome.
<p><u>INDICATOR:</u> <u>CONTENT ORGANIZATION AND DELIVERY</u></p> <p><i>OBSERVATION</i></p>	<p>Organization and delivery of content includes all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Previewing what will be learned and why it is worth learning. ▪ Teaching concepts step-by-step with visuals, graphic organizers, mnemonics, diagrams, cues, manipulatives, problems, etc. ▪ Using a variety of examples sequenced from easy to difficult ▪ Providing frequent opportunities for all students to respond and receive immediate and specific feedback. ▪ Providing opportunities for purposeful student reflection. 		<p>Organization and delivery of content includes all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Previewing what will be learned and why it is worth learning. ▪ Teaching the concept step-by-step using visuals, graphic organizers, mnemonics, diagrams, cues, manipulatives, problems, etc. ▪ Using a variety of examples sequenced from easy to more difficult. 		<p>Organization and delivery of content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Neither previews what will be learned, nor why it is important to learn it. ▪ Does not sufficiently break down concepts and ideas to facilitate student understanding. ▪ Uses few examples to illustrate the concept or ideas to be learned.

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<p>INDICATOR: QUESTIONING</p> <p><i>OBSERVATION</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A high frequency of questions (procedural and academic) is asked. ▪ A wide variety of question types (recall, comprehension, analysis, application, problem solving) are posed. ▪ Most questions require whole class interactivity (e.g., signaling, whiteboards, think-pair-share, rally table, line up review, etc.). ▪ Teacher calls on volunteers, non-volunteers, and a balance of students based on race, ability, and gender. ▪ Students are explicitly taught how to generate questions to deepen their understanding. 	<p>Exceeds Expectations (Must include all Meets Expectations and at least one (1) Exemplary element.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A moderate frequency of questions (procedural and academic) is asked. ▪ Some different question types (recall, comprehension, analysis, application, problem solving) are posed. ▪ Some questions require whole class interactivity (e.g., signaling, whiteboards, think-pair-share, rally table, line up review, etc.). ▪ Teacher calls on volunteers, non-volunteers, and a balance of students based on race, ability, and gender. 	<p>Below Expectations (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A low frequency of questions (procedural and academic) is asked. ▪ Few different question types (recall, comprehension, analysis, application, problem solving) are posed. ▪ Questions rarely require whole class interactivity. ▪ Teacher calls on mostly volunteers and high ability students.
<p>INDICATOR: FEEDBACK</p> <p><i>OBSERVATION</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teacher gives a high frequency of feedback that is academically focused, corrective, and specific to the learning outcome. ▪ Teacher circulates to prompt student thinking and assess progress. ▪ Feedback from students (verbal and nonverbal) is used to adjust instruction. ▪ Teacher intentionally engages students in giving academically focused, corrective, and specific feedback to one another. ▪ Teacher explicitly instructs students how to self evaluate and improve their own work. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teacher gives a moderate frequency of feedback that is academically focused, corrective, and specific to the learning outcome. ▪ Teacher circulates during instructional activities to support engagement. ▪ Feedback from students (verbal and nonverbal) is used by the teacher to adjust instruction. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teacher gives a low frequency of feedback. ▪ Teacher circulates during instructional activities, but mostly monitors behavior. ▪ Teacher does not adjust instruction based on students (verbal and nonverbal) feedback.

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<p>INDICATOR: <u>ENGAGEMENT</u></p> <p><i>OBSERVATION</i></p>	<p>During lesson (s), all students are actively involved in learning activities <u>most of the time</u> as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participating in relevant discussions with teachers/peers • attending/or being on-task during the instructional period • being involved in objective-related tasks • asking and responding to questions that are directly tied to the objective (not directions) • explaining their thinking (schema) either verbally or in writing (or via some other appropriate method of expression) • explaining the purpose(s) of the intended learning • explaining how the intended learning is connected to the real world, to other disciplines, or to prior learning • demonstrating creativity/novel ideas • monitoring their own work through self-assessment 	<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Exceeds Expectations (Must include all Meets Expectations and at least one (1) Exemplary element.)</p>	<p>During lesson (s), most students are actively involved in learning activities <u>most of the time</u> as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participating in relevant discussions with teachers/peers • attending/or being on-task during the instructional period • being involved in objective-related tasks • asking and responding to questions that are directly tied to the objective (not directions) • explaining their thinking (schema) either verbally or in writing (or via some other appropriate method of expression) • explaining the purpose(s) of the intended learning 	<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Below Expectations (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)</p>	<p>During lesson (s), some students are <u>consistently</u> not actively involved in learning activities as evidenced by a lack of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participating in relevant discussions with teachers/peers • attending/or being on- task during the instructional period • being involved in objective-related tasks • asking and responding to questions that are directly tied to the objective (not directions) • explaining their thinking (schema) either verbally or in writing (or via some other appropriate method of expression) • explaining the purpose(s) of the intended learning
<p>INDICATOR: <u>DISCUSSION/GROUP WORK</u></p> <p><i>OBSERVATION</i></p>	<p>The lesson incorporates group or peer-to-peer work in which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students' practice, feedback, and interaction are maximized. • students are held accountable for group and individual work. • all students know their roles and responsibilities. • group composition (e.g., size, ability level, race, and gender) is appropriate. • group tasks create interdependence • groups are guided towards self-reflection and independence as learners. 		<p>The lesson incorporates group or peer-to-peer work in which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ students' practice, feedback, and interaction are enhanced. ▪ students are held accountable for group work. ▪ most students know their roles and responsibilities. ▪ group composition (e.g., size, ability level, race, and gender) is appropriate. 		<p>The lesson incorporates group or peer-to-peer work which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ does not increase practice, feedback, or interaction more than if students were to work individually. ▪ few students know their roles and responsibilities. ▪ does not hold groups or individuals accountable.

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<p>INDICATOR: <u>DIFFERENTIATION</u></p> <p>OBSERVATION/ ARTIFACT</p>	<p>During lesson (s), there is consistent evidence that the teacher meets the individual needs of students based on knowledge, skills, interests, backgrounds and learning styles to help each student achieve the learning objective by differentiating :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>content</u> (e.g., tiered assignments, accelerating or decelerating the curriculum) ▪ <u>process</u> (e.g., direct instruction, flexible grouping) ▪ <u>product</u> (e.g., oral/written performance) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher provides a clear rationale for differentiation. • The teacher’s decision to differentiate is based on the analysis of student data prior to the lesson and data gathered during the lesson. 	<p>Exceeds Expectations (Must include all Meets Expectations and at least one (1) Exemplary element.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During lesson(s), there is evidence that the teacher meets the needs of groups of students based on knowledge, skills, interests, backgrounds and learning styles to help groups achieve the learning objective by differentiating : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>content</u> (e.g., tiered assignments, accelerating or decelerating the curriculum) <p style="text-align: center;">and/or</p> ▪ <u>process</u> (e.g., direct instruction, flexible grouping) <p style="text-align: center;">and/or</p> ▪ <u>product</u> (e.g., oral/written performance) • The teacher provides a clear rationale for differentiation. • The teacher’s decision to differentiate is based on the analysis of student data prior to the lesson. 	<p>Below Expectations (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During lesson (s), there is no evidence that the teacher differentiates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>content</u> (e.g., tiered assignments, accelerating or decelerating the curriculum) <p style="text-align: center;">and/or</p> ▪ <u>process</u> (e.g., direct instruction, flexible grouping) <p style="text-align: center;">and/or</p> ▪ <u>product</u> (e.g., oral/written performance)

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<p>INDICATOR: <u>THINKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING</u></p> <p><i>OBSERVATION</i></p>	<p>During lesson (s), there is consistent evidence that 2 thinking approaches are/ have been intentionally and explicitly taught.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analytical thinking where students either: compare/contrast, evaluate/explain, classify/categorize, or draw/ justify conclusions. ▪ Practical thinking where students use and apply ideas they learned to work on real-life tasks. ▪ Creative thinking where students generate ideas, design, create, and evaluate a final product. ▪ Research based thinking where student hypothesize, observe, experiment, record, and report results. ▪ Self-assessment where students assess their own learning by setting goals, monitoring progress, and evaluating performance. 	<p>Exceeds Expectations (Must include all Meets Expectations and at least one (1) Exemplary element.)</p>	<p>During lesson (s), there is evidence that 1 thinking approach is/ has been intentionally and explicitly taught.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Analytical thinking where students either: compare/contrast, evaluate/explain, classify/categorize, or draw/justify conclusions. ▪ Practical thinking where students use and apply ideas they learned to work on real-life tasks. ▪ Creative thinking where students generate ideas, design, create, and evaluate a final product. ▪ Research based thinking where student hypothesize, observe, experiment, record, and report results. ▪ Self-assessment where students assess their own learning by setting goals, monitoring progress, and evaluating performance. 	<p>Below Expectations (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)</p>	<p>During lesson (s) there is no evidence that thinking approaches are/have been intentionally and explicitly taught.</p>
<p>INDICATOR: <u>EFFICIENCY AND PROCEDURES</u></p> <p><i>OBSERVATION</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Procedures (e.g., entering the room, distributing and collecting materials, transitioning between learning activities, gaining students' attention, what to do when students complete work early, how to work independently and in groups, returning to a task after an interruption, etc.) are well established, highly efficient, and executed by all students. ▪ 85% of classroom time is devoted to academic learning. ▪ Pacing in each part of the lesson maximizes learning for all students. ▪ Physical space is organized in a manner conducive to learning. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Procedures (e.g., entering the room, distributing and collecting materials, transitioning between learning activities, gaining students' attention, what to do when students complete work early, how to work independently and in groups, returning to a task after an interruption, etc.) are established, but some are not executed efficiently by all students. ▪ 65% of classroom time is devoted to academic learning. ▪ Pacing in each part of the lesson is appropriate for the majority of students, but sometimes is too fast or too slow. ▪ Physical space is organized in a manner conducive to learning. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Few procedures are established, or are poorly designed. ▪ Less than 50% of classroom time is devoted to academic learning. ▪ Pacing is uneven and too fast or too slow for the majority of the students. ▪ Physical space is organized poorly making it difficult for students to get into groups and easily and efficiently access learning materials

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<p>INDICATOR: <u>CLASSROOM</u> <u>MANAGEMENT</u></p> <p><i>OBSERVATION</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Students are consistently well-behaved. ▪ Teacher-student interactions demonstrate caring and respect. ▪ Mistakes are used as learning opportunities. ▪ Teacher consistently praises effort and measures progress. ▪ Teacher is receptive to students' opinions. 	<p>Exceeds Expectations (Must include all Meets Expectations and at least one (1) Exemplary element.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Students behave, but minor disruptions occur. ▪ Teacher-student interactions are mostly respectful. ▪ Mistakes are accepted as part of the learning process. 	<p>Below Expectations (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Students are not well behaved. ▪ Disruptions frequently interrupt learning. ▪ Teacher-student interactions are sometimes authoritarian, negative, or inappropriate.

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Performance Continuum	Meets Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (1)
<p>INDICATOR: <u>MAINTAINS ACCURATE RECORDS</u></p> <p><i>ARTIFACT</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teacher uses an effective system of record keeping to track student progress in learning. ▪ The teacher contributes to the smooth operation of the school. 	<p>Comments: Provide specific evidence/data of failure to maintain accurate records.</p>
<p>INDICATOR: <u>COMMUNICATES WITH FAMILIES</u></p> <p><i>OBSERVATION AND ARTIFACT</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teacher is proactive in providing information to families about the instructional program and individual student progress. ▪ Teacher communication with families is respectful of cultural norms and available as needed. ▪ The teacher provides frequent opportunities which engage families in the instructional program. 	<p>Comments: Provide specific evidence/data of failure to communicate with families.</p>
<p>INDICATOR: <u>CONTRIBUTES TO SCHOOL AND DISTRICT</u></p> <p><i>OBSERVATION AND ARTIFACT</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teacher develops and maintains mutually supportive and cooperative relationships with colleagues. ▪ The teacher takes an active role in school life and district events/initiatives 	<p>Comments: Provide specific evidence of failure to contribute to school and district.</p>
<p>INDICATOR: <u>GROWS AND DEVELOPS PROFESSIONALLY</u></p> <p><i>OBSERVATION AND ARTIFACT</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teacher participates in required professional learning opportunities. ▪ The teacher frequently pursues additional professional learning opportunities to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skills. ▪ The teacher contributes to the profession by actively sharing knowledge with fellow educators or assisting colleagues. 	<p>Comments: Provide specific evidence/data of failure to grow and develop professionally.</p>
<p>INDICATOR: <u>SHOWS PROFESSIONALISM</u></p> <p><i>OBSERVATION AND ARTIFACT</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teacher complies with the Code of Professional Responsibility for Teachers. ▪ The teacher complies with the policies and procedures of the Greenwich Public Schools. ▪ The teacher is aware of and compliant with established school procedures, district policies, and state and federal guidelines related to the establishment of a safe and accessible learning environment. 	<p>Comments: Provide specific evidence/data of failure to show professionalism.</p>

Appendix C: Forms for Teacher Evaluation

Pre-Observation Conference Worksheet

(To be completed by the teacher)

Name:

School:

Department/Grade:

Date:

Please consider the following elements as you plan your lesson and be prepared to discuss how you have addressed these areas in the development of your plan. Please submit a lesson plan or a completed copy of this worksheet to the evaluator prior to the pre-observation conference and bring any materials that will be distributed to students to the conference. This worksheet is related to the GPS Indicators of Professional Practice as per indicators cited below. A copy of the GPS indicators and rubrics will be attached to this form.

1A. Describe the class, including specific needs of students. (Indicator: Planning and Assessment)

1B. Indicate if there will be any additional support staff in the classroom during the lesson and describe their role (s).

1C. Describe the instructional strategies you will use to address diverse needs and other information (e.g. data such as IEPs, copies of student work, previous assessments, etc.) about the students that may impact planning. (Indicators: Content Organization and Delivery, Student Work, Differentiation)

2. What is the focus of the lesson? What are the goals of the lesson and how are these goals aligned with the district curriculum? (Indicator: Learning Outcomes)

3. How does this lesson connect to students' prior knowledge and how will it be linked to the lessons that follow? (Indicators: Planning and Assessment, Content Organization and Delivery)

4. How will students be productively engaged during the lesson? (Indicators: Engagement, Questioning)

5. What resources, materials and arrangements will be used in the lesson? (Indicators: Group Work and Discussion, Thinking and Problem Solving, Efficiency and Procedures, Classroom Management)

6. How will student learning/ understanding be assessed? (Indicators: Assessment, Student Work, Feedback)

7. What can the evaluator do to assist you?

NOTE: This completed worksheet/a lesson plan will become part of the formal observation report and the teacher's personnel file

Post-Observation Conference Reflection

Questions for Discussion

(To be completed by the teacher)

Name:
Department/Grade:

School:
Date:

The questions are to be used as a guide in reflecting on the lesson. The observer and teacher will use these questions as a framework for discussion in the post-observation conference. This document will be attached to the formal observation report.

NOTE: Bring copies of student work to the post-observation conference to reference/use as evidence in responding to questions 1, 2, and 3.

References to GPS Indicators of Professional Practice are cited below in parentheses.

1. Did the students learn what I intended? Were my instructional goals met?
(Indicators: Planning and Assessment, Student Work)
2. How do I know? What evidence do I have? (Indicators: Student Work, Questioning)
3. To what extent were my students productively engaged?(Indicators: Student Work, Engagement, Discussion/ Group Work, Thinking and Problem Solving, Efficiency and Procedures, Classroom Management)
4. How did I adjust the instruction given the range of students in my class? (Indicators: Learning Outcomes, Questioning, Feedback, Differentiation)
5. If I were to teach this lesson again, what might I do differently and why?
(Indicator: Reflection)
6. What did you discover about your students' learning and how will that impact future teaching and learning? (Indicators: Planning and Assessment, Reflection)

FORMAL OBSERVATION REPORT

(To be completed by evaluator within 15 days of Post-Observation Conference) *

Name: _____ **Date of Pre-Conference:** _____
Grade/ Subject: _____ **Date of Observation:** _____
School: _____ **Beginning and Ending Times:** _____
Evaluator/ Observer: _____ **Date of Post-Conference:** _____

Specific Indicator(s) of Focus during Lesson (e.g. Content Organization and Delivery) if applicable:

Brief Summary of the Lesson:

INDICATORS
Planning and Assessment (Artifact)
Student Work (Artifact)
Reflection (Artifact)
Learning Outcomes (Observation)
Content Organization and Delivery (Observation)
Questioning (Observation)
Feedback (Observation)
Engagement (Observation)
Discussion /Group Work (Observation)
Differentiation (Observation)
Thinking and Problem Solving (Observation)
Efficiency and Procedures (Observation)
Classroom Management (Observation)

Analysis of indicators in the lesson including:

- ✓ Areas of strength (reinforcement)
- ✓ Areas needing improvement (refinement)
- ✓ Suggestions for future growth

Teacher Comments (Optional): Attach comments on additional sheet.

EVALUATOR'S OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF LESSON

Check one of the following.

- Exemplary
- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations
- Below Expectations
- Unsatisfactory

Date: _____ **Teacher received copy** _____
(Signature)

Date: _____ **Evaluator** _____
(Signature)

(Signature indicates receipt of the formal observation report.)

NOTE: Original to Office of the Director of Human Resources; Copies to Teacher, Prime Evaluator and Contributing Evaluator

* Timeline may be adjusted when the formal observation is part of a unit of instruction or when unforeseen circumstances arise (e.g., illness).

SELF ASSESSMENT INVENTORY

Reflect on your teaching performance in all areas. Complete the Self Assessment by using the following rubric indicating levels of performance. Prepare to discuss your performance in all areas during the end-of-year goal setting conference. Not to be included in personnel file.

TEACHING AND LEARNING					
Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
INDICATOR: <i>Planning and Assessment</i>	Teacher plans include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ daily objectives that specify student performance outcomes aligned with district curricula. ▪ weekly assessments with clear measurement criteria aligned to the district curricula. ▪ evidence of the use of assessment to adjust planning for students that do not meet the objective and for those that exceed them. ▪ evidence of more than 3 assessment practices (e.g., essay, project, portfolio, oral report/performance, short answer & multiple choice, etc.) that measure the performance outcome in different ways. 	Exceeds Expectations (Must meet all Meets Expectations elements and at least one (1) Exceeds Expectations element.)	Teacher plans include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ daily objectives that are aligned with the district curricula. ▪ monthly assessments aligned to the district curricula. ▪ evidence of the use of 2 assessment practices (e.g., essay, project, portfolio, oral report/performance, short answer & multiple choice, etc.) to adjust planning for students who do not meet objectives. 	Below Expectations (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)	Teacher plans include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ objectives that are not aligned with district curricula and lack clear student performance outcomes. ▪ little evidence of assessments that measure performance outcomes. ▪ little evidence of how assessment is used to adjust planning for student learning.
INDICATOR: <i>Student Work</i>	Students complete assignments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ organize, interpret, analyze, create, and evaluate information. ▪ draw conclusions, make generalizations, and produce extended written arguments. ▪ make connections to prior learning, big ideas, life experiences, and other disciplines. 		Students complete assignments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ organize, analyze, and interpret information. ▪ draw conclusions and support them through writing. ▪ make connections to prior learning. 		Students complete assignments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ mostly reproduce information. ▪ rarely draw conclusions and support them through writing. ▪ rarely connect what they are learning to prior learning or life experiences.
INDICATOR: <i>Reflection</i>	Prior to each instructional evaluation conference, the teacher writes a reflection that accurately identifies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the lesson's strengths and weaknesses. ▪ specific alternatives to improve unsuccessful teaching. ▪ professional learning opportunities that can improve an area of his or her instruction. 		Prior to each instructional evaluation conference, the teacher writes a reflection that accurately identifies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ his or her teaching strengths and weaknesses. ▪ alternatives to improve unsuccessful teaching. 		Prior to each instructional conference, the teacher writes a reflection that inaccurately identifies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ his or her teaching strengths and weaknesses. ▪ alternatives to improve unsuccessful teaching.

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
INDICATOR: <i>Learning Outcomes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The learning outcome is specific, measurable, aligned to district content standards, and meaningful (e.g. Meaning is connections to background knowledge, or using manipulatives, organizers, problems, visual representations, games, etc.). ▪ All aspects of the lesson (e.g. review, introduction, presentation, activity, closure) are focused on a limited set of skills to help students reach the outcome. ▪ Teacher provides both additional feedback/teaching to students who have not achieved the outcome and additional challenges for those that have. 	Exceeds Expectations (Must meet all Meets Expectations elements and at least one (1) Exceeds Expectations element.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The learning outcome is specific, measurable and aligned to district content standards. ▪ Most aspects of the lesson (e.g. review, introduction, presentation, activity, closure) are focused on a limited set of skills to help students reach the outcome. ▪ Teacher provides either additional feedback/teaching for students that have not achieved the outcome, or additional challenges for those that have. 	Below Expectations (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The learning outcome is ambiguous or too simple or too advanced for the majority of students. ▪ Few aspects of the lesson (e.g., review, introduction, presentation, activity, closure) are focused on a limited set of skills. ▪ Teacher does not provide additional feedback/teaching to students that have not achieved the outcome.
INDICATOR: <i>Content Organization and Delivery</i>	Organization and delivery of content includes all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Previewing what will be learned and why it is worth learning. ▪ Teaching concepts step-by-step with visuals, graphic organizers, mnemonics, diagrams, cues, manipulatives, problems, etc. ▪ Using a variety of examples sequenced from easy to difficult ▪ Providing frequent opportunities for all students to respond and receive immediate and specific feedback. ▪ Providing opportunities for purposeful student reflection. 		Organization and delivery of content includes all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Previewing what will be learned and why it is worth learning. ▪ Teaching the concept step-by-step using visuals, graphic organizers, mnemonics, diagrams, cues, manipulatives, problems, etc. ▪ Using a variety of examples sequenced from easy to more difficult. 		Organization and delivery of content: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Neither previews what will be learned, nor why it is important to learn it. ▪ Does not sufficiently break down concepts and ideas to facilitate student understanding. ▪ Uses few examples to illustrate the concept or ideas to be learned.
INDICATOR: <i>Questioning</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A high frequency of questions (procedural and academic) is asked. ▪ A wide variety of question types (recall, comprehension, analysis, application, problem solving) are posed. ▪ Most questions require whole class interactivity (e.g., signaling, whiteboards, think-pair-share, rally table, line up review, etc.). ▪ Teacher calls on volunteers, non-volunteers, and a balance of students based on race, ability, & gender. ▪ Students are explicitly taught how to generate questions to deepen their understanding. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A moderate frequency of questions (procedural and academic) is asked. ▪ Some different question types (recall, comprehension, analysis, application, problem solving) are posed. ▪ Some questions require whole class interactivity (e.g., signaling, whiteboards, think-pair-share, rally table, line up review, etc.). ▪ Teacher calls on volunteers, non-volunteers, and a balance of students based on race, ability, and gender. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A low frequency of questions (procedural and academic) is asked. ▪ Few different question types (recall, comprehension, analysis, application, problem solving) are posed. ▪ Questions rarely require whole class interactivity. ▪ Teacher calls on mostly volunteers and high ability students.

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
INDICATOR: <i>Feedback</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teacher gives a high frequency of feedback that is academically focused, corrective, and specific to the learning outcome. ▪ Teacher circulates to prompt student thinking and assess progress. ▪ Feedback from students (verbal and nonverbal) is used to adjust instruction. ▪ Teacher intentionally engages students in giving academically focused, corrective, and specific feedback to one another. ▪ Teacher explicitly instructs students how to self evaluate and improve their own work. 	Exceeds Expectations (Must meet all Meets Expectations elements and at least one (1) Exceeds Expectations element.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teacher gives a moderate frequency of feedback that is academically focused, corrective, and specific to the learning outcome. ▪ Teacher circulates during instructional activities to support engagement. ▪ Feedback from students (verbal and nonverbal) is used by the teacher to adjust instruction. 	Below Expectations (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Teacher gives a low frequency of feedback. ▪ Teacher circulates during instructional activities, but mostly monitors behavior. ▪ Teacher does not adjust instruction based on students (verbal and nonverbal) feedback.
INDICATOR: <i>Engagement</i>	<p>During lesson (s), all students are actively involved in learning activities <u>most of the time</u> as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participating in relevant discussions with teachers/peers • attending/or being on-task during the instructional period • being involved in objective-related tasks • asking and responding to questions that are directly tied to the objective (not directions) • explaining their thinking (schema) either verbally or in writing (or via some other appropriate method of expression) • explaining the purpose(s) of the intended learning • explaining how the intended learning is connected to the real world, to other disciplines, or to prior learning • demonstrating creativity/novel ideas • monitoring their own work through self-assessment 				<p>During lesson (s), most students are actively involved in learning activities <u>most of the time</u> as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • participating in relevant discussions with teachers/peers • attending/or being on-task during the instructional period • being involved in objective-related tasks • asking and responding to questions that are directly tied to the objective (not directions) • explaining their thinking (schema) either verbally or in writing (or via some other appropriate method of expression) • explaining the purpose(s) of the intended learning

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
INDICATOR: <i>Discussion/ Group Work</i>	<p>The lesson incorporates group or peer-to-peer work in which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students’ practice, feedback, and interaction are maximized. • students are held accountable for group and individual work. • all students know their roles and responsibilities. • group composition (e.g., size, ability level, race, and gender) is appropriate. • group tasks create interdependence • groups are guided towards self-reflection and independence as learners. 	Exceeds Expectations (Must meet all Meets Expectations elements and at least one (1) Exceeds Expectations element.)	<p>The lesson incorporates group or peer-to-peer work in which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ students’ practice, feedback, and interaction are enhanced. ▪ students are held accountable for group work. ▪ most students know their roles and responsibilities. ▪ group composition (e.g., size, ability level, race, and gender) is appropriate. 	Below Expectations (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)	<p>The lesson incorporates group or peer-to-peer work which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ does not increase practice, feedback, or interaction more than if students were to work individually. ▪ few students know their roles and responsibilities. ▪ does not hold groups or individuals accountable.
INDICATOR: <i>Differentiation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During lesson(s), there is consistent evidence that the teacher meets the individual needs of students based on knowledge, skills, interests, backgrounds and learning styles to help each student achieve the learning objective by differentiating : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>content</u> (e.g., tiered assignments, accelerating or decelerating the curriculum) ▪ <u>process</u> (e.g., direct instruction, flexible grouping) ▪ <u>product</u> (e.g., oral/written performance) • The teacher provides a clear rationale for differentiation. • The teacher’s decision to differentiate is based on the analysis of student data prior to the lesson. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During lesson (s), there is evidence that the teacher meets the needs of groups of students based on knowledge, skills, interests, backgrounds and learning styles to help groups achieve the learning objective by differentiating : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>content</u> (e.g., tiered assignments, accelerating or decelerating the curriculum) and/or ▪ <u>process</u> (e.g., direct instruction, flexible grouping) and/or ▪ <u>product</u> (e.g., oral/written performance) • The teacher provides a clear rationale for differentiation. • The teacher’s decision to differentiate is based on the analysis of student data prior to the lesson. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During lesson (s), there is no evidence that the teacher differentiates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>content</u> (e.g., tiered assignments, accelerating or decelerating the curriculum) and/or ▪ <u>process</u> (e.g., direct instruction, flexible grouping) and/or ▪ <u>product</u> (e.g., oral/written performance)

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
INDICATOR: <i>Thinking and Problem Solving</i>	<p>During lesson (s), there is evidence that 2 thinking approaches are/ have been intentionally and explicitly taught.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical thinking where students either: compare/contrast, evaluate/explain, classify/categorize, or draw/justify conclusions. Practical thinking where students use and apply ideas they learned to work on real-life tasks. Creative thinking where students generate ideas, design, create, and evaluate a final product. Research based thinking where student hypothesize, observe, experiment, record, and report results. Self-assessment where students assess their own learning by setting goals, monitoring progress, and evaluating performance. 	Exceeds Expectations (Must meet all Meets Expectations elements and at least one (1) Exceeds Expectations element.)	<p>During lesson (s), there is evidence that 1 thinking approach is/ has been intentionally and explicitly taught.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analytical thinking where students either: compare/contrast, evaluate/explain, classify/categorize, or draw/justify conclusions. Practical thinking where students use and apply ideas they learned to work on real-life tasks. Creative thinking where students generate ideas, design, create, and evaluate a final product. Research based thinking where student hypothesize, observe, experiment, record, and report results. Self-assessment where students assess their own learning by setting goals, monitoring progress, and evaluating performance. 	Below Expectations (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)	<p>During lesson (s), there is no evidence that thinking approaches are or have been intentionally and explicitly taught.</p>
INDICATOR: <i>Efficiency and Procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures (e.g., entering the room, distributing and collecting materials, transitioning between learning activities, gaining students' attention, what to do when students complete work early, how to work independently and in groups, returning to a task after an interruption, etc.) are well established, highly efficient, and executed by all students. 85% of classroom time is devoted to academic learning. Pacing in each part of the lesson maximizes learning for all students. Physical space is organized in a manner conducive to learning. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures (e.g., entering the room, distributing and collecting materials, transitioning between learning activities, gaining students' attention, what to do when students complete work early, how to work independently and in groups, returning to a task after an interruption, etc.) are established, but some are not executed efficiently by all students. 65% of classroom time is devoted to academic learning. Pacing in each part of the lesson is appropriate for the majority of students, but sometimes is too fast or too slow. Physical space is organized in a manner conducive to learning. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few procedures are established, or are poorly designed. Less than 50% of classroom time is devoted to academic learning. Pacing is uneven and too fast or too slow for the majority of the students. Physical space is organized poorly making it difficult for students to get into groups and easily and efficiently access learning materials.
INDICATOR: <i>Classroom Management</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are consistently well-behaved. Teacher-student interactions demonstrate caring and respect. Mistakes are used as learning opportunities. Teacher consistently praises effort and measures progress. Teacher is receptive to students' opinions. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students behave, but minor disruptions occur. Teacher-student interactions are mostly respectful. Mistakes are accepted as part of the learning process. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are not well behaved. Disruptions frequently interrupt learning. Teacher-student interactions are sometimes authoritarian, negative, or inappropriate.

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES		
Performance Continuum	Meets Expectations (3)	Unsatisfactory (1)
INDICATOR: <i>Maintains Accurate Records</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teacher uses an effective system of record keeping to track student progress in learning. ▪ The teacher contributes to the smooth operation of the school. 	Comments: Provide specific evidence/data of failure to maintain accurate records.
INDICATOR: <i>Communicates with Families</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teacher is proactive in providing information to families about the instructional program and individual student progress. ▪ Teacher communication with families is respectful of cultural norms and available as needed. ▪ The teacher provides frequent opportunities which engage families in the instructional program. 	Comments: Provide specific evidence/data of failure to communicate with families.
INDICATOR: <i>Contributes to School and District</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teacher develops and maintains mutually supportive and cooperative relationships with colleagues. ▪ The teacher takes an active role in school life and district events/initiatives. 	Comments: Provide specific evidence of failure to contribute to school and district.
INDICATOR: <i>Grows and Develops Professionally</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teacher participates in required professional learning opportunities. ▪ The teacher frequently pursues additional professional learning opportunities to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skills. ▪ The teacher contributes to the profession by actively sharing knowledge with fellow educators or assisting colleagues. 	Comments: Provide specific evidence/data of failure to grow and develop professionally.
INDICATOR: <i>Shows Professionalism</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The teacher complies with the Code of Professional Responsibility for Teachers. ▪ The teacher complies with the policies and procedures of the Greenwich Public Schools. ▪ The teacher is aware of and compliant with established school procedures, district policies, and state and federal guidelines related to the establishment of a safe and accessible learning environment. 	Comments: Provide specific evidence/data of failure to show professionalism.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH PLAN Goal Setting and End-of-Year Reflection

Teacher: _____ Program: _____
Date of Plan Development: _____ Date of Reflection: _____

Focus from end of year goal setting :

Professional Learning/Teacher Performance and Practice Goal: (Indicate how you will address the TEPL I indicator identified for growth in the end of year goal setting with your evaluator and how your goal will support the Vision of the Graduate on page 3 of the TEPL I document.) **REMINDER:** The professional learning /teacher performance and practice goal for non-tenured teachers in Years 1 and 2 will focus on the requirements of TEAM.

Part A: Goal Setting

<u>RATIONALE</u> (Specific rationale statements related to the performance/practice outcomes of the identified TEPL indicator that will be realized in your classroom.) These are written in SMART* goal language.	<u>ACTION PLAN</u> (Training, research, research-based strategies and resources/support that you will use to accomplish this goal and to achieve the desired outcomes, including specific dates, topics, follow-up, and implementation.)	<u>SUPPORTING DATA/EVIDENCE</u> (Data/evidence that will be offered to validate the efficacy of your actions , the appropriateness of your action plan, and the attainment of the goal, including specific dates, benchmarks, observation reports and evaluator feedback).

Part B: Reflection (To be completed by the teacher and brought to the End-of-Year conference.)

Use this section to reflect on goal attainment during the past school year. In your reflection, provide the following information related to your professional learning/teacher performance and practice goal.

- Describe the performance/practices outcomes that have been realized in your class/program.
- Indicate the research-based strategies and resources that you and or your team have used to realize these performance/ practice outcomes.
- Detail the specific actions you and/or your team have taken to support the performance/practice outcomes.
- Provide supporting data/evidence to validate the efficacy of your actions, the appropriateness of your action plan and/or the attainment of the performance/practice goal.

Professional Learning/Teacher Performance and Practice Goal

Reflection on TEPL I Indicator chosen as Professional Learning/Teacher Performance and Practice Goal

Student Learning Objectives (Indicate how you will support student learning within your role/responsibilities.)

Student Learning Objective: (Based on standardized assessment if applicable to your role/responsibility; if not, based on local assessment.)

Part A: Goal Setting

INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (IAGDs) (Specific rationale statements related to relevant standards, baseline data and interim assessments that delineate students' current level of achievement, what will be accomplished in terms of student learning in your class or program and the percentage of students involved. These are written in SMART* goal language.)	ACTION PLAN (Research-based strategies that you will use to accomplish this goal and to achieve the desired student outcomes, including people with whom you will collaborate, specific dates, benchmarks, and possible resources.)	SUPPORTING DATA/EVIDENCE Data/evidence that will be offered to validate the efficacy of your actions, the appropriateness of your action plan and the attainment of the goal)

Part B: Reflection (To be completed by the teacher and brought to the End-of-Year conference.)

Use this section to reflect on goal attainment during the past school year. In your reflection, provide the following information related to your student learning objective(s).

- Describe the student learning outcomes that have been realized in your class/program.
- Indicate the training, research, research-based strategies and resources you and or your team have used to realize these student learning outcomes.
- Detail the specific actions you and/or your team have taken to support the student learning outcomes.
- Provide supporting data/evidence to validate the efficacy of your actions and/or your team's actions, the appropriateness of your action plan, and the attainment of the student learning objective(s).

Student Learning Objectives

Reflection on Student Learning Objectives

Parent Engagement Goal (Indicate how you will support the parent engagement within your role/responsibilities.)

Part A: Goal Setting

<p><u>RATIONALE</u> (Specific statements related to baseline data that delineate what will be accomplished in terms of parent engagement in your class/ program/ school. These are written in SMART* goal language.)</p>	<p><u>ACTION PLAN</u> (Strategies that you will use to accomplish this goal and to achieve the desired outcomes, including people with whom you will collaborate, specific dates, benchmarks, and possible resources.)</p>	<p><u>SUPPORTING DATA/EVIDENCE</u> (Data/evidence that will be offered to validate the efficacy of your actions, the appropriateness of your action plan and the attainment of the goal)</p>

Part B: Reflection (To be completed by the teacher and brought to the End-of-Year conference.)

Use this section to reflect on goal attainment during the past school year. In your reflection, provide the following information related to your parent engagement goal.

- Describe the parent engagement outcomes that have been realized in your class/program/school.
- Indicate the strategies, resources and /materials you and or your team have used to realize these outcomes.
- Detail the specific actions you have taken to support the parent engagement outcomes.
- Provide evidence/data to validate the efficacy of the actions, the appropriateness of your action plan, and the attainment of the parent engagement goal.

Parent Engagement Goal

<p>Reflection on Parent Engagement Goal</p>

Fall Goal Setting: Signature indicates goal approval.

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____

* **SMART** = Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timely

Optional: Teacher may attach a separate sheet for additional reflection on the school year.

Timeline for Unit of Instruction

This timeline for the Unit of Instruction may be impacted by the length of the unit and the instructional schedule of the individual teacher (e.g. specialists). Thus, the timeframe for the unit, the timing of the formal observation within the unit, and the dates when meetings take place/ written documents are produced are intended to be flexible and responsive to diverse teaching environments.

1. Meeting to discuss unit of instruction (The pre-observation conference for the formal observation will take place during this meeting.)

When: Prior to the unit being implemented

Purpose: Discuss unit topic, scope, focus, timeframe, linkage to GPS curriculum, timing and student population; gather evidence of teacher planning skills; arrange dates for formal observation and post-observation conference.

Persons responsible: Teacher and evaluator

2. Formal observation (The pre-observation conference for the formal observation will take place during the initial planning meeting. The post-observation conference will take place within a week of the formal observation. The formal observation write-up will be part of the end of unit report if the formal observation takes place toward the end of the unit; otherwise, it should be a separate document.)

When: During unit of instruction

Purpose: Gather evidence of teacher skill in implementing instruction; gather evidence of teacher skill in designing and assessing student work

Persons responsible: Teacher and evaluator

3. Informal observation (includes written feedback to teacher)

When: During unit of instruction

Purpose: Gather evidence of teacher skill in implementing instruction and designing and assessing student work

Person responsible: Teacher and evaluator(s)

4. Unit of Instruction – End of Unit Conference

When: Within fifteen (15) school days* of completion of unit

Purpose: Discuss questions in teacher's end of unit reflection, examine student work from the unit and gather evidence of teacher reflection

Note: Teacher must submit the written end of unit reflection at least one (1) school day prior to the established conference date.

Persons responsible: Teacher and evaluator

5. Unit of Instruction – End of Unit Feedback

When: Within fifteen (15) school days* of the End of Unit conference

Purpose: Provide feedback to teacher on her/his performance in the four key areas of planning, implementation, assessment and analysis as related to the Greenwich Public School Components of Professional Practice.

Person responsible: Evaluator

* Timeline may be extended due to unforeseen circumstances (e.g. illness).

Unit of Instruction
Unit Plan Development/ Lesson (Written)
(To be completed by the teacher)

*Use the following questions to guide your preparation for the **pre-observation conference** for the formal observation and **the initial meeting** with the evaluator to discuss the unit of instruction.*

Name: _____ **School:** _____
Department/Grade: _____ **Date:** _____

The unit of instruction planning document should include the following information:

1. Concept/topic/scope of the unit (Note: Submit a lesson plan from the unit for the formal observation.)
2. Proposed timeframe for the unit
3. Description of the class, including diverse needs of students and other information (e.g., data such as IEPs, copies of student work, previous assessments, etc.) about the students that may impact planning and delivery (e.g., instructional strategies). (Indicator: Planning and Assessment, Content Organization and Delivery, Student Work, Differentiation)
4. Unit objectives/goals/expectations and how they are aligned with the district curriculum and prior knowledge and future units/lessons. (Indicator: Learning Outcomes, Planning and Assessment, Content Organization and Delivery)
5. Description of activities or assignments that will engage students productively in authentic work related to the concept/topic of the unit and lesson. (Indicators: Engagement, Questioning)
6. Description of the materials, resources and arrangements that will be used during the unit and lesson. (Indicators: Group Work and Discussion, Thinking and Problem Solving, Efficiency and Procedures, Classroom Management)
7. Assessment plan, specifically how will student learning/understanding be assessed, both formatively and summatively. (Indicators: Assessment, Student Work, Feedback)

NOTE: This document is to be used for two purposes. First, the teacher should use responses to items 3-7 in unit plan development. Second, the teacher should be prepared to discuss responses to these items in the pre-observation conference for the formal observation.

End-of-Unit Reflection/ Lesson Reflection (Written)

(To be completed by the teacher)

Name:

School:

Department/Grade:

Date:

*Use the following questions to guide your preparation for the **post-observation conference discussion**, the **end-of-unit conference discussion**, and **your written reflection** on the unit. Provide evidence of student learning reflecting the full range of student achievement levels in the class and feedback you provided to students on their work.*

DIRECTIONS:

Part A. Attach a copy of the unit plan.

Part B. Be prepared to reflect on the student data from the unit at the conference. The conference will include discussion of your planning of the unit of instruction (Indicators: Planning and Assessment, Learning Outcomes, Content Organization and Delivery), your implementation of the instructional plan (Indicators: Content Organization and Delivery, Questioning, Engagement, Discussion/Group Work, Differentiation, Thinking and Problem Solving), your assessment of student learning (Indicators: Planning and Assessment, Student Work, Feedback) and your analysis of student growth (Indicator: Reflection).

1. How did the sequence of the content and activities in the unit/ lesson support the diverse learning needs of the students, engage them in the learning process, and facilitate their understanding? Provide specific examples. (Indicator: Differentiation, Engagement)
2. How did the selected materials, resources and arrangements used in the unit/lesson meet the needs of students and facilitate their learning? Provide specific examples. (Indicators: Student Work, Engagement, Discussion/Group Work, Thinking and Problem Solving, Efficiency and Procedures)
3. How did the unit/lesson learning experiences facilitate meaningful, real world connections for your students? Provide specific examples (Indicators: Thinking and Problem Solving)
4. How did you determine when to assess and what to assess in the unit/lesson? How was student work assessed (e.g., rubrics)? How did the range of student responses align with the assigned tasks and reflect individual student growth? (Indicators: Planning and Assessment, Student Work)
5. Were the instructional goals of the unit/lesson met? What evidence/data do you have to demonstrate the goal attainment? (Indicators: Planning and Assessment, Student Work)
6. What adjustments, if any, were made during the unit/lesson? (Indicators: Learning Outcomes, Questioning, Feedback, Differentiation)
7. What did you discover about your students' learning during the unit of instruction/ lesson and how will that impact future teaching and learning? (Indicators: Planning and Assessment, Reflection)
8. Is there anything about your class/students the administrator needs to know?

NOTE: This document is to be used for two purposes. First, the teacher should be prepared to discuss the responses to these questions as they relate to the formal observation at the post-observation conference. Second, the teacher should submit written responses to these questions for the end-of-unit of instruction conference.

Attach this document to the end of unit report prepared by the evaluator.

Unit of Instruction
End-of-Unit Report

(To be completed by the evaluator)

Teacher:	Evaluator:
School:	Department/Grade:
Date of Planning Meeting:	
Date of Formal Observation:	
Date of Post Observation Conference:	
Date of End of Unit Conference:	

Check one of the following:

End of Unit Report includes Formal Observation Report
or
 Separate Formal Observation Report Attached

DIRECTIONS:

After the Unit of Instruction End of Unit Conference, the evaluator will provide written feedback to the teacher about the unit of instruction and the formal observation. This feedback will include assessment of the teacher's performance in four key areas: **planning** of the unit of instruction/lesson (Indicators: Planning and Assessment, Learning Outcomes, Content Organization and Delivery) **implementation** of the instructional plan (Indicators: Content Organization and Delivery, Questioning, Engagement, Discussion/Group Work, Differentiation, Thinking and Problem Solving), **assessment** of student learning (Indicators: Planning and Assessment, Student Work, Feedback) and **analysis** of student growth (Indicator: Reflection).

Overall Assessment for the Unit of Instruction (Check one of the following):

Exemplary Exceeds Expectations Meets Expectations Below Expectations Unsatisfactory

Date: _____ **Teacher** _____
(Signature)

Date: _____ **Evaluator** _____
(Signature)

(Signature indicates receipt of end of unit report.)

NOTE: Send to Office of Human Resources by June 1. Copy to Teacher. Copy to Personnel File.

END-OF-YEAR SUMMATIVE REPORT

Teacher:

School:

Department/ Grade:

Evaluator:

TEACHING AND LEARNING					
Performance Continuum	Exemplary	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
Indicator 1: Planning and Assessment					
Indicator 2: Student Work					
Indicator 3: Reflection					
Indicator 4: Learning Outcomes					
Indicator 5: Content Organization and Delivery					
Indicator 6: Questioning					
Indicator 7: Feedback					
Indicator 8:Engagement					
Indicator 9: Discussion/Group Work					
Indicator 10: Differentiation					
Indicator 11: Thinking and Problem Solving					
Indicator 12: Efficiency and Procedures					
Indicator 13: Classroom Management					

Overall Assessment for **Teaching and Learning:**

Check one of the following:

- Exemplary (4)
- Exceeds Expectations (4)
- Meets Expectations (3)
- Below Expectations (2)
- Unsatisfactory (1)

Note: For purposes of state reporting, the Exemplary and Exceeds Expectations performance categories will be listed as Exemplary with a number rating of 4.

Comments/ Recommendations:

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES		
Performance Continuum	Meets Expectations	Unsatisfactory
Indicator 14: Maintains Accurate Records		
Indicator 15: Communicates with Families		
Indicator 16: Contributes to School and District		
Indicator 17: Grows and Develops Professionally		
Indicator 18: Shows Professionalism		

Please acknowledge that attendance and promptness have been discussed by completing the following:

The teacher's attendance and promptness have been reviewed and discussed.
(Please check box.)

Comments regarding attendance and promptness (optional):

Overall Assessment for Professional Responsibilities:

- Check one of the following:
- ___ Meets Expectations (3)
- ___ Unsatisfactory (1)

Comments/ Recommendations:

Final Summative Rating for State Reporting:

- Check one of the following:**
- ___ Exemplary (4)
- ___ Exceeds Expectations (4)
- ___ Meets Expectations (3)
- ___ Below Expectations (2)
- ___ Unsatisfactory (1)

Specific Recommendations for Improvement for Any Assessment of Unsatisfactory Must Be Included:

END-OF-YEAR SUMMATIVE REPORT Tenured Teachers – Streamlined Process

(This form is to be used for tenured teachers who have received a “Meets Expectations” performance rating for all TEPL I indicators on the end-of-year summative report in Year 4 or on the end-of-year summative report in Years 1 or 2 if the teacher is not already in the streamlined process.)

Teacher:

School:

Department/ Grade:

Evaluator:

TEACHING AND LEARNING					
Performance Continuum	Exemplary	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
Indicator 1: Planning and Assessment					
Indicator 2: Student Work					
Indicator 3: Reflection					
Indicator 4: Learning Outcomes					
Indicator 5: Content Organization and Delivery					
Indicator 6: Questioning					
Indicator 7: Feedback					
Indicator 8:Engagement					
Indicator 9: Discussion/Group Work					
Indicator 10: Differentiation					
Indicator 11: Thinking and Problem Solving					
Indicator 12: Efficiency and Procedures					
Indicator 13: Classroom Management					

The above end-of-year ratings are the same as the year 1, 2 and /or 4 ratings unless sufficient data/evidence has been collected to support a change in the rating.

Overall Assessment for Teaching and Learning:

Check one of the following:

- Exemplary (4)
- Exceeds Expectations (4)
- Meets Expectations (3)
- Below Expectations (2)
- Unsatisfactory (1)

Note: For purposes of state reporting, the Exemplary and Exceeds Expectations performance categories will be listed as Exemplary with a number rating of 4.

Indicator linked to Professional Learning/Teacher Performance and Practice Goal:

Narrative Summary of Performance related to above indicator:

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES		
Performance Continuum	Meets Expectations	Unsatisfactory
Indicator 14: Maintains Accurate Records		
Indicator 15: Communicates with Families		
Indicator 16: Contributes to School and District		
Indicator 17: Grows and Develops Professionally		
Indicator 18: Shows Professionalism		

Please acknowledge that attendance and promptness have been discussed by completing the following:

The teacher's attendance and promptness have been reviewed and discussed.
(Please check box.)

Comments regarding attendance and promptness (optional):

Overall Assessment for Professional Responsibilities:

Check one of the following:

___ Meets Expectations (3)

___ Unsatisfactory (1)

Comments/ Recommendations:

Final Summative Rating for State Reporting:

Check one of the following:

- Exemplary (4)
- Exceeds Expectations (4)
- Meets Expectations (3)
- Below Expectations (2)
- Unsatisfactory (1)

Specific Recommendations for Improvement for Any Assessment of Unsatisfactory Must Be Included:

Evaluation Phase for Next Year - Check one of the following:

- Induction I: Year 1 Year 2 Year 3 Year 4
- Induction II: Year 1 Year 2
- Tenured: Year 1 Year 2 Year 3 Year 4

Completed Unit of Instruction: Yes No Not Applicable
If No, please explain.

TEPL I Indicator identified for Professional Learning/Teacher Performance and Practice Goal for Next Year:

Date: _____ **Teacher received copy** _____
(Signature)

Date: _____ **Evaluator** _____
(Signature)

(Signature indicates receipt of End of Year Summative Report.)

NOTE: Send Original to Office of Human Resources by July 1. Copy to Teacher. Copy to file.

END-OF-YEAR RUBRIC CHECKLIST FOR TENURED TEACHERS COMPLETING A UNIT OF INSTRUCTION

Teacher: _____

Date of Evaluation: _____

This form will be used for **TENURED TEACHERS** only during the school year when a Unit of Instruction is completed. NOTE: Asterisk (*) indicates that narrative comments are required when the performance continuum rating for any indicator fails to meet district expectations. (i.e., is rated below expectations or unsatisfactory). Performance continuum ratings for indicators that meet district expectations (i.e., meets expectations, exceeds expectations, exemplary) do not require narrative comments. **THIS CHECKLIST IS ATTACHED TO THE END-OF-YEAR SUMMATIVE REPORT.**

TEACHING AND LEARNING					
Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory* (1)
INDICATOR: <i>Planning and Assessment</i>	Teacher plans include: <input type="checkbox"/> daily objectives that specify student performance outcomes aligned with district curricula. <input type="checkbox"/> weekly assessments with clear measurement criteria aligned to the district curricula. <input type="checkbox"/> evidence of the use of assessment to adjust planning for students that do not meet the objective and for those that exceed them. <input type="checkbox"/> evidence of more than 3 assessment practices (e.g., essay, project, portfolio, oral report/performance, short answer & multiple choice, etc.) that measure the performance outcome in different ways.	Exceeds Expectations (Must include all Meets Expectations and at least one (1) Exemplary element.)	Teacher plans include: <input type="checkbox"/> daily objectives that are aligned with the district curricula. <input type="checkbox"/> monthly assessments aligned to the district curricula. <input type="checkbox"/> evidence of the use of 2 assessment practices (e.g., essay, project, portfolio, oral report/performance, short answer & multiple choice, etc.) to adjust planning for students who do not meet objectives.	Below Expectations* (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)	Teacher plans include: <input type="checkbox"/> objectives that are not aligned with district curricula and lack clear student performance outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> little evidence of assessments that measure performance outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> little evidence of how assessment is used to adjust planning for student learning.
INDICATOR: <i>Student Work</i>	Students complete assignments that: <input type="checkbox"/> organize, interpret, analyze, create, and evaluate information. <input type="checkbox"/> draw conclusions, make generalizations, and produce extended written arguments. <input type="checkbox"/> make connections to prior learning, big ideas, life experiences, and other disciplines.		Students complete assignments that: <input type="checkbox"/> organize, analyze, and interpret information. <input type="checkbox"/> draw conclusions and support them through writing. <input type="checkbox"/> make connections to prior learning.		Students complete assignments that: <input type="checkbox"/> mostly reproduce information. <input type="checkbox"/> rarely draw conclusions and support them through writing. <input type="checkbox"/> rarely connect what they are learning to prior learning or life experiences.
INDICATOR: <i>Reflection</i>	Prior to each instructional evaluation conference, the teacher writes a reflection that accurately identifies: <input type="checkbox"/> the lesson's strengths and weaknesses. <input type="checkbox"/> specific alternatives to improve unsuccessful teaching. <input type="checkbox"/> professional learning opportunities that can improve an area of his or her instruction.		Prior to each instructional evaluation conference, the teacher writes a reflection that accurately identifies: <input type="checkbox"/> his or her teaching strengths and weaknesses. <input type="checkbox"/> alternatives to improve unsuccessful teaching.		Prior to each instructional conference, the teacher writes a reflection that inaccurately identifies: <input type="checkbox"/> his or her teaching strengths and weaknesses. <input type="checkbox"/> alternatives to improve unsuccessful teaching.

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory * (1)
INDICATOR: <i>Learning Outcomes</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> The learning outcome is specific, measurable, aligned to district content standards, and meaningful (e.g. Meaning is connections to background knowledge, or using manipulatives, organizers, problems, visual representations, games, etc.). <input type="checkbox"/> All aspects of the lesson (e.g. review, introduction, presentation, activity, closure) are focused on a limited set of skills to help students reach the outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher provides both additional feedback/teaching to students who have not achieved the outcome and additional challenges for those that have.	Exceeds Expectations (Must include all Meets Expectations and at least one (1) Exemplary element.)	<input type="checkbox"/> The learning outcome is specific, measurable and aligned to district content standards. <input type="checkbox"/> Most aspects of the lesson (e.g. review, introduction, presentation, activity, closure) are focused on a limited set of skills to help students reach the outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher provides either additional feedback/teaching for students that have not achieved the outcome, or additional challenges for those that have.	Below Expectations* (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)	<input type="checkbox"/> The learning outcome is ambiguous or too simple or too advanced for the majority of students. <input type="checkbox"/> Few aspects of the lesson (e.g., review, introduction, presentation, activity, closure) are focused on a limited set of skills. <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher does not provide additional feedback/teaching to students that have not achieved the outcome.
INDICATOR: <i>Content Organization and Delivery</i>	Organization and delivery of content includes all of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Previewing what will be learned and why it is worth learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching concepts step-by-step with visuals, graphic organizers, mnemonics, diagrams, cues, manipulatives, problems, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Using a variety of examples sequenced from easy to difficult <input type="checkbox"/> Providing frequent opportunities for all students to respond and receive immediate and specific feedback. <input type="checkbox"/> Providing opportunities for purposeful student reflection.		Organization and delivery of content includes all of the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Previewing what will be learned and why it is worth learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching the concept step-by-step using visuals, graphic organizers, mnemonics, diagrams, cues, manipulatives, problems, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Using a variety of examples sequenced from easy to more difficult.		Organization and delivery of content: <input type="checkbox"/> Neither previews what will be learned, nor why it is important to learn it. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not sufficiently break down concepts and ideas to facilitate student understanding. <input type="checkbox"/> Uses few examples to illustrate the concept or ideas to be learned.
INDICATOR: <i>Questioning</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> A high frequency of questions (procedural and academic) is asked. <input type="checkbox"/> A wide variety of question types (recall, comprehension, analysis, application, problem solving) are posed. <input type="checkbox"/> Most questions require whole class interactivity (e.g., signaling, whiteboards, think-pair-share, rally table, line up review, etc.). <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher calls on volunteers, non-volunteers, and a balance of students based on race, ability, & gender. <input type="checkbox"/> Students are explicitly taught how to generate questions to deepen their understanding.		<input type="checkbox"/> A moderate frequency of questions (procedural and academic) is asked. <input type="checkbox"/> Some different question types (recall, comprehension, analysis, application, problem solving) are posed. <input type="checkbox"/> Some questions require whole class interactivity (e.g., signaling, whiteboards, think-pair-share, rally table, line up review, etc.). <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher calls on volunteers, non-volunteers, and a balance of students based on race, ability, and gender.		<input type="checkbox"/> A low frequency of questions (procedural and academic) is asked. <input type="checkbox"/> Few different question types (recall, comprehension, analysis, application, problem solving) are posed. <input type="checkbox"/> Questions rarely require whole class interactivity. <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher calls on mostly volunteers and high ability students.

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory * (1)
INDICATOR: <i>Feedback</i>	Organization and delivery of content includes all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Previewing what will be learned and why it is worth learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching concepts step-by-step with visuals, graphic organizers, mnemonics, diagrams, cues, manipulatives, problems, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Using a variety of examples sequenced from easy to difficult <input type="checkbox"/> Providing frequent opportunities for all students to respond and receive immediate and specific feedback. <input type="checkbox"/> Providing opportunities for purposeful student reflection. 	Exceeds Expectations (Must include all Meets Expectations and at least one (1) Exemplary element.)	Organization and delivery of content includes all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Previewing what will be learned and why it is worth learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching the concept step-by-step using visuals, graphic organizers, mnemonics, diagrams, cues, manipulatives, problems, etc. <input type="checkbox"/> Using a variety of examples sequenced from easy to more difficult. 	Below Expectations* (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)	Organization and delivery of content: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Neither previews what will be learned, nor why it is important to learn it. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not sufficiently break down concepts and ideas to facilitate student understanding. <input type="checkbox"/> Uses few examples to illustrate the concept or ideas to be learned.
INDICATOR: <i>Engagement</i>	During lesson (s), all students are actively involved in learning activities <u>most of the time</u> as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> participating in relevant discussions with teachers/peers <input type="checkbox"/> attending/or being on-task during the instructional period <input type="checkbox"/> being involved in objective-related tasks <input type="checkbox"/> asking and responding to questions that are directly tied to the objective (not directions) <input type="checkbox"/> explaining their thinking (schema) either verbally or in writing (or via some other appropriate method of expression)e <input type="checkbox"/> explaining the purpose(s) of the intended learning <input type="checkbox"/> explaining how the intended learning is connected to the real world, to other disciplines, or to prior learning <input type="checkbox"/> demonstrating creativity/novel ideas <input type="checkbox"/> monitoring their own work through self-assessment 		During lesson (s), most students are actively involved in learning activities <u>most of the time</u> as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> participating in relevant discussions with teachers/peers <input type="checkbox"/> attending/or being on-task during the instructional period <input type="checkbox"/> being involved in objective-related tasks <input type="checkbox"/> asking and responding to questions that are directly tied to the objective (not directions) <input type="checkbox"/> explaining their thinking (schema) either verbally or in writing (or via some other appropriate method of expression)e <input type="checkbox"/> explaining the purpose(s) of the intended learning 		During lesson (s), some students are <u>consistently</u> not actively involved in learning activities as evidence by a lack of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> participating in relevant discussions with teachers/peers <input type="checkbox"/> attending/or being on-task during the instructional period <input type="checkbox"/> being involved in objective-related tasks <input type="checkbox"/> asking and responding to questions that are directly tied to the objective (not directions) <input type="checkbox"/> explaining their thinking (schema) either verbally or in writing (or via some other appropriate method of expression)e <input type="checkbox"/> explaining the purpose(s) of the intended learning

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory * (1)
INDICATOR: <i>Discussion/Group Work</i>	The lesson incorporates group or peer-to-peer work in which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> students' practice, feedback, and interaction are maximized. <input type="checkbox"/> students are held accountable for group and individual work. <input type="checkbox"/> all students know their roles and responsibilities. <input type="checkbox"/> group composition (e.g., size, ability level, race, and gender) is appropriate. <input type="checkbox"/> group tasks create interdependence <input type="checkbox"/> groups are guided towards self-reflection and independence as learners. 	(4) Exceeds Expectations (Must include all Meets Expectations and at least one Exemplary element.)	The lesson incorporates group or peer-to-peer work in which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> students' practice, feedback, and interaction are enhanced. <input type="checkbox"/> students are held accountable for group work. <input type="checkbox"/> most students know their roles and responsibilities. <input type="checkbox"/> group composition (e.g., size, ability level, race, and gender) is appropriate. 	(2) Below Expectations* (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)	The lesson incorporates group or peer-to-peer work which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> does not increase practice, feedback, or interaction more than if students were to work individually. <input type="checkbox"/> few students know their roles and responsibilities. <input type="checkbox"/> does not hold groups or individuals accountable.
INDICATOR: <i>Differentiation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> During lesson (s), there is evidence that the teacher meets the individual needs of students based on knowledge, skills, interests, backgrounds and learning styles to help each student achieve the learning objective by differentiating : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>content</u> (e.g., tiered assignments, accelerating or decelerating the curriculum) ▪ <u>process</u> (e.g., direct instruction, flexible grouping) ▪ <u>product</u> (e.g., oral/written performance) <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher provides a clear rationale for differentiation. <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's decision to differentiate is based on the analysis of student data prior to the lesson. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> During lesson (s), there is evidence that the teacher meets the needs of groups of students based on knowledge, skills, interests, backgrounds and learning styles to help groups achieve the learning objective by differentiating : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>content</u> (e.g., tiered assignments, accelerating or decelerating the curriculum) and/or ▪ <u>process</u> (e.g., direct instruction, flexible grouping) and/or ▪ <u>product</u> (e.g., oral/written performance) <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher provides a clear rationale for differentiation. <input type="checkbox"/> The teacher's decision to differentiate is based on the analysis of student data prior to the lesson. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> During lesson (s), there is no evidence that the teacher differentiates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>content</u> (e.g., tiered assignments, accelerating or decelerating the curriculum) and/or ▪ <u>process</u> (e.g., direct instruction, flexible grouping) and/or ▪ <u>product</u> (e.g., oral/written performance)

Performance Continuum	Exemplary (4)	(4)	Meets Expectations (3)	(2)	Unsatisfactory (1) *
INDICATOR: <i>Thinking and Problem Solving</i>	<p>During lesson (s), there is evidence that 2 thinking approaches are/ have been intentionally and explicitly taught.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Analytical thinking where students either: compare/contrast, evaluate/explain, classify/categorize, or draw/justify conclusions. <input type="checkbox"/> Practical thinking where students use and apply ideas they learned to work on real-life tasks. <input type="checkbox"/> Creative thinking where students generate ideas, design, create, and evaluate a final product. <input type="checkbox"/> Research based thinking where student hypothesize, observe, experiment, record, and report results. <input type="checkbox"/> Self-assessment where students assess their own learning by setting goals, monitoring progress, and evaluating performance. 	Exceeds Expectations (Must include all Meets Expectations and at least one (1) Exemplary element.)	<p>During lesson (s), there is evidence that 1 thinking approach is/ has been intentionally and explicitly taught.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Analytical thinking where students either: compare/contrast, evaluate/explain, classify/categorize, or draw/justify conclusions. <input type="checkbox"/> Practical thinking where students use and apply ideas they learned to work on real-life tasks. <input type="checkbox"/> Creative thinking where students generate ideas, design, create, and evaluate a final product. <input type="checkbox"/> Research based thinking where student hypothesize, observe, experiment, record, and report results. <input type="checkbox"/> Self-assessment where students assess their own learning by setting goals, monitoring progress, and evaluating performance. 	Below Expectations* (Has met some but not all Meets Expectations elements.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> During lesson (s) there is no evidence that thinking approaches are/have been intentionally and explicitly taught.
INDICATOR: <i>Efficiency and Procedures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Procedures (e.g., entering the room, distributing and collecting materials, transitioning between learning activities, gaining students' attention, what to do when students complete work early, how to work independently and in groups, returning to a task after an interruption, etc.) are well established, highly efficient, and executed by all students. <input type="checkbox"/> 85% of classroom time is devoted to academic learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Pacing in each part of the lesson maximizes learning for all students. <input type="checkbox"/> Physical space is organized in a manner conducive to learning. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Procedures (e.g., entering the room, distributing and collecting materials, transitioning between learning activities, gaining students' attention, what to do when students complete work early, how to work independently and in groups, returning to a task after an interruption, etc.) are established, but some are not executed efficiently by all students. <input type="checkbox"/> 65% of classroom time is devoted to academic learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Pacing in each part of the lesson is appropriate for the majority of students, but sometimes is too fast or too slow. <input type="checkbox"/> Physical space is organized in a manner conducive to learning. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Few procedures are established, or are poorly designed. <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 50% of classroom time is devoted to academic learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Pacing is uneven and too fast or too slow for the majority of the students. <input type="checkbox"/> Physical space is organized poorly making it difficult for students to get into groups and easily and efficiently access learning materials.
INDICATOR: <i>Classroom Management</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Students are consistently well-behaved. <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher-student interactions demonstrate caring and respect. <input type="checkbox"/> Mistakes are used as learning opportunities. <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher consistently praises effort and measures progress. <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher is receptive to students' opinions. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Students behave, but minor disruptions occur. <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher-student interactions are mostly respectful. <input type="checkbox"/> Mistakes are accepted as part of the learning process. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Students are not well behaved. <input type="checkbox"/> Disruptions frequently interrupt learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher-student interactions are sometimes authoritarian, negative, or inappropriate.

Appendix D: Structured Support and Intensive Assistance

STRUCTURED SUPPORT PHASE

The purpose of the Structured Support Phase is to provide organizational support and assistance to teachers who are not currently meeting the district's professional teaching standards. This Phase demonstrates the district's commitment to quality services/teaching by providing a supported, structured and focused system of assistance to ensure that every teacher is meeting the professional practice expectations of the Greenwich Public Schools.

The Structured Support Phase is designed for tenured teachers whose performance indicates a need for more structured supervision to meet the district's professional practice expectations or those teachers who may be experiencing difficulty in some aspect of their job performance.

“Safety Net”

Teachers who have been assigned to a new job responsibility or who have self-identified an area of weakness or challenge may access the “safety net.” The safety net is the period of collaboration, mentoring and support provided by the administration without formal documentation.

Structured Support Plan Development

1. The plan will be developed collaboratively by a group consisting of the teacher, the evaluator/administrator, a representative from the Human Resources office and a representative of the Greenwich Education Association.
2. The plan must be developed within twenty (20) days of the observation or identification of other issues documenting the difficulty.
3. The actions and activities must be documented using SSP Form #1 (page 76).
4. The plan must include the following components:
 - a. A minimum of three (3) formal observations consisting of a pre-observation conference with a review of the lesson plan and a post-observation conference, conducted by the prime evaluator/administrator;
 - b. The expected length of the plan;
 - c. The identified areas of concerns referenced to the Greenwich Public Schools Indicators of Professional Practice rubrics;
 - d. The supports to be provided (may include workshops, conferences, written materials, classroom/school visitations);
 - e. The evidence of success that will be used to evaluate the effective implementation of the plan and document improved performance; and
 - f. The teacher may request support from Human Resources and/or the Greenwich Education Association.

5. Either the prime evaluator/administrator or the teacher may request a contributing evaluator.
6. At the end of the predetermined time period, the prime evaluator/administrator writes a summative evaluation to determine whether the teacher returns to the Professional Growth Phase, continues in the Structured Support Phase with a modified plan or requires Intensive Assistance.

FORMS (See following pages for samples):

SSP-1: Structured Support Phase Plan - copy given to teacher; copy kept by evaluator; one copy per team sent to the Human Resources Department. (Page 76)

SSP-2. Structure Support Plan Evaluation Timeline - kept by administrator until end of school year; sent to Human Resources Office with End-of-Year Report by July 1. (Page 77)

SSP-3. Structured Support Plan End-of-Plan Report - copy given to teacher; copy kept by evaluator; one copy sent to the Human Resources Department. This report will contain the teacher's summary of the Structured Support Plan and overall performance. The report will also include the evaluator's written summary and evaluation of the Structured Support Plan, as well as a copy of the Timeline. The evaluator will indicate whether the teacher is to remain in the Structured Support Phase with a modified plan, return to the Professional Growth Phase or requires Intensive Assistance. (Page 78)

SSP-2 STRUCTURED SUPPORT PHASE EVALUATION TIMELINE

Name: _____ School: _____
 Assignment: _____ Prime evaluator: _____
 Contributing evaluator: _____ Projected length of plan _____ to _____

Action/Activity	Person Responsible	Projected Date of Completion
1. Initial meeting to discuss Structured Support Plan and criteria for evaluation (within 20 calendar days* of the observation or identification of other issue documenting the difficulty)		
2. First formal observation conducted by prime evaluator, including lesson plan submission or pre-conference, post-observation conference and observation report** (within 20 calendar days* of observation).		
3. Second formal observation including lesson plan submission or pre-conference, post-observation conference and observation report**, (within 20 calendar days* of observation).		
4. Third formal observation including lesson plan submission or pre-conference, post-observation conference and observation report** (within 20 calendar days* of observation).		
5. Interim conference, discussion of implementation of plan and areas of growth and areas of continued weaknesses. Plan may be modified as needed.		
6. End-of-Plan Report** completed by prime evaluator and staff member, including written notice of progress of the plan signed by prime evaluator/administrator.		

(Teacher's signature/date)

(Prime evaluator's signature/date)

(Signature indicates participation with the development of the Timeline and an agreement with the target dates. If the teacher disagrees with the Timeline, s/he may request in writing a review of the Timeline with a representative from Human Resources.)

NOTE: * 20 calendar days exclusive of school vacations. ** Send original Observation Report/ End-of-Plan Report to Human Resources Office as soon as it is signed.

SSP-3 STRUCTURED SUPPORT PHASE END-OF-PLAN REPORT

Name: _____ School: _____
Assignment: _____ Prime evaluator: _____
Contributing evaluator: _____ Projected length of plan _____ to _____

Teacher's summary of Structured Support Plan and overall performance (reference the Teacher Evaluation and Professional Learning {TEPL I} rubrics as needed):

Evaluator's summary (should describe the Teacher's overall performance as well as the extent of her/his accomplishment of the Structured Support Plan, and may indicate areas for future growth):

EVALUATOR (for each year of the phase): Complete **one** of the following sentences:

1. _____'s overall performance meets the performance expectations of the Greenwich Public Schools and has accomplished the Structured Support Plan. S/he will return to the Professional Growth Phase.
2. _____'s overall performance generally meets the performance expectations of the Greenwich Public Schools. However, the rubric indicator (s) identified on the attached sheet need(s) additional attention. A revised Timeline and SSP Plan are attached.
3. _____'s overall performance does not show sufficient progress toward meeting the performance expectations of the Greenwich Public Schools. _____ needs to move into the Intensive Support Phase in order to address significant and continuing performance deficiencies.

Evaluator's signature/date: _____

Teacher's signature*/date: _____

(*Signature indicates receipt of Structured Support Phase End of Plan Report. If the teacher disagrees with the evaluation report, s/he may request in writing a review of the evaluation from the Director of Human Resources.)

INTENSIVE ASSISTANCE PHASE

The prime evaluator is responsible for identifying any teacher whose performance appears to be unsatisfactory or in need of intensive assistance. The purpose of the Intensive Assistance Phase is to address performance deficiencies, provide intensive and corrective support, and inform and make employment decisions. The procedure for identifying Intensive Assistance status is described below:

1. A tenured teacher in either the Professional Growth Phase or the Structured Support Phase may be placed in Intensive Assistance after three formal observations conducted by the prime evaluator. Each of these observations will be followed by a conference. The three observations and conferences shall occur within no fewer than fifteen (15) school days and no more than eighty (80) school days. Each conference shall be summarized in writing, and both parties shall sign the summary. The teacher must be notified in writing by the Director of Human Resources of his/her placement in Intensive Assistance.
2. When a teacher's performance appears to be unsatisfactory or in need of intensive assistance, a second evaluator (appointed by the Superintendent or his/her designee) will be assigned. The staff member may also request support from Human Resources and/or the Greenwich Education Association.
3. Each evaluator must file a minimum of two Intensive Assistance Progress Reports (pages 84-85) and two formal observation reports within twelve months of placement in Intensive Assistance. The prime evaluator, designated by the Superintendent or his/her designee, shall write the end-of-year summary evaluation.
4. Each formal observation will be followed by a post-observation conference. Evaluation examines total performance, and the conference may deal with any of the Greenwich Public Schools Indicators of Professional Practice in addition to those observed in the formal observation. Specific comments dealing with total performance should be made on the progress reports. These comments should be shared with the staff member at the conference. Specific statements about strengths and weaknesses should be made. Plans to reinforce strengths and to correct weaknesses should be noted on the **two** formal observation reports and on the **two** Intensive Assistance Progress Reports.
5. The Superintendent or Designee will observe teachers in the Intensive Assistance Phase at least once during the school year. This formal observation is in addition to the required observations. This observation will follow the usual procedure, with a post-observation conference including all assigned evaluators and the completion of a formal observation report that will be placed in the teacher's personnel file.
6. The prime evaluator will write an end-of-year summary evaluation, containing constructive suggestions if appropriate, and will share the evaluation with the teacher. A copy of the end-of-year evaluation will be sent to the Human Resources Office by July 1.

7. When in the judgement of the evaluators the teacher's performance has improved so that there are no longer serious performance concerns based upon the Greenwich Public Schools Indicators of Professional Practice, the evaluators will inform the teacher and advise the Director of Human Resources in writing of this matter. A teacher may remain in Intensive Assistance for no longer than two years.

IAP-1 INTENSIVE ASSISTANCE PHASE PLAN

Name: _____ School: _____
 Assignment: _____ Prime evaluator: _____
 Second evaluator: _____ Projected length of plan _____ to _____

1. Initial meeting to discuss Intensive Assistance Plan and criteria for evaluation. Date _____

Members Attending (Print and Signature)

Staff Member	_____	_____
Evaluator/Administrator	_____	_____
Second Evaluator	_____	_____
HR Representative	_____	_____
GEA Representative	_____	_____

2. Submission of new or updated Professional Growth Plan (attach) Date _____

3. Supervisory/Support Activities

Activity	Person Responsible	Projected Date of Completion

4. Review of Professional Growth Plan and Supervisory/Support activities. Date _____

5. Evidence of Success

Data or documentation

(Teacher's signature/date)

(Prime evaluator's signature/date)

(Second evaluator's signature/date)

(Signature indicates participation in the development of the plan. If the teacher disagrees with the contents of the plan, s/he may request in writing a review from the Director of Human Resources.)

Send to Human Resources within 10 days of development of the plan.

IAP-2 INTENSIVE ASSISTANCE PHASE EVALUATION TIMELINE

Name: _____ School: _____
 Assignment: _____ Prime evaluator: _____
 Second evaluator: _____ Projected length of plan _____ to _____

Action/Activity	Person Responsible	Projected Date of Completion
1. Initial meeting to discuss Intensive Assistance Plan and criteria for evaluation (within 20 calendar days* of the observation or identification of other issue documenting the difficulty)		
2. First formal observation conducted by prime evaluator, including lesson plan submission or pre-conference, post-observation conference and observation report** (within 20 calendar days* of observation).		
3. Second formal observation including lesson plan submission or pre-conference, post-observation conference and observation report** (within 20 calendar days* of observation).		
4. First formal observation conducted by second evaluator, including lesson plan submission or pre-conference, post-observation conference and observation report** (within 20 calendar days* of observation).		
5. Second formal observation conducted by second evaluator, including lesson plan submission or pre-conference, post-observation conference and observation report** (within 20 calendar days* of observation).		
6. Formal observation conducted by the Superintendent/ Designee, including lesson plan submission or pre-conference, post-observation conference and observation report** (within 20 calendar days* of observation)		
7. Interim conference, discussion of implementation of plan and areas of growth and areas of continued weaknesses. Plan may be modified as needed.		
8. End-of-Plan Summary Report** completed by prime evaluator and staff member, including written notice of progress of the plan signed by prime evaluator/administrator.		

(Teacher's signature/date)

(Prime evaluator's signature/date)

(Signature indicates participation with the development of the Timeline and an agreement with the target dates. If the teacher disagrees with the Timeline, s/he may request in writing a review of the Timeline with a representative from Human Resources.)

NOTE: * 20 calendar days exclusive of school vacations. ** Send original Observation Report/ End-of-Plan Summary Report to Human Resources Office as soon as it is signed.

IAP-3 INTENSIVE ASSISTANCE END-OF-YEAR SUMMARY REPORT

Name: _____ School: _____
Assignment: _____ Prime evaluator: _____
Second evaluator: _____ Projected length of plan _____ to _____

Teacher's summary of Intensive Assistance Plan and overall performance (reference the Teacher Evaluation and Professional Learning {TEPL I} rubrics as needed):

Evaluator's summary (should describe the Teacher's overall performance as well as the extent of her/his accomplishment of the Intensive Assistance Plan, and may indicate areas for future growth):

EVALUATOR (for each year of the phase): Complete **one** of the following sentences:

1. _____'s overall performance meets the performance expectations of the Greenwich Public Schools and has accomplished the Intensive Assistance Plan. S/he will return to the Professional Growth Phase.
2. _____'s overall performance generally meets the performance expectations of the Greenwich Public Schools. However, the rubric indicator (s) identified on the attached sheet need(s) additional attention. A revised Timeline and Intensive Assistance Plan are attached.
3. _____'s overall performance does not show sufficient progress toward meeting the performance expectations of the Greenwich Public Schools.

Evaluator's signature/date: _____

Teacher's signature*/date: _____

(*Signature indicates receipt of Intensive Assistance Phase End of Year Summary Report. If the teacher disagrees with the evaluation report, s/he may request in writing a review of the evaluation from the Director of Human Resources.)

INTENSIVE ASSISTANCE PROGRESS REPORT

Greenwich Public Schools Indicators of Professional Practice

Teacher: _____ School: _____ Progress Report Number: _____ Date: _____
Prime Evaluator: _____ Second Evaluator: _____

Greenwich Public Schools Indicators of Professional Practice (Refer to professional practice expectations outlined in the rubrics)

TEACHING AND LEARNING

Indicator 1: Planning and Assessment

Indicator 2: Student Work

Indicator 3: Reflection

Indicator 4: Learning Outcomes

Indicator 5: Content Organization and Delivery

Indicator 6: Questioning

Indicator 7: Feedback

Indicator 8: Engagement

Indicator 9: Discussion/Group Work

Indicator 10: Differentiation

Indicator 11: Thinking and Problem Solving

Indicator 12: Efficiency and Procedures

Indicator 13: Classroom Management

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Recommendations:

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Indicator 14: Maintains Accurate Records

Indicator 15: Communicates with Families

Indicator 16: Contributes to school and district

Indicator 17: Grows and develops professionally

Indicator 18: Shows professionalism

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Recommendations:

Progress toward removal from INTENSIVE ASSISTANCE status:

Evaluator's comments:

Teacher's comments (optional):

Teacher's signature* /date

Signature indicates receipt of Intensive Assistance Progress Report. If the teacher disagrees with the contents of the report, s/he may request in writing a review of the report from the Director of Human Resources.)

Prime evaluator's signature/date

Second evaluator's signature/date

Additional pages may be attached for comments and/or recommendations.

**Appendix E: Correlation of CCT and
Greenwich Public Schools Indicators of
Professional Practice**

CCT Foundational Skills (2010)	Greenwich Indicators of Professional Practice
<p><u>Domain 1</u> Content and Essential Skills Teachers understand and apply essential skills, central concepts and tools of inquiry in their subject matter or field.</p>	<p>Knowledge and performance related to “Content and Essential Skills” are evidenced in all indicators in the Teaching and Learning and Professional Responsibilities domains.</p>
<p><u>Domain 2</u> Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning Teachers promote student engagement, independence and interdependence in learning by facilitating a positive learning community.</p>	<p>Engagement Feedback Discussion/Group Work Efficiency and Procedures Classroom Management Record Keeping</p>
<p><u>Domain 3</u> Planning for Active Learning Teachers plan instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large.</p>	<p>Planning and Assessment Content Organization and Delivery Learning Outcomes Differentiation</p>
<p><u>Domain 4</u> Instruction for Active Learning Teachers implement instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large.</p>	<p>Engagement Questioning Feedback Discussion/Group Work Thinking and Problem Solving Differentiation</p>
<p><u>Domain 5</u> Assessment for Learning Teachers use multiple measures to analyze student performance and to inform subsequent planning and instruction.</p>	<p>Planning and Assessment Differentiation Feedback Student Work</p>
<p><u>Domain 6</u> Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership Teachers maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration with others, and leadership.</p>	<p>Reflection Communication School and District Contributions Professional Growth Professionalism</p>

Appendix F: Support Documents and Guides

Goal Setting Guide

Timeframe: By October 15

Orientation to 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 and student learning objectives (SLOs), and they will commit to set time aside for the types of collaboration required by the evaluation process.

Teacher Reflection and Goal-Setting

The teacher examines student data, prior year assessments and survey results and TEPL I document to draft goals for the school year in four areas:

1. Performance and practice goal (40%)
2. Student learning objective (SLO) (45%)
3. Parent feedback goal (10%).

In addition to the goals stated above, 5% of a teacher's summative rating will be based on **Whole-School Student Learning Indicator** which is based on administrator progress on SLOs.

The teacher may collaborate in grade-level or subject-matter teams to support the goal-setting process and develop common goals.

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.

TEACHER PRACTICE RELATED INDICATORS

Performance and Practice Goal (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.

Teachers develop a performance and practice goal that is aligned to the TEPL I rubric. This goal provides a focus for observations and feedback conversations. **In most instances, the focus for the teacher performance and practice goal will be identified at the end-of-year conference. New staff/ staff with a change of assignment will meet to establish a performance and practice goal by October 15.**

At the start of the year, each teacher will work with his or her evaluator to develop a performance and practice goal through mutual agreement. Goals should have a clear link to student achievement and should move the teachers towards Meets Expectations or Exemplary on the TEPL I rubric. Schools may decide to create a school-wide goal aligned to a particular indicator (e.g., Questioning) that all teachers will include as their performance and practice goal.

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 two-step process:

- 1) Evaluator holistically reviews evidence collected through observations (**both formal and informal**), interactions (e.g., team meetings, conferences), and **artifacts (e.g., student work)** and uses professional judgment to determine performance level ratings for all indicators in the Teaching and Learning Domains.
- 2) Evaluator determines overall assessment for the Teaching and Learning Domains and derives a numerical score (1.0 – 4.0) to be used to calculate the summative rating for state reporting.

The summative Teacher Performance and Practice performance level rating and numerical score and the indicator 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 Check In to discuss progress toward Teacher Performance and Practice goals/outcomes.

Parent Feedback Goal (10%)

Feedback from parents will be used to help determine the remaining 10% of the Teacher Practice Indicators.

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. Surveys should be confidential and survey responses should not be tied to parents' names. (**Note: The Harris Survey and GPS Safe School Climate Surveys will provide data to inform the parent feedback goal.**)

2. Determining School-Level Parent Goals

Principals and School Data Teams (SDT) 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.

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. Teachers will also set improvement targets related to the goal they select. 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.

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)	Meets Expectations (3)	Below Expectations (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Exceeded Goal	Met Goal	Partially Met Goal	Did Not Meet Goal

STUDENT OUTCOMES RELATED INDICATORS

Student Learning Objective (SLO) (45%)

SLOs are carefully planned, long-term objectives. SLOs should reflect high expectations for learning or improvement and aim for mastery of content or skill development. SLOs are measured by Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs) which include specific assessments/measures of progress and targets for student mastery or progress.

To create their Student Learning Objective (SLO), teachers will follow these four steps:

Step 1: Review the Data

This first phase is the discovery phase which begins with reviewing district initiatives and key priorities, school/district improvement plans, and the building administrator’s goals. Teachers should examine multiple sources of data about their students’ performance to identify and area(s) of need. Documenting the “baseline” data, or where students are at the beginning of the year, is a key aspect of this step. It allows the teacher to identify where students are with respect to the grade level or content area the teacher is teaching.

A teacher may use but is not limited to the following data in developing a SLO:

- Initial performance for current interval of instruction (writing samples, student interest surveys, pre-assessments, etc.)
- Student scores on previous state standardized assessments (Science CMTs)

- Results from other standardized and non-standardized assessments
- Report cards from previous years
- Results from diagnostic assessments
- Discussions with other teachers who have previously taught the same students
- Individual Educational Plans (IEEs) and 504 plans
- Data related to English Language Learner students and gifted students

It is important that the teacher understands both the individual student and group strengths and challenges. This information serves as the foundation for setting the ambitious yet realistic goals in the next phase.

Step 2: Set SLO

The SLOs are broad goal statements for student learning and expected student improvement. These goal statements identify core ideas, domains, knowledge and/or skills students are expected to acquire for which baseline data indicate a need. Each SLO should address a central purpose of the teacher's assignment and should pertain to a large proportion of his/her students, including specific target groups where appropriate. Each SLO statement 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 State Standards) or district standards for the grade level or course. Depending on the teacher's assignment, a SLO statement might aim for content mastery or else it might aim for skill development.

SLOs broad goal statements can unify teachers within a grade level or department while encouraging collaborative work across multiple disciplines. Teachers with similar assignments may have identical SLOs although they will be individually accountable for their own students' results.

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

An **Indicator of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD)** is an assessment/measure of progress to include a quantitative target that will demonstrate whether the SLO was met. The SLO must include **at least two IAGDs** but may include multiple, differentiated IAGDs where appropriate. **However, the metric used for each IAGD must be different.**

IAGDs should be written in SMART goal language:

- S**pecific
- M**easurable
- A**ligned and Attainable
- R**esults-Oriented
- T**ime-bound

IAGDs should be rigorous, attainable and meet or exceed district expectations (rigorous targets reflect both greater depth of knowledge and complexity of thinking required for success). Each indicator should make clear:

- 1) What evidence/measure of progress will be examined;

- 2) What level of performance is targeted; and
- 3) What proportion of students is projected to achieve the targeted performance level.

IAGDs can also address student subgroups, such as high or low performing students or English Language Learners. It is through Step 1 examination of student data that teachers will determine what level of performance to target for which population(s) of students.

IAGDs are unique to the teacher's particular students; teachers with similar assignments may use the same assessment(s)/measure of progress for their SLOs, but it is unlikely they would have identical targets established for student performance. For example, all 2nd grade teachers in a district might set the same SLO and use the same reading assessment (measure of progress) to measure their SLOs, but the target(s) and/or the proportion of students expected to achieve proficiency would likely vary among 2nd grade teachers. Additionally, individual teachers may establish multiple differentiated targets for students achieving at various performance levels.

Step 3: Provide Additional Information

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

- Baseline data used to determine SLO and set IAGDs;
- Selected student population supported by data;
- Learning content aligned to specific, relevant standards;
- Interval of instruction for the SLO;
- Assessments/measures of progress teacher plans to use to gauge students' progress;
- Instructional strategies;
- Any important technical information about the indicator evidence (like timing or scoring plans); and
- Professional learning/supports needed to achieve the SLO.

Step 4: Submit SLOs to Evaluator for Approval

SLOs are proposals until the teacher and the evaluator mutually agree upon them. Prior to the Goal-Setting Conference, the evaluator will review each SLO relative to the following criteria to ensure that SLOs across subjects, grade levels and schools are both rigorous and comparable:

- Baseline – Trend Data
- Student Population
- Standards and Learning Content
- Interval of Instruction
- Assessments/Measure of Progress
- Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs)/Growth Targets
- Instructional Strategies and Supports

Monitoring Students' Progress

Once SLOs are finalized, teachers should monitor students' progress towards the objectives. Teachers can, for example, examine student work; 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. Progress towards SLOs/IAGDs and action steps for achieving progress should be referenced in feedback conversations throughout the year.

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

Assessing 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-reflection 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 IAGD.
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-reflection and assign one of four ratings to each SLO.

EXCEEDED (4)	All or most students met or exceeded the target(s) contained in the indicator(s).
MET (3)	Most students met the target(s) contained in the indicators within a few points on either side of the target(s).
PARTIALLY MET (2)	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.
DID NOT MEET (1)	A few students met the target(s) but a substantial percentage of students did not. Little progress toward the goal was made.

The evaluator may score each IAGD separately, and 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.

Whole-School Student Learning Indicator (5%)

The **whole-school student learning indicator** is based on the administrator's progress on SLO targets included in his/her goal setting process. Teachers do NOT have to develop this goal. It is automatically assigned.

Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring Guide

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.

- 1. Performance and practice goal (40%)**
- 2. Whole-School Student Learning (5%)**
- 3. Student learning objective (SLO) (45%)**
- 4. Parent feedback goal (10%)**

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 (40%) and the parent feedback score (10%)
- 2) Calculate a Student Outcomes Related Indicators score by combining the student growth and development score (45%) and whole-school student learning indicator score (5%)
- 3) Use Summative Matrix to determine Summative Rating (**See page 97.**)

Every educator will receive one of four performance ratings:

Exemplary (4) – Exceeding indicators of performance

Meets Expectations (3) – Meeting indicators of performance

Below Expectations (2) – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others

Unsatisfactory (1) – Not meeting indicators of performance

Step 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 which are rounded to a whole number. The points are translated to a rating using the rating table example 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
Total Teacher Practice Related Indicator Points			142

***NOTE: In the determination of the score derived from the TEPL I rubric (observations of teacher performance and practice), the indicators in the Teaching and Learning Domains will constitute 30% of the total score and the indicators in the Professional Responsibilities Domain will constitute 10% of the total score.**

RATING TABLE

Teacher Practice Indicators Points	Teacher Practice Indicators Rating
50-80	Unsatisfactory (1)
81-126	Below Expectations (2)
127-174	Meets Expectations (3)
175-200	Exemplary (4)

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

Category	Score (1-4)	Weight	Points (Score X Weight)
Student Growth and Development (SLO)	3.5	45%	157.5
Whole School Learning Indicator (SPI)	3	5%	15
Total Student Outcomes Related Indicator Points			173

RATING TABLE

Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points	Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating
50-80	Unsatisfactory
81-126	Below Expectations
127-174	Meets Expectations
175-200	Exemplary

3) Use the Summative Matrix to determine Summative Rating

Using the ratings determined for each major category: Student Outcomes Related Indicators and Teacher 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 Teacher Practice Related Indicators rating is *proficient* and the Student Outcomes Related Indicators rating is *proficient*. The summative rating is therefore *proficient*. If the two major categories 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 determine a summative rating.

SUMMATIVE RATING MATRIX		Teacher Related Practice Indicators			
		Exemplary (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Below Expectations (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating	Exemplary (4)	Exemplary	Exemplary	Meets Expectations	<i>Gather More Information</i>
	Meets Expectations (3)	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	<i>Gather More Information</i>
	Below Expectations (2)	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
	Unsatisfactory (1)	<i>Gather More Information</i>	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory

Adjustment of Summative Ratings must be completed for all teachers by June 30 of a given school year. If standardized test data not 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 a teacher may be significantly impacted by state standardized test data, the evaluator may recalculate the teacher’s summative rating when the data is available and submit the adjusted rating no later than September 15. These adjustments should inform goal setting in the new school year.

Dispute Resolution Process

The resolution of disputes between teacher and evaluators on issues related to agreement on objectives/goals, the evaluation period, feedback on performance and practice, or the final summative rating shall include the following steps/procedures:

Level 1

If a teacher has an issue related to the elements of the teacher evaluation plan indicated above, the teacher should schedule a meeting with the evaluator to discuss and resolve the issue.

Level 2

If the issue cannot be resolved by the teacher and evaluator, the Director of Human Resources should be contacted and a meeting with the teacher and evaluator should take place.

Level 3

If the issue cannot be resolved at Level 2, the issue will be brought to the superintendent/designee.

At any level of the Dispute Resolution Process, the teacher may request bargaining unit representation.

Resolutions must be topic-specific and timely. Should the process established not result in resolution, the final determination will be made by the superintendent.

Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

Each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings. A pattern may consist of a pattern of one. Using the model recommended by the State of Connecticut, the Greenwich Public Schools will use the following patterns.

Novice teachers shall generally be deemed effective if said educator receives at least two sequential Meets Expectations ratings, one of which must be earned in the fourth year of a novice teacher's career. An Unsatisfactory rating shall only be permitted in the first year of a novice teacher's career, assuming a pattern of growth in year two and two sequential Meets Expectations ratings in years three and four. Superintendents shall offer a contract to any educator he/she deems effective at the end of year four. This shall be accomplished through the specific issuance to that effect.

A post-tenure educator shall generally be deemed ineffective if said educator or receives at least two sequential Below Expectations ratings or one Unsatisfactory rating at any time.

Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing

The district provides training and feedback to administrators in the evaluation process and procedures on an ongoing basis through onsite coaching by a teacher evaluation consultant, monthly district leadership council meetings, and school site visits by central office staff.

The Teacher Evaluation Process will be reviewed at the first faculty conference each year and the district enrolls each certified staff member in Schoology course on Teacher Evaluation Process. The district has developed an orientation program for new teachers and administrators to familiarize them with the TEPL plan. In addition, the district has developed and implemented a process to certify (and recertify every three years) the proficiency of all district evaluators in the use of TEPL by an outside consultant.

Career Development and Professional Growth

The district recognizes the benefit of career development and professional growth opportunities for teachers as a critical step in building the capacity and skills of all teachers and has established several processes to achieve this goal.

Mentoring – Each year a committee is formed to recruit, interview and assign mentors for teachers participating in the TEAM program. This is a stipended position for which specific criteria is established. Training for the chosen mentors is required.

Coaching – The district supports a peer coaching model as an effective strategy for enhanced teacher practice and improved student outcomes. Dedicated coaching positions are in place for Literacy, Math, Science, Technology (part time) and Instruction. Coaching applicants are interviewed and chosen based on a rigorous set of criteria. On-going professional learning is provided by the district in both content expertise and coaching strategies.

Peer Observations – The district encourages and supports peer observations by providing both professional learning by an outside consultant and teacher release time. Recently some schools have explored an electronic solution to peer observations through taped lessons followed by peer review.

Greenwich Public Schools

2015-16

Administrator Evaluation Plan



Updated May, 2015

Greenwich Board of Education

Ms. Barbara O’Neill *Chairperson*

Ms. Jennifer Dayton *Vice Chairperson*

Ms. Debbie Applebaum *Secretary*

Mr. Peter Bernstein

Ms. Laura Erickson

Ms. Adriana Ospina

Mr. Peter Sherr

Mr. Peter von Braun

Greenwich Public Schools

Dr. William McKersie *Superintendent*

Dr. Ellen Flanagan *Deputy Superintendent*

Mrs. Irene Parisi *Assistant Superintendent*

Ms. Mary Forde *Director of PPS*

Dr. Robert Lichtenfeld *Director of Human Resources*

The Greenwich Public Schools is committed to complying with federal, state and local equal opportunity and non-discrimination laws that prohibit that school district from making any employment decision, excluding any person from any of its educational programs or activities, or denying any person the benefits of any of its educational programs or activities, on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability or genetic information, ancestry, age, religion, sexual orientation, marital status, economic status or any other basis prohibited by applicable law, except in the case of a bona fide occupational qualification and/or subject to conditions and limitations established by law. Inquiries regarding the Greenwich Public Schools’ nondiscrimination policies should be directed to the Director of Human Resources, Greenwich Public Schools, 290 Greenwich Avenue, Greenwich, CT 06830.

Table of Contents

System Overview	5
Administrator Evaluation and Support Framework	5
Process and Timeline	6
Step 1: Orientation and Context-Setting	7
Step 2: Goal-Setting and Plan Development.....	7
Step 3: Plan Implementation and Evidence Collection	10
Step 4: Mid-Year Formative Review	11
Step 5: Self-Assessment.....	11
Step 6: Summative Review and Rating.....	12
Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing	12
Support and Development	13
Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning	13
Improvement and Remediation Plans	13
Career Development and Growth	14
Leadership Practice Related Indicators	15
Component #1: Observation of Leadership Practice (40%)	15
Arriving at a Leadership Practice Summative Rating	18
Component #2: Stakeholder Feedback (10%).....	20
Stakeholder Feedback Summative Rating	20
Student Outcomes Related Indicators	21
Component #3: Student Learning (45%)	21
Locally-Determined Measures (Student Learning Objectives)	21
Arriving at Student Learning Summative Rating	24
Component #4: Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%).....	25
Summative Administrator Evaluation Rating	25
Summative Scoring	25
Determining Summative Ratings	26
A. PRACTICE: Leadership Practice (40%) + Stakeholder Feedback (10%) = 50%	27
B. OUTCOMES: Student Learning (45%) + Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%) = 50%	27
C. OVERALL: Leader Practice + Student Outcomes	28
Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness.....	29
Dispute Resolution Process	30

VISION OF THE GRADUATE

The Greenwich Public Schools are committed to preparing students to function effectively in an interdependent global community. Therefore, in addition to acquiring a core body of knowledge*, all students will develop their individual capacities to:

- Pose and pursue substantive questions
- Critically interpret, evaluate, and synthesize information
- Explore, define, and solve complex problems
- Communicate effectively for a given purpose
- Advocate for ideas, causes, and actions
- Generate innovative, creative ideas and products
- Collaborate with others to produce a unified work and/or heightened understanding
- Contribute to community through dialogue, service, and/or leadership
- Conduct themselves in an ethical and responsible manner
- Recognize and respect other cultural contexts and points of view
- Pursue their unique interests, passions and curiosities
- Respond to failures and successes with reflection and resilience
- Be responsible for their own mental and physical health

*The core body of knowledge is established in local curricular documents which reflect national and state standards as well as workplace expectations.

3/31/09

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 Leadership 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 an administrator's contribution to student academic progress, at the school and classroom level. This category 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 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

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:

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.

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 .
2. Stakeholder survey data are available for review by the administrator. (Harris and Safe School Climate Surveys)
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.”



Administrators should start with the outcomes they want to achieve. This includes setting three SLOs and one target related to stakeholder feedback.

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 a specific focus area 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 following completed form 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.

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
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%.	SLO 1: Increase EL cohort graduation rate by 2% and the extended graduation rate by 3%.	Focus Area 1: 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.	SLO 2: 90% of students complete 10th grade with 12 credits.	Focus Area 2: 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 Common Core 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 CAPT scores (if available).	SLO 3: 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%.	Survey 1: 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.

School site visits to observe administrator practice can vary significantly in length and setting. Evaluators need to plan visits carefully to maximize the opportunity to gather evidence relevant to an administrator's practice focus areas. Each site visit should conclude with the evaluator and administrator meeting to debrief on the observation and discuss follow up.

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 9, 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:

- Datasystems 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.

- 2 observations for each administrator.
- 4 observations for any administrator new to their district, school, the profession or who has received ratings of *developing* or *below standard*.

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 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 discuss progress toward student learning targets, as well as any areas of performance related to standards of performance and practice. This 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.

Step 5: Self-Assessment

In the spring, the administrator takes an opportunity to assess his/her practice on 6 performance expectations of the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards. For each, the administrator determines whether he/she:

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

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

The administrator submits the written reflection to the evaluator one week prior to the end of year conference. This reflection becomes part of their evaluation.

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.

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.

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, the evaluator and administrator will use available evidence and data to estimate ratings. Once the data becomes available, the ratings may be adjusted.

Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing

All evaluators are required to complete training on administrator evaluation processes. 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 district will provide training opportunities to support evaluators of administrators in implementation of the model across their schools.

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 GPS vision for professional learning is that each and every educator engages in continuous learning every day to increase professional effectiveness, resulting in positive outcomes for all students. For students to graduate college and be 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 the evaluator process, in mutual agreement with their evaluators all administrators will identify professional learning needs that support their goal and objectives. The identified needs will serve as the foundation for ongoing conversations about the administrator'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 administrators, which can then be targeted with school-wide or district- wide professional learning opportunities.

Improvement and Remediation Plans

If a GPS administrator's performance is rated as *developing* or *below standard*, it signals the need for focused support and development. Depending on the level of need the administrator will be placed in one of two support phases – Structured Support or Intensive Assistance. The administrator and the evaluator, along with a representative from Human Resources and GOSA will meet to develop a Structured Support Plan or an Intensive Assistance Plan.

- 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. 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.

Components of the Support Plan shall include by are not limited to:

- Clearly identified 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 delineated 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.”
- A timeline for implementing such resources, support and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is developed. Determined dates for interim and final reviews in accordance with stages of support.
- Indicators of success, including a rating of proficient or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.

Career Development and Growth

The Greenwich Public Schools provide several opportunities for career development and growth including:

Network Facilitator – each school is a member of a Network and the administrators within that Network function as a collaborative team to plan professional learning based on staff and student needs. Each Network has a stipended *Network Facilitator* position. The *Network Facilitator* provides leadership to the group and acts as a liaison to Central Office. One of the Elementary Network Facilitators also works with the Deputy Superintendent to develop professional learning opportunities for administrators; provides coaching for administrators on support plans; and assists in the training of new administrators.

Mentoring – all administrators new to the district are assigned a mentor. The mentor along with the new administrator attends training at CES. The mentor meets with the new administrator periodically to facilitate his/her transition to the district and the role. The *GPS Administrator Mentor Handbook* outlines the expectations for the mentor and mentee.

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. Principals should begin each year with a discussion with the Deputy Superintendent to discuss which of the six performance expectations will be the focus of their work during the upcoming school year. Any principal with a previous rating of Developing or Below Standard will be required to focus on those performance expectations.

Figure 3: Leadership Practice – 6 Performance Expectations



These weightings should be consistent for all principals and central office administrators. For assistant principals and other school-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*. Each administrator should begin the year with a discussion with his/her evaluator as to which components of the rubric does/does not apply to his/her role.

*A copy of the *CT Common Core of Leading* can be found on the GPS Schoology group *Educator Evaluation* in the Administrator folder.

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

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 six 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.

3. 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*.**
4. The administrator and evaluator hold a Mid-Year Formative Review with a focused discussion of progress toward proficiency in the focus areas identified as needing development.
5. 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.
6. 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:

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		

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.

GPS administrators are expected to base their Stakeholder Feedback goal in data from the *Harris Survey* or the *Safe School Climate Survey*.

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:

1. Select appropriate survey measures aligned to the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.
2. Review baseline data on selected measures, which may require a fall administration of the survey in year one.
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).
4. Later in the school year, administer surveys to relevant stakeholders.
 5. Aggregate data and determine whether the administrator achieved the established target.
 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.

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 based on 3 Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) set by the administrator during their goal setting conference at the beginning of the school year.

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 Common Core State Standards and 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.

	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3
Elementary or Middle School Principal	Non-tested subjects or grades	Broad discretion	
High School Principal	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subjects)	Broad discretion	
Elementary or Middle School AP	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.	
High School AP	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.	

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 indicators, goals and SLOs for administrators:

Grade Level	SLO
2nd Grade	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.
Middle School Science	78% of students will attain <i>proficient</i> or higher on the science inquiry strand of the CMT in May.
High School	9th grade students will accumulate sufficient credits to be in good standing as sophomores by June.

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.

- 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 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	<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

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 proficient or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	> 60% of teachers are rated proficient or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	> 40% of teachers are rated proficient or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	< 40% of teachers are rated proficient or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation

- 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:

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.

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 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

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 six 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
TOTAL LEADER PRACTICE-RELATED POINTS			110

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 student learning objectives – and teacher effectiveness outcomes.

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

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. Using the model recommended by the State of Connecticut, the Greenwich Public Schools will consider 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 resolution of disputes between administrator and evaluators on issues related to agreement on objectives/goals, the evaluation period, feedback on performance and practice, or the final summative rating shall include the following steps/procedures:

Level 1

If an administrator has an issue related to the elements of the administrator evaluation plan indicated above, the administrator should schedule a meeting with the evaluator to discuss and resolve the issue.

Level 2

If the issue cannot be resolved by the administrator and evaluator, the Director of Human Resources should be contacted and a meeting with the administrator and evaluator should take place.

Level 3

If the issue cannot be resolved at Level 2, the issue will be brought to the superintendent/designee.

At any level of the Dispute Resolution Process, the administrator may request bargaining unit representation.

Resolutions must be topic-specific and timely. Should the process established not result in resolution, the final determination will be made by the superintendent.