

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015
AMITY BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015
CSDE APPROVED XXXX

AMITY REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 5

TEACHER EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT MODEL

Amity Regional School District No. 5
Bethany Orange Woodbridge

Committee on Teacher/Administrator Evaluation

	2014-15	Term Ends
Chip Dumais	- Superintendent of Schools	
E. Marie McPadden	- Chair, Advisory Committee on Teacher Evaluation Director of Curriculum & Staff Development	
Amy Benton	- Teacher, Bethany	2016
Charles Britton	- Building Administrator, Woodbridge	
Brenda Burt	- Teacher, High School	2016
Richard Dellinger	- Building Administrator, Bethany	
Tasia Kimball	- Teacher, High School	2017
Kathleen Fuller-Cutler	- Building Administrator, Orange	
Jen Bshara	- Teacher, Orange	2016
Peter Downhour	- AEA President	Duration of term as President
Mary Raiola	- Director of Pupil Services	
Claude Roy	- Teacher, High School	2015

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015
Teacher Evaluation Plan
BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015
EMM – 5/2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview of the Teacher Evaluation and Development Model.....	5
Purpose and Rationale of the Evaluation System.....	5
Core Design Principles.....	5
Teacher Evaluation Process and Timeline.....	6
Goal Setting and Planning.....	6
Evidence Collection.....	7
Mid-Year Check-In.....	7
End-of-Year Summative Review and Conference	7
Local Reporting.....	8
State Reporting.....	8
Summative Rating Revisions.....	8
Evaluation and Support System Overview.....	9
Teacher Performance and Goal-Setting.....	10
Teacher Evaluation Components.....	11
Student Outcome Related Indicators.....	12
Student Growth and Development (45%).....	12
Standardized State Tests.....	12
Non-Standardized Indicators.....	13
Student Learning Objectives.....	13
Student Feedback (5%).....	17
Teacher Performance and Practice (40%).....	18
Teacher Practice Framework: Connecticut Common Core of Teaching.....	18
Domains of Teacher Performance.....	18
Observation Process.....	19
Feedback.....	21
Pre-Conferences.....	22
Post-Conferences.....	22
Non-Classroom Reviews of Practice.....	22
Teacher Performance and Practice Scoring.....	22
Peer Feedback (10%).....	23
Final Summative Ratings.....	24
Primary and Complementary Observers.....	26
Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy.....	27
Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness.....	27
Evaluation-Based Professional Learning.....	27
Support and Development.....	28
Career Growth and Development.....	28
Improvement and Remediation Plans.....	28
Dispute Resolution Process.....	29
Orientation Programs.....	29

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

Online Resources

Panorama Student Feedback Survey. Web. 28 Apr. 2015. <<http://goo.gl/e4ck6k>>

Peer Feedback Survey. High School. Web. 28 Apr. 2015. <<http://goo.gl/hhOh20>>

Peer Feedback Survey. Orange Middle School. Web. 28Apr. 2015.
<<http://goo.gl/GHF2Nf>>

Peer Feedback Survey. Bethany Middle School. Web. 28Apr. 2015.
<<http://goo.gl/qlERjS>>

CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching. May 2014. Web. 28 Apr. 2015.
<<http://goo.gl/RUWf4p>>

CCT Rubric for Student and Educator Support Specialists. Oct. 2014. Web. 28 Apr. 2015. <<http://goo.gl/ePIKSj>>

TEACHER EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT MODEL

Purpose and Rationale of the Evaluation System

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

Core Design Principles

The following principles guided the design of Amity's teacher model:

- *Consider multiple, standards-based measure of performance*

An evaluation system that uses multiple sources of information and evidence results in a fair, accurate and comprehensive picture of a teacher's performance. The model defines four categories of teacher effectiveness: student learning (45%), teacher performance and practice (40%), peer feedback (10%) and student feedback (5%).

These categories are grounded in research-based, national standards:

 - The Common Core State Standards (CCSS), which clearly establishes high expectations for learning for all of Connecticut's children.
 - Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching (CCT), adopted in 2014, which defines effective teaching practice throughout the career continuum of educators from pre-service to induction to experienced teaching status in four domains:
 - Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning;
 - Planning for Active Learning;
 - Instruction for Active Learning;
 - Professional Responsibilities and Educator Leadership.
 - Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT) Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2014 for Student and Educator Support Specialists
 - Common Core of Leading: Connecticut Leadership Standards, adopted in June of 2012 (for Administrators only). This uses the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards as their foundation and define effective administrative practice through six performance expectations:
 - Vision, Mission, Goals
 - Teaching and Learning
 - Organizational Systems and Safety
 - Families and Stakeholders
 - Ethics and Integrity
 - The Education System
 - The Connecticut Framework K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards
 - State Assessments
 - Locally-developed curriculum standards
- *Promote both professional judgment and consistency*

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

- *Foster dialogue about student learning*
- *Encourage aligned professional development, coaching and feedback to support teacher growth*
- *Ensure feasibility of implementation.*

Teacher Evaluation Process and Timeline

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

Orientation, Planning and Goal Setting Conference – by October 31st

Evidence Collection – ongoing

Mid-year Check- in – January/February

End-of-year summative review and conference – last day of school

Local reporting – June 30th – BOE

State reporting – June 30th – SDE

Summative assessment revision – September 15th

Goal-Setting and Planning

Timeframe: Must be completed by **October 31st**

Required Steps:

1. ***Orientation on Process*** – To begin the evaluation process, evaluators meet with teachers, in a group or individually, to discuss the evaluation process and their roles and responsibilities within it. The teachers will be provided with materials outlining the process and other information as appropriate. Training will take place in August. All forms and materials will be available on the website.

2. ***Planning, Teacher Reflection and Goal Setting-*** The teacher examines student performance data, prior year evaluation and survey results to draft a proposed performance and practice goal(s), student learning objectives (SLOs), and a student feedback goal for the school year. The teacher may collaborate in grade-level or subject-matter teams to support the goal-setting process.

3. ***Goal-setting Conference*** – The primary evaluator and teacher meet at the beginning of the school year to discuss 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. Guidance on developing professional development focus areas based on evidence collected should also be

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

reviewed. A system for monitoring progress should be reviewed and agreed upon by the evaluator and the teacher to support the review.

Evidence Collection

Timeframe: **On-going**

1. The teacher collects evidence about his/her practice to support review.
2. The primary evaluator or complementary observer collects evidence about teacher practice to support review.
3. Examples of types of evidence collected may include, but not limited to, student achievement data, lesson plans, student work samples, and common formative assessments.

Mid-Year Check-in

Timeframe: **January/February**

1. *Reflection and Preparation* – The teacher and evaluator collect and reflect on evidence to date about the teacher’s practice and student learning in preparation for the check-in.
2. *Mid-year conference* - The evaluator and teacher complete at least one mid-year check-in conference during which they review progress on teacher practice goals, student learning objectives (SLOs) and performance on each to date. The mid-year conference is an important point in the year for addressing concerns and reviewing results for the first half of the year. Evaluators **will** deliver mid-year formative information on **all** components of the evaluation framework (**CCT Rubric**) for which evidence has been gathered and analyzed (**including SLO’s, goals, surveys, non-classroom reviews of practice**). **An indication of quantitative progress will be provided at the mid-year conference.** If needed, teachers and evaluators can mutually agree to revisions on the strategies or approaches used and/or mid-year adjustment of SLOs to accommodate changes (e.g. student population, assignment). They also discuss actions that the teacher can take and supports the evaluator can provide to promote teacher growth in his/her development areas.

End-of-Year Summative Review and Conference

Timeframe: May and June; must be completed no later than **the last day of school**

1. *Teacher self-assessment*- The teacher reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the evaluator. This self-

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the goal-setting conference.

2. *Scoring* – The evaluator reviews submitted evidence; self-assessments and observation data to generate category and focus area ratings. The category ratings generate the final, summative rating. After all data, including state test data, are available, the evaluator may adjust the summative rating if the state test data change the student-related indicators significantly to change the final rating. Such revisions should take place as soon as state test data are available and before September 15th.
3. *End-of-Year Conference* – the evaluator and teacher meet to discuss all evidence collected to date and to discuss category ratings. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.

Local Reporting

Timeframe: By **June 30th**

The superintendent of Amity shall report the status of teacher evaluations to the Board of Education.

State Reporting

Timeframe: By **June 30th**

The superintendent of Amity shall report to the Commissioner of Education the status of the implementation of teacher evaluations, including the frequency of evaluations, aggregate evaluation ratings, the number of administrators and teachers who have not been evaluated and other requirements as determined by the Department of Education.

Summative Rating Revisions

Timeframe: By **September 15th**

After all data, including state test data, are available, the principal or designees may adjust the summative rating if the state test data may have significant impact on a final rating. A final rating may be revised when state test data are available.

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

Evaluation and Support System Overview

The evaluation and support system consists of multiple measures to paint an accurate and comprehensive picture of teacher performance. All Amity 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%)
 - b. Peer feedback (10%)
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 objectives (SLOs)
 - b. Measures of student learning as determined by student feedback (5%) through student surveys

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

Exemplary – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance

Accomplished – Meeting indicators of performance

Developing – Meeting some indicators of performance by not others

Below Standard – Not meeting indicators of performance

In order to determine summative rating designations for each teacher, Amity will:

1. Rate each teacher's performance in each category – indicators of student academic growth and development, observations of teacher performance and practice; peer feedback and student surveys.
2. Combine the indicators of student growth and development rating and whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback rating into a single rating, taking into account their

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

relative weights; this will represent an overall “outcome rating” of Exemplary, **Accomplished**, Developing and Below Standard.

3. Combine the observations of teacher performance and practice rating and the peer feedback rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “practice rating” of Exemplary, **Accomplished**, Developing, or Below Standard.
4. Combine the outcomes rating and practice rating into a final rating. In undertaking this step, Amity will assign a final summative rating of Exemplary, **Accomplished**, Developing or Below Standard.

Teacher Performance and Goal Setting

Amity teachers will develop two student learning objectives that are aligned to student performance data. These goals will provide a framework for the observations and feedback conversations.

At the start of the school year, each teacher will work with his or her evaluator to develop their practice and performance goal(s) through mutual agreement. All goals will have a clear link to student achievement and should move the teachers towards **Accomplished** or **Exemplary**.

Goals should be **SMART**:

S = Specific and Strategic

M = Measurable

A= Aligned and Attainable

R= Results-Oriented

T= Time-Bound

Progress towards goals and action steps for achieving progress should be referenced in feedback conversations following observations throughout the year. Goals and action steps should be formally discussed during the Mid-Year Conference and End-of-Year Conference. Although performance and practice goals are not explicitly rated as part of the Teacher Performance and Practice category, progress on goals will be reflected in the scoring of Teacher Performance and Practice evidence.

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

TEACHER EVALUATION COMPONENTS

Student Outcomes Related Indicators

- Student Growth and Development (45 %)
 - Standardized State Tests (*Per CSDE Guidelines)
 - Non- standardized indicators
- Student Feedback (5%)

Teacher Related Indicators

- Teacher Performance and Practice (40 %)
 - Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT)
 - Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT) for Student and Educator Support Specialists
 - Observation Process
 - Feedback
 - Pre and Post Conferences
- Peer Feedback (10 %)

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

Student Outcomes Related Indicators = 50%

This Student Outcomes Related Indicators half of the evaluation captures the teacher's impact on students. The Indicators includes two categories:

- Student growth and development = 45%
- Student feedback = 5%

Category 1: Student Growth and Development (45%)

Forty-five percent (45%) of a teacher's evaluation shall be based on attainment of two goals and/or objectives for student growth, using multiple Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD) to measure those goals/objectives.

The process for assessing student growth using multiple indicators of academic growth and development for teacher evaluation will be developed through mutual agreement by each teacher and their evaluator at the beginning of the year. All goals will align with district and building goals.

- STANDARDIZED STATE TESTS – SLO 1

*Note: For the **2015-2016** academic year, the required use of state test data is suspended, pending federal approval.*

In lieu of a SDE requirement to base SLOs on a standardized test, teachers may have the option to use assessments that are aligned to CCSS and/or SBAC.

For the **2015-2016** academic year, academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goals/objectives are met shall not be determined by a single, isolated standardized test score, but shall be determined through the comparison of data across assessments. Isolated standardized test results will not be used as the sole basis for the 22.5% of teacher evaluation. Standardized test results will only be used for the development of an SLO if used in tandem with teacher-developed, interim assessments aligned to the standardized assessment. If standardized test results are used as part of an SLO's, the interim, teacher-developed assessments will receive the same weight and consideration when determining student growth and development. During **2015-2016**, the use of a standardized test score where applicable (GMRT, AP, CMT/Science, CAPT/Science, PE Fitness Test, Ten Marks Assessments, Study Island assessments, etc.) will be "mutually agreed" to by the teacher and primary evaluator or supervising teacher (i.e., department chair).

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

Characteristics of interim, teacher-developed assessments shall include, where appropriate:

1. Four quarterly common performance-based assessments aligned to CCSS and/or SBAC (2 for semester-long courses) must be used as part of measuring the SLO.
2. The four common performance-based assessments aligned to CCSS and/or SBAC must assess student performance against the Common Core State Standards.
3. The four common performance-based assessments aligned to CCSS and/or SBAC must be used in a manner that determines student preparation for the Smarter Balanced assessment.

Note: The number of common performance-based assessments will be adjusted for semester length and nine week courses.

- **NON-STANDARDIZED INDICATORS – SLO 2**
22.5% of IAGDs will be based on a minimum of one non-standardized indicator.

Examples of non-standardized indicators include:

- Performance rated against a rubric (such as: music performance, dance performance);
- Performance assessments or tasks rated against a rubric (such as: constructed projects, student oral work, and other written work);
- Portfolios of student work rated against a rubric;
- Curriculum-based assessments, including those constructed by a teacher or team of teachers
- Periodic assessments that document student growth over time (such as: formative assessments, diagnostic assessments, district benchmark assessments);
- Other indicators (such as: teacher developed tests, student written work, constructed projects).

All assessments must be aligned to the Common Core State Standards and/or SBAC. There will be mutual agreement on the weighting of multiple IAGDs.

For student growth and development to be measured for teacher evaluation purposes, it is imperative to use a method that takes each teacher's assignment, students and context into account.

Student Learning Objective (SLO) Phase I: Learn about this year's students: The first phase, the discovery phase, just before the start of the school year. Once teachers know their rosters, they will access as much information as possible about their new students' baseline skills and abilities, relative to the grade or course. End-of-year tests from the prior spring, prior grades,

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

benchmark assessments and quick demonstration assessments are all examples of sources teachers can tap to understand both individual student and group strengths and challenges.

Student Learning Objective (SLO) Phase II: Set 2 Goals for Learning: As described above.

Step 1: Decide on the Student Learning Objectives

The objective will be broad goals for student learning. They should each address a central purpose of the teacher's assignment and it should pertain to a large proportion of his/her students. Each SLO should reflect high expectations for student learning – at least a year's worth of growth (or a semester's worth for shorter courses) - and should be aligned to relevant state, national (i.e., CCSS), or district standards for the grade level or course. Depending on the teacher's assignment, the objective might aim for content mastery or skill development.

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

Step 2: Select Indicators of Academic Growth and Development

Step 3: Provide Additional Information

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

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

Step 4: Submit SLO to Evaluator for Approval

SLOs are proposals until the evaluator approves them. If goals are not mutually agreed upon the dispute will be resolved following the dispute resolution procedure. While teachers and evaluators will confer during the goal setting process to select mutually agreed-upon SLOs, ultimately the evaluator must formally approve all SLO proposals.

The evaluator will examine each SLO. The SLO must meet all three criteria to be approved: Priority of Content, Quality of Indicators and Rigor of Objective/Indicator. If one or more of the criteria is not met, the evaluator will provide written comments and discuss their feedback with the teacher. SLOs that are not approved must be revised and resubmitted to the evaluator within ten (10) days.

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

DEFINITIONS:

Priority of Content: Objective is deeply relevant to teacher’s assignment and addresses a large proportion of his/her students.

Quality of Indicators: Indicators provide specific, measurable evidence. The indicators provide evidence about students’ progress over the school year or semester during which they are with the teacher.

Rigor of Objective/Indicators: Objective and indicator(s) are attainable but ambitious and taken together, represent at least a year’s worth of growth for students (or appropriate growth for a shorter interval of instruction).

Student Learning Objective (SLO) Phase 3: Monitor Student Progress - Once the SLOs are approved, teachers should monitor student’s progress towards the objectives. If a teacher’s assignment changes or if his/her student population shifts significantly, the SLOs can be adjusted during the Mid - Year Conference between the evaluator and the teacher.

Student Learning Objective (SLO) Phase 4: Assess student outcomes relative to SLOs - At the end of the school year, the teacher should collect the evidence required by their indicators and submit to their evaluator. Along with evidence, teachers will complete and submit a self-assessment which asks teachers to reflect on the SLO outcomes by responding to the following four statements:

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

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

Exceeded (4)	87.5-100% target was met or substantially exceeded the target(s) contained in the indicator(s).
Met (3)	63.5-87.5% of the target(s) contained in the indicators.
Partially Met (2)	40.5 – 63.0% met the target(s) but taken as a whole, progress towards the goal was made.
Did Not Meet (1)	25.0- 40.0% - Little progress toward the goal was made.

For SLOs with more than one indicator, the evaluator may score each indicator 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.

The final student growth and development rating for a teacher is the average of their SLO scores. The individual SLO ratings and the student growth and development rating will be shared and discussed with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference.

For teachers in the **2015-2016** academic year who decide to use CAPT/Science and/or CMT/Science standardized test scores, results may not be available in time to score the SLO prior to the last day of school. In this instance, if evidence for other indicators in the SLO is available, the evaluator can score the SLO on that basis.

However, once the state test evidence is available, the evaluator is required to score or rescore the SLO, then determine if the new score changes the teacher's final summative rating. The evaluation rating can be amended at that time as needed, but no later than September 15th.

Category 2: Student Feedback- (5%)

Panorama Student Feedback Survey

<http://goo.gl/e4ck6k>

Five percent (5%) of an Amity teacher’s evaluation shall be based on student feedback.

Our survey meets the following criteria:

- Student responses are anonymous.
- The Survey demonstrates properties of fairness, reliability, validity and usefulness.
- The student survey is age appropriate.
- Evidence of teacher’s implementation of strategies to address areas of need as identified by the survey results will be provided to the evaluator.

New teachers (baseline year), who show evidence of implementation of strategies to address areas of need will be rated **Accomplished**.

1. Review the survey results from prior period(s).
2. Use the Panorama Survey Classroom-level Scales **for a minimum of one class**.
3. Set one target for growth or performance for the **current** academic year.
4. Review the Panorama Survey and select two of the five Classroom-level Scales to administer at the mid-course point and at the end-of-course point.
5. At the midyear conference, teachers may opt to modify their target for growth or performance based upon a mid-course administration of the Panorama Survey, followed by an end-of-course administration of the same Panorama Survey.
6. Aggregate data and share results with evaluator.
7. Evidence of teacher’s successful implementation of strategies to address areas of need as identified by the survey results will be provided to the primary evaluator.

EXEMPLARY	ACCOMPLISHED	DEVELOPING	BELOW STANDARD
Exceeded the goal	Met the goal	Partially met the goal	Did not meet the goal

Teacher Evaluation Components

TEACHER PRACTICE RELATED INDICATORS = 50%

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

- Teacher Performance and Practice = 40%
- Peer Feedback = 10%

Category #3: Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)

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

Teacher Practice Framework:

2014 Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT) <http://goo.gl/RUWf4p>; and
The Connecticut CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery for Student and Educator Support Specialists <http://goo.gl/ePIKSj>

The Connecticut CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery for Student and Educator Support Specialists was developed and adopted by the CSDE (October 2014). This rubric will be used to evaluate teachers in special areas specifically, school psychologists, speech and language pathologists, school counselors and may be used with other service providers who "serve a caseload" of students.

The Structure of the CCT: The CCT contains teaching standards which describe two levels of effective knowledge, skills and qualities:

1. The four domains and 12 indicators that identify the foundational skills and competencies that pertain to all teachers, regardless of the subject matter, field or age group they teach; and
2. The discipline-specific professional teaching standards that further define and expand the definition of effective teaching within a particular subject matter or field.

Domains of Teacher Performance

Domain1 (In-Class Observations): Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning:

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

Teachers promote student engagement, independence and interdependence in learning by facilitating a positive learning community.

Domain 2 (Non-classroom Observations/Reviews of Practice): Planning for Active Learning: Teachers plan instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to improve their curiosity about the world at large.

Domain 3 (In-Classroom Observations): Instruction for Active Learning: Teachers implement instruction to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large.

Domain 4 (Non-classroom Observations/Reviews of Practice): Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership: Teachers maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration with others, and leadership.

The 2014 CCT Rubric and the CCT Rubric for Student and Educator Support Specialists (adopted October 2014) will use a four-level rating scale with the following labels:

- 4- Exemplary
- 3- **Accomplished**
- 2- Developing
- 1- Below Standard

The rubrics will be designed to give teachers an end-of-the-year assessment of where they stand in all performance areas - and guidance on how to improve. They are not checklists for classroom visits.

Exemplary – is reserved for truly outstanding teaching that meets very demanding criteria.

Accomplished – describes solid, expected professional performance.

Developing – indicates that performance has real deficiencies; no teacher should be content to remain at this level (although some novices might begin here).

Below Standard – is clearly unacceptable and should lead to dismissal if it is not improved immediately.

Observation Process

- Each teacher will be observed as defined below through both formal and informal observations as defined below:
 - **Formal**: Announced or unannounced observations or reviews of practice when applicable that last one class period and are followed by a post-observation conference (face-to-face), which includes both written and verbal feedback, but not ratings.
 - **Informal**: Unannounced observations that last at least 10 minutes and are followed by written and verbal feedback. The intent of the follow-up conversation is to provide an opportunity to discuss professional practice.

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

- In order to capture an authentic view of practice and to promote a culture of openness and comfort with frequent observations and feedback, the majority of Amity’s observations will be unannounced. Additionally, during informal observations, observers will minimize recording in order to focus upon teacher and student behavior. Creation of a record of the observation will in most instances occur after the observation.
- **An indication of quantitative progress will be provided at the mid-year conference.** A summative rating will be provided at the summative conference given at the end of the year.

Number of Observations:

For tenured teachers formerly rated Accomplished or Exemplary will continue to participate in a three-year observation cycle. Teachers will rotate through each cycle in subsequent years **(Cycle A will move to Cycle B; Cycle B will move to Cycle C, Cycle C will move to Cycle A).**

Newly tenured teachers will be blindly assigned by the Director of Curriculum to a cycle in an effort to balance the number of teachers in each of the cycles.

Teachers in Cycle (A) will receive one formal observation (based on the individual teacher’s decision, this observation shall be announced or unannounced) and five informal observations.

Teachers in Cycles (B) and (C) will receive five informal observations.

TEACHER CATEGORY	OBSERVATION REQUIREMENTS
Non-Tenured Teachers (Years 1-4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 3 formal observations • 2 of the 3 will be announced and include a pre-conference • 1 of the 3 will be unannounced • all include post-conference (verbal and written feedback) • Minimum of 3 informal observations. Include post conference (verbal and written feedback) • non-classroom review of practice

<p>Tenured - Accomplished and Exemplary Teachers Observation Cycle Flexibility Option</p>	<p><u>Cycle A</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 1 formal announced or unannounced observation per teacher decision. Formal announced will include a pre and post conference; Unannounced formal will include a post conference • Minimum 5 informal to include post conference (verbal and written feedback) • non-classroom review of practice <p><u>Cycle B</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of 5 informal to include post conference (verbal and written feedback) • non-classroom review of practice <p><u>Cycle C</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum of 5 informal to include post conference (verbal and written feedback) • non-classroom review of practice
<p>Tenured – Below Standard or Developing Teachers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum 3 formal observations – • 2 of the 3 will be announced and include a pre-conference • 1 of the 3 will be unannounced • all include post conference (verbal and written feedback) • Minimum 5 informal observations all include post conference (written and verbal feedback) • non-classroom review of practice

Feedback

All formal observations shall be followed by constructive and timely feedback - both verbal and written.

A formal observation should have feedback given within 7 school days. Informal observations should have feedback within 2 school days. Feedback of informal observations conducted by complementary evaluators shall be conveyed in writing to the primary evaluator.

Verbal Feedback may include a brief face-to-face conversation or post-conference. Written Feedback may include an e-mail correspondence, a comprehensive write-up and/or a quick note in mailbox.

Feedback should include specific evidence where appropriate on:

- Observed components of the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support
- Prioritized commendations and recommendations for development actions
- Next steps and supports the teacher can pursue to improve his/her practice

Pre- Conferences

Give context for the lesson and information about the students to be observed and for setting expectations for the observation process.

Post- Conference

Provide a forum for reflection on the observation and for generating next steps that will lead to the teacher's improvement. A good post-conference:

- Begins with an opportunity for the teacher to share his/her self-assessment of the lesson observed:
- Cites objective evidence to paint a clear picture for the teacher and the evaluator about the teacher's successes, what improvements will be made, and where future observations may focus.

Non-Classroom Reviews of Practice

All interactions with teachers that are relevant to their instructional practice and professional conduct may contribute to their performance evaluations. These interactions may include, **but not limited to**, reviews of lesson/unit plans and assessments, planning meetings, data team meetings, professional learning community meetings, call-logs or notes from parent-teacher meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, and attendance records from professional development or school-based activities/events.

During the goal-setting conference, evidence aligned to Domains 2 and 4 of the CCT will be identified by the teacher and primary evaluator. The evidence will serve as the basis for non-classroom reviews of practice. The evidence will be collected by the teacher and primary evaluator throughout the year. The evidence will be reviewed during the mid-year and summative conferences. The evidence will be used to support the summative rating for Domains 2 and 4.

Teacher Performance and Practice Scoring

The Connecticut Common Core of Teaching Observation Rubric will be used to establish a practice rating.

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

Category #4: Peer Feedback (10%)

Peer Feedback Survey

Peer Feedback Survey. High School. Web. 28 Apr. 2015. <<http://goo.gl/hhOh20> >

Peer Feedback Survey. Orange Middle School. Web. 28Apr. 2015. <<http://goo.gl/GHF2Nf> >

Peer Feedback Survey. Bethany Middle School. Web. 28Apr. 2015. <<http://goo.gl/qlERjS> >

Ten percent (10%) of an Amity teacher’s evaluation shall be based on peer feedback.

Our survey meets the following criteria:

- Peer responses are anonymous.
- The Survey demonstrates properties of fairness, reliability, validity and usefulness.

Data from **the previous year** will be used to set a minimum of one measurable goals for the **current** academic year. The goal will be collaboratively developed between the teacher and primary evaluator. Teachers will document data/evidence related to; one whole school goal or one departmental or one team goal. The data/evidence will be reviewed during the mid-year and summative evaluation conferences.

Evidence of teacher’s successful implementation of strategies to address areas of need as identified by the survey results will be provided to the evaluator. The primary evaluator will determine a rating.

EXEMPLARY	ACCOMPLISHED	DEVELOPING	BELOW STANDARD
Exceeded the goal	Met the goal	Partially met the goal	Did not meet the goal

For subsequent years, the Whole School Peer Feedback Survey will continue to be distributed to all certified staff members. The data will be calculated each year to determine an overall rating for the whole school and department/middle school interdisciplinary teams. Upon close analysis of the data, teachers will continue to work closely with building administration and department chairs and/or middle school interdisciplinary teams to self-reflect and determine areas of concern.

Final Summative Ratings:

- The individual summative teacher rating will be based on 4 categories of performance; student growth and development, teacher observations, peer feedback and student feedback.
- Every educator will receive one of 4 performance ratings:
 - Exemplary (4)
 - Accomplished (3)
 - Developing (2)
 - Below Standard (1)
- The rating will be determined using the following steps:

A. Calculate an Indicator Score for each category using the Rating Table.

Rating Table

% of Attainment of Indicator	Indicator Points	Indicator Rating	Indicator Score
87.5-100	175-200	Exemplary	4
63.5-87.0	127-174	Accomplished	3
40.5-63.0	81-126	Developing	2
25.0-40.0	50-80	Below Standard	1

B. Calculate the teacher summative rating using the indicator score for all five components, taking into account their relative weights using the Summative Rating Scale.

Summative Rating Table

Component	%	Indicator Score	Weighted Indicator Score
Standardized Test or Other Indicator (2014-15 only)	22.5	# between 1-4	0.225-0.9
Non-standardized Indicator	22.5	# between 1-4	0.225-0.9
Student Feedback	5	# between 1-4	0.05-0.2
Teacher Observations	40	# between 1-4	0.4-1.6
Peer Feedback	10	# between 1-4	0.1-0.4
Summative Score			1.0-4.0

The resulting summative score is likely to contain decimals. Round the summative score as translated in the table below:

Summative Score	Summative Rating
3.52-4.0	Exemplary (4)
2.54-3.51	Accomplished (3)
1.62-2.53	Developing (2)
1.0-1.61	Below Standard (1)

EXAMPLE #1:

Component	%	Indicator Score	Weighted Indicator Score
Standardized Tests/ or Other Indicator (2014-15 only)	22.5	4	.9
Non-Standardized Indicator	22.5	3	.675
Student Feedback	5	3	0.15
Teacher Observations	40	4	1.6
Peer Feedback	10	3	.3
Summative Score			3.625
Summative Rating			Exemplary

EXAMPLE #2:

Component	%	Indicator Score	Weighted Indicator Score
Standardized Test/ or Other Indicator (2014-15 only)	22.5	2	.45
Non-Standardized Indicator	22.5	3	.675
Student Feedback	5	3	0.15
Teacher Observations	40	3	1.2
Peer Feedback	10	3	.30
Summative Score			2.775
Summative Rating			Accomplished

Primary and Complementary Observers

The primary evaluator for Amity teachers will be the school principal, assistant principal, and other Amity Administrators who will be responsible for the overall evaluation process, including assigning summative ratings. Amity will use complementary observers to assist the primary evaluator.

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

Complementary observers are certified teachers who have completed five (5) years in the District. Complementary observers will go through an application and approval process on a per building basis. Complementary observers must be fully trained as evaluators in order to be authorized to serve in this role.

Department chairpersons (high school), as a function of their current job description, will be complementary observers; and as such must be fully trained to serve in this role.

There will be a minimum of four (4) complementary evaluators at both Amity Middle School Orange and Amity Middle School Bethany. There will be a minimum of nine (9) complementary observers in addition to the seven (7) department chairs at Amity Regional High School.

Each teacher would be able to reject one individual at the Middle School or two at the High School (but not a department chair) from the list of potential complementary observers.

Complementary observers will assist primary evaluators by conducting walk-through observations and providing verbal and written feedback.

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing

All evaluators, including complementary observers are required to complete extensive training on the evaluation model. Amity will provide comprehensive training and support to our schools to ensure that evaluators are Accomplished in conducting teacher evaluations including observation, valuation and providing quality feedback. The District will provide calibration sessions on an annual basis to all administrators, department chairs, and complementary observers. Amity has a mechanism in place for assessing individual evaluator proficiency on an on-going basis. Evaluators who do not demonstrate proficiency within a specified period of time will be subject to retraining on the evaluation model.

Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness; Evaluation Audit and Validation

The Amity School District defines effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the evaluation system, and as described in the CSDE 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills Document (pg. 1).

Novice teachers shall generally be deemed effective if said educator receives at least two sequential *Accomplished* ratings, one of which must be earned in the fourth year of a novice teacher's career. A novice teacher who fails to meet this standard may be deemed ineffective.

A post-tenure educator shall be deemed effective if they receive an *Accomplished* or Exemplary rating annually. A post-tenure educator who fails to meet this standard may be deemed ineffective. (See Improvement and Remediation Plan)

At the request of a district or employee the SDE or third-party entity approved by the SDE will audit the evaluation components that are combined to determine an individual's summative rating in the event that such components are significantly dissimilar (i.e. include both exemplary and below standard ratings) to determine a final summative rating.

The SDE or a third-party designated by the SDE will audit evaluations ratings of exemplary and below standard to validate such exemplary or below standard rating by selecting ten districts at random annually and reviewing evaluation evidence files for a minimum of two educators rated exemplary and two educators rated below standard in those districts selected at random, including at least one classroom teacher rated exemplary and at least one teacher rated below standard per district selected.

Evaluation-Based Professional Learning

The Amity District will provide professional learning opportunities for teachers, based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process. Learning opportunities are clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process as it related to student learning results, observations of professional practice and/or the results of stakeholder feedback. In consultation with the Amity Staff Development Committee, Professional Development activities will be designed to facilitate more ongoing small group learning opportunities related to improve student achievement, best instructional practices, effective use of student performance data, and lesson design.

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

Support and Development

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

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

Career Development and Growth

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

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

Improvement and Remediation Plans

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

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

The Amity Improvement and Remediation Plan provides guidance, supervision, and support for staff who need to develop a higher level of proficiency in one or more areas as defined by the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching, and/or the Amity job description. This plan recognizes that a teacher may need support in meeting the expectations of the job description. To be effective in providing instruction to improve student achievement, a teacher needs to

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

demonstrate that he or she is **Accomplished** in implementing the district's curriculum standards, instructional practices, assessment procedures and classroom management strategies. Teachers will work with their evaluator to develop a plan that includes: specific objectives, strategies to complete the objectives, formal and informal observations, professional development opportunities and a timeline. Verification of improvement will be done through a procedure of: collecting data, conferences with the teacher, and a written request which summarizes the nature of the problem and the attempts to resolve the problem. Each of the parties will receive a copy of the appropriate documents. If the evaluatee's status changes to **Accomplished**, copies of appropriate evaluation forms will be placed in the evaluatee's personnel file.

Dispute Resolution Process

A panel, composed of the superintendent, teacher union president and a neutral third person, (teacher provides a list of four people from the District of which the superintendent picks one) shall resolve disputes where the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on objectives/goals, the evaluation period, feedback on performance and practice, or final summative rating. Resolutions must be topic-specific and timely. Should the process established not result in resolution, i.e., consensus on a given issue, the determination regarding that issue will be made by the superintendent.

Orientation Programs

Amity will offer an annual orientation (before the start of the school year) program regarding teacher evaluation and support system to new teachers to the District and whose performance is being evaluated.

REVISED APRIL 28, 2015

Teacher Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

REVISED MAY 1, 2015
AMITY BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015
SDE Accepted for Approval XXXX

AMITY REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 5

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION AND DEVELOPMENT MODEL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Core Requirements for the Evaluation of Administrators.....	3
4-Level Matrix Rating System.....	3
Administrator Evaluation Process and Timeline.....	3
Multiple Student Learning Indicators.....	6
Teacher Effectiveness.....	10
Rating of Administrator Performance and Practice.....	10
Stakeholder Feedback.....	12
Final Summative Ratings.....	13
Evaluation – Based Professional Learning.....	15
Individual Administrator Improvement and Remediation Plan.....	15
Career Growth and Development.....	16
Orientation Programs.....	16
Defining Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness.....	16

Online Resource

Common Core of Leading: Connecticut Leadership Standards. June 2012. Web. 30 Apr. 2015.

<<http://goo.gl/MUjcNk>>

Core Requirements for the Evaluation of Administrators who Serve in Roles Requiring a 092 Certification

The superintendent of Amity Regional School District No. 5 shall annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each administrator who serves in a role requiring a 092 certification. 092 certificate holders whose primary job duties include teaching students shall be evaluated using the requirements in the Teacher Evaluation Model.

4-Level Matrix Rating System

Annual summative evaluations provide each administrator with a summative rating aligned to one of four performance evaluation designators: Exemplary, **Accomplished**, Developing and Below Standard.

The performance levels shall be defined as follows:

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

In order to determine summative rating designations for each administrator, the Amity Regional School District will:

1. Rate administrator performance in each of four categories – multiple student learning indicators, teacher effectiveness outcomes, observations of administrator performance and practice, and stakeholder feedback.
2. Combine the multiple-student learning indicator rating and the teacher effectiveness outcomes rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “outcomes rating” of Exemplary, **Accomplished**, Developing, or Below Standard.
3. Combine the observations of administrator performance and practice rating and stakeholder feedback rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “practice rating” of Exemplary, **Accomplished**, Developing or Below Standard.
4. Combine the outcomes rating and practice rating into a final rating that equally weights the outcomes and practice ratings. Amity will assign a summative rating performance level. Amity will provide at the start of each school year how the “practice rating” and “outcomes rating” will be combined into one summative rating.

Administrator Evaluation Process

1. The annual evaluation process for an administrator will include:

- a. *Orientation on process*

Timeframe: By July 31st

To begin the process, the superintendent or designee will provide the administrator with materials outlining the evaluation process and other information as appropriate. Process information provided in orientation will include the rubric

used for assessing administrator practice, the instruments to be used to gather feedback from staff, families, and /or students and their alignment to the rubric, the process and calculation by which all evaluation elements will be integrated into an overall rating.

b. *Goal-setting conference*

Timeframe: By September 31st

At the start of the school year, the superintendent or designee and administrator meet to discuss information relevant to the evaluation process, and agree on the specific measures and performance targets for the student learning indicators, teacher effectiveness outcomes, and stakeholder feedback. In the absence of agreement, the superintendent or designee makes the final determination about the performance targets. The evaluator and administrator also identify focus areas for development of administrator practice aligned to the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The evaluator and administrator also discuss the appropriate resources and professional development needs to support the administrator in meeting the performance targets.

c. *Evidence collection*

Timeframe: Ongoing

The administrator collects evidence about his/her practice and the superintendent or designee collects evidence about administrator practice to support the review.

1. The superintendent or designee must conduct at least two school site observations for any administrator and should conduct at least four school site observations for administrators who are new to their district, school, the profession or who have received ratings of developing or below standard.
2. The evaluator of an assistant principal shall conduct at least two observations of the practice of said assistant principal.*
2. Examples of school site observations could include observing the administrator leading professional development or facilitating teacher teams, observing the administrator working with parents and community members, observing classrooms and instructional quality, or assessing elements of the school culture.
3. Mid-year formative review
Timeframe: January/February
The superintendent or designee and administrator hold a mid-year formative conference, with explicit discussion of progress toward student learning targets, as well as any areas of performance related to standards of performance and practice.
4. End-of-year summative review:
Timeframe: June 15th
 - a. Administrator self-assessment – The administrator reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the superintendent or designee. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the Goal-setting conference.
 - b. End-of-year conference – The superintendent or designee and the administrator meet to discuss all evidence collected to date. Following the conference, the superintendent or designee assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.

** If the guidelines are modified, the district plan will be adjusted to reflect the new requirement.*

5. Local reporting

Timeframe: By June 30th

Amity's superintendent shall report the status of administrator evaluations to Amity Board of Education on or before June 30th of each year.

6. State reporting

Timeframe: By June 30th

The Amity superintendent shall report of the Commissioner of Education the status of the implementation of administrator evaluations, including the frequency of evaluations, aggregate evaluation ratings, the number of administrators who have not been evaluated and other requirements as determined by the DOE.

7. Summative rating revisions

Timeframe: By September 15th

After all data, including state test data, are available, the superintendent or designee may adjust the summative rating if the state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating. A final rating may be revised when state test data are available, before September 15th of a school year.

Multiple Student Learning Indicators – Forty five percent (45%)

NOTE: For the 2015-16 academic year, the required use of state test data is suspended pending federal approval.

1. Twenty-two point five percent (22.5%) of an administrator’s evaluation shall be based on student performance and/or growth on the state-administered assessments in core content areas that are part of the state’s approved school accountability system. If the state adds a student growth indicator tied to content-area assessments to the state accountability system for schools, then that indicator shall become a required element of this portion of the administrator evaluation system.

This portion must include:

- School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year;
- SPI progress for student subgroups

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

	Exemplary (4)	Accomplished (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
SPI Progress	100% to 125% of target progress	75%-99% of target progress	50-74% of target progress	<50% of target progress
Subgroup SPI Progress	Meets performance targets for all groups that have SPI <88 OR All subgroups have SPI >88 OR The school does not have subgroups of sufficient size	Meets performance targets for 50% or more of subgroups that have SPI <88	Meets performance targets for at least one subgroup that has SPI<88	Does not meet performance target for an subgroup that has SPI <88

Scores are weighted to emphasize improvement in schools below the State’s SPI target of 88 and to emphasize subgroup progress and performance in schools above the target.

	SPI >88	SPI between 88 and 64	SPI <64
SPI progress from year to year	50%	60%	60%
SPI Progress for student subgroups	50%	40%	40%

For 092 holders serving in central office administrative roles, The District shall rate performance based on results in the group of schools, group of students, or subject area most relevant to the administrator’s job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results. All protections related to the assignment of school accountability ratings (e.g. the minimum number of days a student must be enrolled in order for that student’s scores to be included in an accountability measure) shall apply to the use of state test data for administrator evaluation. If the state adds a student growth indicator tied to content-area assessments to the state accountability system for schools, then that indicator shall become a required element of this portion of the administrator evaluation system.

2. Twenty-two point five (22.5%) of an administrator’s evaluation shall be based on at least two locally-determined indicators of student learning, at least one of which will include student outcomes from subjects and/or grades not assessed on state-administered assessments. Locally determined indicators will align to Connecticut learning standards. For administrators in high schools, selected indicators 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 the principal and the assistant principal evaluations.

	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3
High School Principal	Graduation Rate (meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement)	Broad discretion	
Middle School Principal	Non-tested subjects or grades	Broad discretion	
High School AP	Graduation Rate (meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirements)	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.	
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.	
Central office Administrator	(meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement)		

- Students' performance or growth on school-or classroom- developed common performance-based assessments in subjects and grade levels for which there are not available state assessments (State Guidelines, Page 12).
- Other indicators proposed by the district.

The Amity district shall allow administrators and their evaluators to craft mutually agreed-upon student learning objectives specific to that administrator.

The process for selecting measures and creating SLOs should strike a balance between alignment to the district's student learning priorities and focus on the most significant school-level student learning needs.

- First, the district established 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 principal uses available data to craft an improvement plan for the school. This is done in collaboration with other stakeholders and includes a manageable set of clear student learning targets.
- The principal 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 principal chooses measures that best assess the priorities and develops clear and measurable SLOs for the chosen assessments/indicators.
- The professional resources are appropriate to supporting the administrator in meeting their performance targets.

The principal 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 (4)	Accomplished (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Met all 3 objectives and substantially exceeded at least 2 targets	Met 2 objectives and made at least substantial progress on the 3 rd	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

Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes – Five percent (5%)

Acceptable measures include:

- Improving the percentage (or meeting a target of a high percentage) of teachers who meet the student learning objectives outline in their performance evaluations. At this time, the guidelines do not indicate a goal for the 5%.
- Other locally-determined measures of teacher effectiveness.

For assistant principals, measure of teacher effectiveness shall focus only on those teachers the assistant principal is responsible for evaluating. If the assistant principal's job duties do not include teacher evaluation, then the teacher effectiveness rating for the principal of the school shall apply to the assistant principal.

Rating of Administrator Performance and Practice by the District Superintendent or Designee – Forty Percent – 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.

Ratings shall be based on evidence collected about leadership practice as described in the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards using a rubric aligned to those standards. <http://goo.gl/MUjcNk>

Leadership Practice – Six Performance Expectations

	Performance Expectation	%
1.	Vision, Mission and Goals	20
2.	Teaching and Learning	40
3.	Organizational Systems	15
4.	Families and Stakeholders	10
5.	Ethics and Integrity	10
6.	The Education System	5

Amity's performance ratings distinguish among four levels of performance (Exemplary, **Accomplished**, Developing and Below Standard) and clearly identify administrator leadership actions related to improving teacher effectiveness, including conducting teacher evaluations.

Observation protocol distinguishes between observations required for principals, assistant principals and central office administrators with alignment to the Guidelines and includes the following requirements:

- 1. At least two school site observations for any administrator.**
- 2. At least four school site observations for administrators who are new to their district school, the profession, or who have received ratings for developing or below standard.**
- 3. Evaluators of assistant principals will conduct at least two school site observations.**

For principals, the district will weigh the Teaching and Learning Standard at least twice as much as any other standard. The other standards of practice have a weighting of at least 5% of the overall evaluation.

In rating administrators against the rubric, the evaluator is required to identify a performance rating with written evidence to support the rating for each leadership standards and the evaluator must identify the strengths and growth areas of the administrator.

A rubric is not required for central office administrators. Amity will generate ratings from evidence collected directly from the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.

The evaluator is required to provide feedback on administrator performance at least but not limited to the mid-year conference and end-of-year conference. The feedback should be provided as soon after an observation as is practical.

TRAINING

All Amity Administrators will attend training sessions as needed. The training will focus on the administrator evaluation system, including training on conducting effective observations and providing high-quality feedback.

On-going calibration training will be provided throughout the year by external consultants (ACES) or by Central Office administration.

STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK – 10%

School Climate Survey (school-based)

Feedback from stakeholders – assessed by administration of a standardized school climate survey with measures aligned to the Connecticut Leadership Standards is 10% of an administrator’s summative rating.

For school-based administrators, stakeholders solicited for feedback shall include teachers and parents. Central office administrators shall be rated based on feedback from the stakeholders whom the administrator directly serves. The feedback will be kept anonymous and will demonstrate validity and reliability.

More than half of the rating of a principal on stakeholder feedback must be based on an assessment of improvement over time. The Amity District may also rate administrators based on status performance and may have less of a focus on improvement over time if status performance surpasses a district-determined threshold of adequate performance.

The Amity district may set common targets of improvement and performance for all administrators or set specific targets for individual administrators based on survey feedback.

Final Summative Ratings:

- The individual summative administrator rating will be based on 4 categories of performance; multiple student learning indicators, teacher effectiveness outcomes, rating of administrator performance and practice and stakeholder feedback.
- Every administrator will receive one of 4 performance ratings:
 - Exemplary (4)
 - Accomplished (3)
 - Developing (2)
 - Below Standard (1)
- The rating will be determined using the following steps:

A. Calculate an Indicator Score for each category using the Rating Table.

Rating Table

% of Attainment of Indicator	Indicator Points	Indicator Rating	Indicator Score
87.5-100	175-200	Exemplary	4
63.5-87.0	127-174	Accomplished	3
40.5-63.0	81-126	Developing	2
25.0-40.0	50-80	Below Standard	1

B. Calculate the administrator summative rating using the indicator score for all five components, taking into account their relative weights using the Summative Rating Scale.

Summative Rating Table

Component	%	Indicator Score	Weighted Indicator Score
Standardized Test or Other Indicator (2015-16)	22.5	# between 1-4	0.225-0.9
Non-standardized Indicator	22.5	# between 1-4	0.225-0.9
Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes	5	# between 1-4	0.05-0.2
Administrator Performance and Practice	40	# between 1-4	0.4-1.6
Stakeholder Feedback	10	# between 1-4	0.1-0.4
Summative Score			1.0-4.0

The resulting summative score is likely to contain decimals. Round the summative score as translated in the table below:

Summative Score	Summative Rating
3.52-4.0	Exemplary (4)
2.54-3.51	Accomplished (3)
1.62-2.53	Developing (2)
1.0-1.61	Below Standard (1)

EXAMPLE #1:

Component	%	Indicator Score	Weighted Indicator Score
Standardized Test or Other Indicators (2015-16)	22.5	4	.9
Non-Standardized Indicator	22.5	3	.675
Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes	5	3	.15
Administrator Performance and Practice	40	4	1.6
Peer Feedback	10	3	.30
Stakeholder Feedback			3.625
Summative Rating			Exemplary

EXAMPLE #2:

Component	%	Indicator Score	Weighted Indicator Score
Standardized Test or Other Indicators (2015-16)	22.5	2	.45
Non-Standardized Indicator	22.5	3	.675
Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes	5	3	.15
Administrator Performance and Practice	40	2	1.2
Peer Feedback	10	3	.30
Stakeholder Feedback			2.775
Summative Rating			Accomplished

EVALUATION - BASED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

The Amity District shall provide professional learning opportunities for administrators based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process. These learning opportunities shall be clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process as it related to student learning results, observation of professional practice or the results of stakeholder feedback include the provision of useful and timely feedback and improvement opportunities. The District shall provide all evaluators of administrators with training focused on the administrator evaluation system, including at least, but not limited to, training on conducting effective observations and providing high quality feedback.

INDIVIDUAL ADMINISTRATOR IMPROVEMENT AND REMEDIATION PLANS

The Amity District Structured Assistance Level of Administrator Support Plan is designed for those administrators who may need additional assistance to improve the performance of their professional responsibilities. The administrator and the superintendent will develop an action plan to address the stated performance problem area(s). The action plan will: (a) outline the specific area(s) of concern and list specific professional growth activities that must take place in order to remedy the problem (b) will include a dedicated timeline not to exceed five (5) months (c) will include a meeting between the administrator and the superintendent mid-way through the dedicated timeline to discuss the progress towards meeting the defined performance standards. Performance growth will be measured against the specific criteria outlined in the action plan.

At the end of the specified timeline, the administrator and the superintendent will meet to review progress made towards correcting the problem area(s). Following the meeting, the superintendent will make one of the following recommendations:

- If satisfactory progress has been made in the area(s) of concern, the superintendent will return the administrator to the normal evaluation cycle.
- If satisfactory has not been made in the area(s) of concern, the administrator will move to the Extended Structured Assistance Administrator Level of Support plan.
- The Action Plan will be collaboratively developed and will include, but not be limited to, support for the administrator in the following areas:
 - Peer mentoring
 - Professional development activities related to the Action Plan
 - Appropriate resources to support the Action Plan

The Extended Assistance Administrator Support Plan – if at the end of the timeline collaboratively developed by the administrator and the superintendent, the administrator does not meet the Areas of Concern/Performance Requirements plan goals, the administrator will be placed on Extended Structure Assistance Support.

The Plan will include:

- A listing of what the administrator must accomplish
- A listing of the assistance to be offered by the district
- A timeline not to exceed one year from the start of the Extended Structured Assistance Administrator Support Plan
- A series of progress meeting dates between the administrator and the superintendent

REVISED May 1, 2015

Administrator Evaluation Plan

BOE APPROVED MAY 11, 2015

EMM – 5/2015

Page 15

At the conclusion of the timeline established for the Extended Structured Assistance Support Plan, the superintendent will make of the following recommendations:

- The issues in question are resolved and the administrator is returned to the normal evaluation.
- The issues have not been resolved and the administrator may face additional disciplinary measures, including contract termination.

CAREER GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Amity District shall provide opportunities for career development and professional growth based on performance identified through the evaluation process. Examples of opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring/coaching early-career administrators; participating in development of administrator improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is developing or below standard; leading Professional Learning Communities for their peers; differentiate career pathways; and, targeted professional development based on areas of need.

ORIENTATION PROGRAMS

The Amity Regional Board of Education or regional educational service center for the school district (ACES) shall offer annual orientation programs regarding the administrator evaluation and support program to administrators who are employed by such regional board of education and whose performance is being evaluated and shall train administrators who are employed by such local or regional board of education and who are conducting performance evaluations. Annual evaluation calibration training shall be provided to all administrators who conduct evaluations.

DEFINING EFFECTIVENESS AND INEFFECTIVENESS: EVALUATION AUDIT AND VALIDATION

The Amity School District defines effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the evaluation system, and as described in the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.

An Amity Administrator shall be deemed effective if they receive a proficient or exemplary rating annually. An Amity Administrator who fails to meet this standard may be deemed ineffective. (See page 15 – Individual Administrator Improvement and Remediation Plans).

At the request of a district or employee the SDE or third-party entity approved by the SDE will audit the evaluation components that are combined to determine an individual's summative rating in the event that such components are significantly dissimilar (i.e. include both exemplary and below standard ratings) to determine a final summative rating.

The SDE or a third-party designated by the SDE will audit evaluations ratings of exemplary and below standard to validate such exemplary or below standard rating by selecting ten districts at random annually and reviewing evaluation evidence files for a minimum of two educators rated exemplary and two educators rated below standard in those districts selected at random, including at least one classroom teacher rated exemplary and at least one teacher rated below standard per district selected. The district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system.

Dispute Resolution Process

A panel, composed of the superintendent, administrator union president and a neutral third person, shall resolve disputes where the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on objectives/goals, the evaluation period, feedback on performance and practice, or final summative rating. Resolutions must be topic-specific and timely. Should the process established not result in resolution, i.e., consensus on a given issue, the determination regarding that issue will be made by the superintendent.