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Introduction

Excellent schools begin with great school leaders and teachers. The importance of highly-skilled educators is beyond dispute as a strong body of evidence now confirms what parents, students, teachers and administrators have long known: effective teachers are among the most important school-level factor in student learning, and effective leadership is an essential component of any successful school.

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) is committed to raising the overall quality of our schools’ workforce. To meet this goal, the state, in partnership with local and regional school programs and many other stakeholder groups, aims to create a comprehensive approach to supporting and developing Connecticut’s educators so that the state prepares, recruits, hires, supports, develops and retains the best educators to lead our classrooms and schools.

Educator evaluation is the cornerstone of this holistic approach and contributes to the improvement of individual and collective practice. High-quality evaluations are necessary to inform the individualized professional learning and support that all educators require. Such evaluations also identify professional strengths which should form the basis of new professional opportunities. High-quality evaluations are also necessary to make fair employment decisions based on teacher and administrator effectiveness. Used in this way, high-quality evaluations will bring greater accountability and transparency to schools and instill greater confidence in employment decisions across the state.

Design Principles
Purpose and Rationale

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

Core Design Principles

- Consider multiple standards-based measures of performance;
- Emphasize growth over time;
- Promote both professional judgment and consistency;
- Foster dialogue about student learning;
- Encourage aligned professional learning, coaching and feedback to support growth; and
- Ensure feasibility of implementation.
Consider multiple, standards-based measures of performance

An evaluation and support system that uses multiple sources of information and evidence results in a fair, accurate and comprehensive picture of an educator’s performance. The new model defines four components of teacher effectiveness: student growth and development (45%), teacher performance and practice (40%), parent feedback (10%) and whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback (5%). The model defines four components of administrator effectiveness: multiple student learning indicators (45%), leadership practice (40%), stakeholder feedback (10%) and teacher effectiveness outcomes (5%).

The four components of Rushford’s model are grounded in research-based standards for educator effectiveness, CT Core Standards, as well as Connecticut’s professional standards: The Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT); the Common Core of Leading (CCL): Connecticut School Leadership Standards; the Connecticut Framework K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards; and locally-developed curriculum standards.

Emphasize growth over time

The evaluation of an educator’s performance should consider his/her improvement from an established starting point. This applies to professional practice focus areas and the student outcomes they are striving to reach. Attaining high levels of performance matters—and for some educators maintaining high results is a critical aspect of their work—but the model encourages educators to pay attention to continually improving their practice. The goal-setting process in this model encourages a cycle of continuous improvement over time.
Promote both professional judgment and consistency

Assessing an educator’s professional practice requires evaluators to constantly use their professional judgment. No rubric or formula, however detailed, can capture all of the nuances of how teachers and leaders interact with one another and with students. Synthesizing multiple sources of information into performance ratings is inherently more complex than checklists or numerical averages. At the same time, educators’ ratings should depend on their performance, not on their evaluators’ biases. Accordingly, the model aims to minimize the variance between evaluations of practice and support fairness and consistency within and across schools.

Foster dialogue about student learning

In the quest for accuracy of ratings, there is a tendency to focus exclusively on the numbers. Rushford’s model is designed to show that of equal importance to getting better results is the professional conversation between an educator and his/her supervisor which can be accomplished through a well-designed and well-executed evaluation and support system. The dialogue in the Rushford model occurs more frequently and focuses on what students are learning and what administrators can do to support teaching and learning.

Encourage aligned professional learning, coaching and feedback to support growth

Novice and veteran educators alike deserve detailed, constructive feedback and professional learning tailored to the individual needs of their classrooms and students. Rushford’s model promotes a shared language of excellence to which professional learning, coaching and feedback can align to improve practice.

Ensure feasibility of implementation

Launching Rushford’s model will require hard work. Throughout each program, educators will need to develop new skills and to think differently about how they manage and prioritize their time and resources. Sensitive to the tremendous responsibilities and limited resources that administrators have, the model is aligned with other responsibilities (e.g., writing a school improvement plan) and emphasizes the need for evaluators to build important skills in setting goals, observing practice and providing high-quality feedback. The model aims to balance high expectations with flexibility for the time and capacity considerations within programs.
Improving student achievement sits at the center of the work for all educators. The Rushford’s model recognizes that student learning is a shared responsibility among teachers, administrators and program leaders. When teachers and administrators develop goals and objectives in a way that supports overall school improvement, opportunities for success have no boundaries. Therefore, by design, Rushford’s model creates a relationship among component ratings for teachers and administrators as depicted in the diagram below.
For clarity, see the example below to illustrate how administrators receive a final summative rating for Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%) as derived from teachers’ aggregate final summative rating for Student Growth and Development (45%):

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Final Summative Rating (5%) Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes</th>
<th>Teacher Final Summative Rating (45%) Student Growth and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The administrator receives a final summative rating of proficient (3) for Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%) if…</td>
<td>The aggregate final summative rating for Student Growth and Development (45%) for greater than 60% of staff is proficient (3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See the example below to illustrate how teachers receive a final summative rating for the Whole-School Student Learning Indicator as derived from an administrator’s final summative rating for Multiple Student Learning Indicators (45%):

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Final Summative Rating (45%) Multiple Student Learning Indicators</th>
<th>Teacher Final Summative Rating (5%) Whole-School Student Learning Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the administrator receives a final summative rating of proficient (3) for Multiple Student Learning Indicators (45%) then…</td>
<td>Teachers evaluated by that administrator receive a final summative rating of proficient (3) for the Whole-School Student Learning Indicator (5%) rating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Evaluation and Support

Rushford’s model for the evaluation and support of teachers in Connecticut is based on the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (Core Requirements), developed by a diverse group of educators as part of PEAC (Performance Evaluation Advisory Council) in June 2012 and based upon best practice research from around the country. The contents of this document are meant to guide Rushford in the implementation of our Educator Evaluation and Support model.
Rushford’s model for teacher evaluation and support includes specific guidance for the four components of teacher evaluation:

- Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)
- Parent Feedback (10%)
- Student Growth and Development (45%)
- Either Whole-School Student Learning or Student Feedback (5%)

Additional Requirements for Educator Evaluation and Support Plans

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

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

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

Teacher Evaluation Overview

Teacher Evaluation and Support Framework

The evaluation and support system consists of multiple measures to paint an accurate and comprehensive picture of teacher performance. All teachers will be evaluated in four components, grouped into two types of major categories: 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 category is comprised of two components:

   (a) **Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)** as defined within the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014*, which articulates four domains and twelve indicators of teacher practice
   (b) **Parent Feedback (10%)** on teacher practice through surveys

2. **Student Outcomes Related Indicators**: An evaluation of teachers’ contributions to student academic progress at the school and classroom level. There is also an option in this category to include student feedback. This area is comprised of two components:

   (a) **Student Growth and Development (45%)** as determined by the teacher’s Student
Learning Objectives (SLOs) and associated Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs)

(b) Whole-School Measures of Student Learning as determined by aggregate student learning indicators

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

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

**Process and Timeline**

The annual evaluation process between a teacher and an evaluator (principal or designee) is anchored by three conferences, which guide the process 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 developmental goals and identify development opportunities. These conversations are collaborative and require reflection and preparation by both the evaluator and the teacher in order to be productive and meaningful.
Goal-Setting and Planning:
Timeframe: Target is October 15, must be completed by November 15

1. **Orientation on Process** – To begin the evaluation process, evaluators meet with teachers, in a group or individually, to discuss the evaluation process and their roles and responsibilities within it. In this meeting, they will discuss any school or program priorities that should be reflected in teacher practice focus areas and Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), and they will commit to set time aside for the types of collaboration required by the evaluation and support process.

2. **Teacher Reflection and Goal-Setting** – The teacher examines student data, prior year evaluation and survey results, and the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* to draft a proposed performance and practice focus area, a parent feedback goal, two SLOs and a student feedback goal (if required) for the school year. The teacher may collaborate in grade-level or subject-matter teams to support the goal-setting process.

3. **Goal-Setting Conference** – The evaluator and teacher meet to discuss the teacher’s proposed focus area, 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 focus area(s), goals and objectives if they do not meet approval criteria. Ultimately, the evaluator and educator must agree on the goals. If necessary, the Director of School Programs or the PDEC committee may serve as additional resources to assist in reaching mutually agreeable goals.
Mid-Year Check-In:
Timeframe: January and 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 evidence related to the teacher practice focus area and progress towards SLOs and other goals. 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 may deliver mid-year formative information on indicators of the evaluation framework for which evidence has been gathered and analyzed. If needed, teachers and evaluators can mutually agree to revisions on the strategies or approaches used and/or mid-year adjustment of SLOs to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignment). They also discuss actions that the teacher can take and supports the evaluator can provide to promote teacher growth in his/her focus area. A **Mid-Year Conference Discussion Guide** is available to assist evaluators in conducting the conference on the SEED website.

End-of-Year Summative Review:
Timeframe: May and June; must be completed by June 30

1. **Teacher Self-Assessment** – The teacher reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the evaluator. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the Goal-Setting Conference.

2. **End-of-Year Conference** – The evaluator and the teacher meet to discuss all evidence collected to date and to discuss component ratings. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation **two weeks** before the end of the school year.

3. **Scoring** – The evaluator reviews submitted evidence, self-assessments and observation data and uses them to generate component ratings once the end-of-year conference has taken place. The component ratings are combined to calculate scores for Teacher Practice Related Indicators and Student Outcomes Related Indicators. These scores generate the final, summative rating.
Complementary Observers

The primary evaluator for most teachers will be the school principal or assistant principal or education director who will be responsible for the overall evaluation process, including assigning summative ratings. Rushford may also decide to use complementary observers to assist the primary evaluator. Complementary observers are certified educators and may include the Director of School Programs, Assistant Director of School Programs, or a Principal from another site. They must be fully trained as evaluators in order to be authorized to serve in this role. In APSEPs, clinical supervisors who hold the appropriate license for their role and who have been fully trained as evaluators of educators, may serve as complementary observers for educators that have both educational and clinical responsibilities within the educational program.

Complementary observers may assist primary evaluators by conducting observations, including pre-and post-conferences, collecting additional evidence, reviewing SLOs and providing additional feedback. A complementary observer should share his/her feedback with the primary evaluator as it is collected and shared with teachers. Primary evaluators will have sole responsibility for assigning final summative ratings. Both primary evaluators and complementary observers must demonstrate proficiency in conducting standards-based observations.

Complementary observers are suggested if a teacher has been consistently receiving Below Standard ratings.

Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing

All evaluators, including complementary observers, are required to complete extensive training on the SEED evaluation and support model. The purpose of training is to provide educators who evaluate instruction and support service delivery with the tools that will result in evidence-based observations, within classrooms and other learning environments, professional learning opportunities tied to evaluation feedback and improved educator and student performance.

The CSDE will provide programs with training opportunities to support program administrators, evaluators and teachers in implementing the model across their schools. Programs can adapt and build on these tools to provide comprehensive training and support to their schools and to ensure that evaluators are proficient in conducting teacher evaluations.

All evaluators are expected to engage in the CSDE-sponsored multi-day training. This comprehensive training will give evaluators the opportunity to:

- Understand the nature of learning for students and educators and its relation to the priorities of the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014;
- Establish a common language that promotes professionalism and a culture for learning through the lens of the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014;
- Understand how coaching conversations support growth-producing feedback;
- Establish inter-rater reliability through calibrations of observer interpretations of evidence and judgments of teaching practice; and
- Collaborate with colleagues to deepen understanding of the content.
Participants in the training will have opportunities to interact with colleagues and engage in practice and proficiency exercises to:

- Deepen understanding of the evaluation criteria;
- Define proficient teaching;
- Collect, sort and analyze evidence across a continuum of performance;
- Engage in professional conversations and coaching scenarios; and
- Determine a final summative rating across multiple indicators.

Completion of the multi-day training and demonstration of proficiency using established criteria enables evaluators to begin to engage in the evaluation and support process.

*Additional one-day training sessions may be offered on the CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015.

At the request of a program/APSEP or employee, the CSDE or a third-party entity approved by the CSDE 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) ratings in different components. In these cases, the CSDE or a third-party entity will determine a final summative rating.

Additionally, there is an annual audit of evaluations. “The CSDE or a third-party designated by the CSDE will audit ratings of exemplary and below standard to validate such exemplary or below standard ratings by selecting ten programs at random annually and reviewing evaluation evidence files for a minimum of two educators rated exemplary and two educators rated below standard in those programs selected at random, including at least one classroom teacher rated exemplary and at least one teacher rated below standard per program selected.” [Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation 2.8 (3)]
Support and Development

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

Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning

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

Throughout the process of implementing Rushford’s model, in mutual agreement with their evaluators, all teachers will identify professional learning needs that support their goal and objectives. The identified needs will 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 need among teachers, which can then be targeted with school-wide or program-wide professional learning opportunities.

Points for Program Consideration

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

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

Another key component of success is the development of leadership capacity in these alignment and coherence efforts. This is accomplished by:

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

Connecticut’s Standards for Professional Learning can be found here.
Improvement and Remediation Plans

If a teacher’s performance is rated as developing or below standard, it signals the need for focused support and development. Improvement and remediation plans will be developed in consultation with the teacher and his/her exclusive bargaining representative and be differentiated by the level of identified need and/or stage of development.

Stages or Levels of Support.

The Director of School Programs should be notified if an educator is placed on the following support plans. The union may be notified by either the educator or administration if formal support is required.

1. **Structured Support:** An educator would receive structured support when an area(s) of concern is identified during the school year. This support is intended to provide short-term assistance to address a concern in its early stage.

2. **Special Assistance:** An educator would receive special assistance when he/she earns an overall performance rating of developing or below standard and/or has received structured support. An educator may also receive special assistance if he/she does not meet the goal(s) of the structured support plan. This support is intended to assist an educator who is having difficulty consistently demonstrating proficiency.

3. **Intensive Assistance:** An educator 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.
Career Development and Growth

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

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

Teacher Practice Related Indicators

The Teacher Practice Related Indicators evaluate the teacher’s knowledge of a complex set of skills and competencies and how these are applied in a teacher’s practice. Two components comprise this category:

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

These two components will be described in detail below: Component #1: Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)

The Teacher Performance and Practice component is a comprehensive review of teaching practice conducted through multiple observations, which are evaluated against a standards-based rubric. It comprises 40% of the summative rating. Following observations, evaluators provide teachers with specific feedback to identify strong practice, to identify teacher development needs and to tailor support to meet those needs.

Teacher Practice Framework - CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014

The CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014, is available on the SEED website and represents the most important skills and knowledge that teachers need to demonstrate in order to prepare students to be career, college and civic ready. The rubric was revised through the collaborative efforts of the CSDE, representatives from the Regional Educational Service Centers (RESCs), the Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS), the two statewide teachers’ unions and teachers and school leaders with experience in using the observation instrument. The CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014 is aligned with the Connecticut Core of Teaching and includes references to Connecticut Core Standards and other content standards. The CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014 is organized into four domains, each with three indicators. Forty percent of a teacher’s final annual summative rating is based on his/her performance across all four domains. The domains represent essential practice and knowledge and receive equal weight when calculating the summative Performance and Practice rating.

Student and Educator Support Specialist (SESS) Practice Framework-CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2014

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) recognizes that in many APSEPs, there are educators who provide academic and/or clinical services. A group of these individuals are referred to as Student and Educator Support Specialists (SESS). Support specialists or service providers are those
individuals who, by the nature of their job description, do not have traditional classroom assignments, but serve a “caseload” of students, staff and/or families. In addition, they often are not directly responsible for content instruction nor do state standardized assessments directly measure their impact on students.

The CSDE, in partnership with SESS representatives from around the state, developed the *CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2014* for use with support specialists. This rubric was developed as a companion to the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* and parallels its structure and format to illustrate the common characteristics of effective practice across a variety of educators in the service of learners.

In spring 2015, phase one of a validation study of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery* began with an extended group of field practitioners. This work resulted in an improved version of the rubric to embrace a wider range of service provider roles and responsibilities with greater attention to both student and adult learners. As with any tool for the observation of educator performance and practice, the *CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015* is offered as an option for use as part of an APSEP evaluation and support plan and should be considered by the established Professional Development and Evaluation Committee (PDEC) as part of the discussion of educator roles and responsibilities and appropriate observation frameworks. Specifically, School Psychologists, Speech and Language Pathologists, School Social Workers and Comprehensive School Counselors may find this rubric to most closely represent a progression of their practice; however, this most recent version has considered other educators in a school or CSDE-APSEP that may have unique assignments and responsibilities (e.g., board-certified behavior analyst (BCBA), home school family liaison, instructional coach, transition coordinator, etc.).

**PLEASE NOTE:** The *CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015* is available via www.connecticutseed.org.
### CCT RUBRIC FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING 2014 - AT A GLANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Generally Collected Through <strong>In-Class Observations</strong></th>
<th>Evidence Generally Collected Through <strong>Non-Classroom Observations/Reviews of Practice</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOMAIN 1: Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>DOMAIN 2: Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers promote student engagement, independence and inter-dependence in learning and community by:</td>
<td>Teachers plan instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a Creating a positive learning environment that is responsive to and respectful of the learning needs of all students;</td>
<td>2.a Planning instructional content that is aligned with standards, builds on students’ prior knowledge and provides for appropriate level of challenge for all students;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b Promoting developmentally appropriate standards of behavior that support a productive learning environment for all students; and</td>
<td>2.b Planning instruction to cognitively engage students in the content; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.c Maximizing instructional time by effectively managing routines and transitions.</td>
<td>2.c Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to monitor student progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOMAIN 3: Instruction for Active Learning</strong></td>
<td><strong>DOMAIN 4: Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers implement instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:</td>
<td>Teachers maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration with others and leadership by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a Implementing instructional content for learning;</td>
<td>4.a Engaging in continuous professional learning to impact instruction and student learning;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b Leading students to construct meaning and apply new learning through the use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies; and</td>
<td>4.b Collaborating with colleagues to examine student learning data and to develop and sustain a professional learning environment to support student learning; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Assessing student learning, providing feedback to students and adjusting instruction.</td>
<td>4.c Working with colleagues, students and families to develop and sustain a positive school climate that supports student learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>3</sup>Domain 5: Assessment is embedded throughout the four domains
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1: Learning Environment, Engagement and Commitment to Learning</th>
<th>Domain 2: Planning for Active Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence Generally Collected Through Observations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evidence Generally Collected Through Non-classroom/Reviews of Practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service providers promote student/adult learner engagement, independence and interdependence in learning and facilitate a positive learning community by:</td>
<td>Service providers design academic, social/behavioral, therapeutic, crisis or consultative plans to engage student/adult learners in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Promoting a positive learning environment that is respectful and equitable.</td>
<td>2a. Developing plans aligned with standards that build on learners’ knowledge and skills and provide an appropriate level of challenge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Promoting developmentally appropriate standards of behavior that support a productive learning environment.</td>
<td>2b. Developing plans to actively engage learners in service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Maximizing service delivery by effectively managing routines and transition.</td>
<td>2c. Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to identify and plan learning targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 3: Service Delivery</th>
<th>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities and Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence Generally Collected Through Observations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evidence Generally Collected Through Non-classroom/Reviews of Practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service providers implement academic, social/behavioral, therapeutic, crisis or consultative plans to engage student/adult learners in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:</td>
<td>Service providers maximize support for learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration and leadership by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Implementing service delivery for learning.</td>
<td>4a. Engaging in continuous professional learning to enhance service delivery and improve student/adult learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Leading student/adult learners to construct meaning and apply new learning through the use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies.</td>
<td>4b. Collaborating to develop and sustain a professional learning environment to support student/adult learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Assessing learning, providing feedback and adjusting service delivery.</td>
<td>4c. Working with colleagues, students and families to develop and sustain a positive school climate that supports student/adult learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Observation Process**

Observations in and of themselves are not useful to teachers – it is the feedback, based on observations, that helps teachers reach their full potential. All teachers deserve the opportunity to grow and develop through observations and timely feedback. In fact, teacher surveys conducted nationally demonstrate that most teachers are eager for more observations and feedback to inform their practice throughout the year.

**Therefore, in Rushford’s teacher evaluation and support model:**

Each teacher should be observed between three and eight times per year through both formal and informal observations as defined below.

- **Formal:** Observations that were preceded by a pre-observation meeting, last at least 30 minutes, and are followed by a post-observation conference, which includes timely written and verbal feedback within 5 days from the date of the observation.
- **Informal:** Observations that last at least ten minutes and are followed by written and/or verbal feedback.
- **Non-classroom observations/reviews of practice include but are not limited to:** Observations of data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, PPT’s, and student work or other teaching artifacts.

**PLEASE NOTE:** reviewing lesson plans in a pre-observation conference, prior to a scheduled observation, generally provides evidence for the planning domain and is considered a part of the formal observation process. It does not serve as a separate observation or review of practice.

- All observations must be followed by feedback, either verbal (e.g., a post-conference, conversation in the hallway) or written (e.g., via email, comprehensive write-up, quick note in mailbox) or both, within a timely manner.
- Providing both verbal and written feedback after an informal observation or a review of practice is ideal, but school leaders are encouraged to discuss feedback preferences and norms with their staff.
- In order to capture an authentic view of practice and to promote a culture of openness and comfort with frequent observations and feedback, it is recommended that evaluators use a combination of announced and unannounced informal observations.
- The table on the next page summarizes the recommendations within Rushford’s model as compared with requirements established in the Guidelines.
### Teacher Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rushford’s Model</th>
<th>Guideline Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All First and Second Year Teachers* OR Below Standard and Developing (any years)</td>
<td>3 in-class formal observations; at least 2 of which include a pre-conference and all of which include a post-conference; and 3 informal observations (including one PPT review of practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Third and Fourth Year Teachers* AND Rated Proficient Or Exemplary</td>
<td>2 in-class formal observations; 2 of which include a pre-conference and all of which must include a post-conference; and 3 informal observations (including one PPT review of practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Fifth Year+ Teachers* AND Rated Proficient Or Exemplary</td>
<td>1 in-class formal observation including a pre and post conference and 3 informal observations (including one PPT review of practice)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only years of service at Rushford counted

**PLEASE NOTE:** To establish baseline data during the first year of official evaluation, all first and second year teachers will follow the first row above, and all teachers beginning their third year or more at Rushford will begin on the second row. Following this school year, teachers will be placed on their appropriate category based on years of service and/or summative rating.

### Pre-Conferences and Post-Conferences

Pre-conferences are valuable for establishing the context for the lesson, providing information about the students to be observed and setting expectations for the observation process and provide the evidence for Domain 2: Planning for Active Learning. Pre-conferences are optional for observations except where noted in the requirements described in the table above. A pre-conference can be held with a group of teachers, where appropriate.

Post-conferences provide a forum for reflecting on the observation against the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* or *The CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015* and for generating action steps that will lead to the teacher’s improvement. A good post-conference:

- Begins with an opportunity for the teacher to share his/her reflections on the lesson;
- Cites objective evidence to paint a clear picture for both the teacher and the evaluator about the teacher’s successes, what improvements will be made and where future observations may focus;
- Involves written and verbal feedback from the evaluator; and
- Occurs within a timely manner, typically within five business days.
Classroom observations generally provide the most evidence for Domains 1 and 3 of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* as well as the *CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015*. Non-classroom observations/reviews of practice generally provide the most evidence for Domains 2 and 4. Both pre-and post-conferences provide the opportunity for discussion of all four domains, including practice outside of classroom instruction (e.g., lesson plans, reflections on teaching). Pre- and Post-Conference Forms are available on the SEED website. This form may be revised by our PDEC committee.

Because the evaluation and support model aims to provide teachers with comprehensive feedback on their practice as defined by the four domains of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014*, and the *CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015*, all interactions with teachers that are relevant to their instructional practice and professional conduct may contribute to their performance evaluation. Non-classroom observations/reviews of practice generally provide the most evidence for Domains 2 and 4 of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* and the *CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015*. These interactions may include, but are not limited to, reviews of lesson/unit plans and assessments, planning meetings, data team meetings, progress monitoring and behavioral data, Professional Learning Community meetings, call logs or notes from parent-teacher meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers and/or attendance records from professional learning or school-based activities/events.

**Feedback**

The goal of feedback is to help teachers grow as educators and inspire high achievement in all of their students. With this in mind, evaluators should be clear and direct, presenting their comments in a way that is supportive and constructive. Feedback should include:

- Specific evidence and formative ratings, where appropriate, on observed indicators of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* or the *CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015*;
- Prioritized commendations and recommendations for development actions;
- Next steps and supports to improve teacher practice; and
- A timeframe for follow up.

**Teacher Performance and Practice Focus Area**

As described in the Evaluation Process and Timeline section, teachers develop one performance and practice focus area that is aligned to the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014 or the *CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015*. The focus area will guide observations and feedback conversations throughout the year.

Each teacher will work with his/her evaluator to develop a practice and performance focus area through mutual agreement. All focus areas should have a clear link to student academic or behavioral achievement and should move the teacher towards proficient or exemplary on the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* or the *CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015*. Programs may decide to create school-wide or grade-specific focus areas aligned to a particular indicator (e.g., 3b: Leading students to construct meaning and apply new learning through the use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies.)
Growth related to the focus area should be referenced in feedback conversations throughout the year. The focus area and action steps should be formally discussed during the Mid-Year Conference and the End-of-Year Conference. Although performance and practice focus areas are not explicitly rated as part of the Teacher Performance and Practice component, growth related to the focus area will be reflected in the scoring of Teacher Performance and Practice evidence.

Teacher Performance and Practice Scoring

During observations, evaluators should take evidence-based, including some scripted notes, capturing specific instances of what the teacher and students said and did in the classroom. Once the evidence has been recorded, the evaluator can align the evidence with the appropriate indicator(s) on the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014 or the CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015 and then make a determination about which performance level the evidence supports. Evaluators are not required to provide an overall rating for each observation, but they should be prepared to discuss evidence for the rubric indicators at the performance level that was observed.

Summative Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice Rating

Primary evaluators must determine a final teacher performance and practice rating and discuss this rating with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference. Within the Rushford model, each domain of the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014 as well as the CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015 - carries equal weight in the final rating. The final teacher performance and practice rating will be calculated by the evaluator in a three-step process:

1. Evaluator holistically reviews evidence collected through observations, interactions and reviews of practice (e.g., team meetings, conferences) and uses professional judgment to determine indicator ratings for each of the 12 indicators.
2. Evaluator averages indicators within each domain to a tenth of a decimal to calculate domain-level scores of 1.0-4.0.
3. Evaluator averages domain scores to calculate an overall Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice rating of 1.0-4.0.

Each step is illustrated below:

1. Evaluator holistically reviews evidence collected through observations and reviews of practice and uses professional judgment to determine indicator level ratings for each of the 12 indicators.

By the end of the year, evaluators should have collected a variety of evidence on teacher practice from the year’s observations and reviews of practice. Evaluators then analyze the consistency, trends and significance of the evidence to determine a rating for each of the 12 indicators. Some questions to consider while analyzing the evidence include:

- Consistency: What levels of performance have I seen relatively uniform, homogenous evidence for throughout the semester/year? Does the evidence paint a clear, unambiguous
picture of the teacher’s performance in this area?

- **Trends:** Have I seen improvement over time that overshadows earlier observation outcomes? Have I seen regression or setbacks over time that overshadows earlier observation outcomes?
- **Significance:** Are some data more valid than others? Do I have notes or ratings from “meatier” lessons or interactions where I was able to better assess this aspect of performance?

Once a rating has been determined, it is then translated to a 1-4 score. Below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1</th>
<th>Indicator-Level Rating</th>
<th>Evaluator’s Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Score**

2.7

**Standard = 1 and Exemplary = 4. See example below for Domain 1:**

2. Evaluator averages indicators within each domain to a tenth of a decimal to calculate domain-level scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Averaged Domain-Level Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The evaluator averages domain-level scores to calculate an overall observation of Teacher Performance and Practice rating of 1.0-4.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Score**

2.8

Steps 2 and 3 can be performed by program administrators and/or using tools/technology that calculate the averages for the evaluator.
The summative Teacher Performance and Practice component rating and the domain/indicator-level ratings will be shared and discussed with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference. This process can also be followed in advance of the Mid-Year Conference to discuss formative progress related to the Teacher Performance and Practice rating.

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

The Guidelines for Educator Evaluation require that feedback from parents will be used to help determine the remaining 10% of the Teacher Practice Indicators category.

Our PDEC will explore expanding the requirement of feedback from stakeholders to include other stakeholders such as LEAs, other state or placing agencies, as well as the individual students. For some students, feedback may be provided by a surrogate parent, a foster parent, a Department of Children and Families case worker, or a therapist or doctor unaffiliated with the school program.

The process for determining the parent/stakeholder feedback rating includes the following steps:

1. Rushford school programs conducts a system wide survey (with the exceptions of Inpatient and Journey Schools—they will have their own).
2. Data will be aggregated at the school/program level.
3. Administrators and teachers determine several school-level parent/stakeholder goals based on the survey feedback;
4. The teacher and evaluator identify one related parent/stakeholder engagement goal and set improvement targets;
5. Evaluator and teacher measure progress on growth targets; and
6. Evaluator determines a teacher’s summative rating, based on four performance levels.

Administration of a Whole-School Parent/Stakeholder Survey

Parent/stakeholder surveys should be conducted at the whole-school level as opposed to the teacher-level, meaning parent/stakeholder feedback will be aggregated at the school level. This is to ensure adequate response rates from parents. Parent/stakeholder surveys must be administered in a way that allows parents to feel comfortable providing feedback without fear of retribution. Surveys should be confidential, and survey responses should not be tied to parents’ names. The parents’/stakeholders’ survey should be administered every spring and trends analyzed from year to year.

Our PDEC will create a survey based on the questions available from state resources by September 1st, 2016. The proposed list will be approved at the September 2016 Principals’ Meeting. If there are major changes, it will be returned to the PDEC for feedback.

Surveys are to be sent out with self-addressed stamped envelopes by October 1st with a deadline of October 20th. Results are to be calculated by October 31st.

The survey instrument will be evaluated by June 15th, 2017 to determine validity and reliability.
Determining School-Level Parent/Stakeholder Goals

**To be done at the program level.** Evaluators and teachers should review the parent survey results by November 15th to identify areas of need and set general parent engagement goals. Ideally, this goal-setting process would occur between the evaluator and teachers (possibly during faculty meetings) so agreement can be reached on two to three improvement goals for the entire school.

Selecting a Parent/Stakeholder Engagement Goal and Improvement Targets

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

The goal should be written in SMART language format and must include specific improvement targets. For instance, if the goal is to improve parent communication, an improvement target could be specific to sending more regular correspondence to parents/stakeholders such as sending bi-weekly updates to parents/stakeholders or developing a new website for their class. Part of the evaluator’s job is to ensure (1) the goal is related to the overall school improvement parent goals, and (2) that the improvement targets are aligned, ambitious and attainable.

Measuring Progress on Growth Targets

Teachers and their evaluators should use their judgment in setting growth/improvement targets for the parent/stakeholder feedback component. There are two ways teachers can measure and demonstrate progress on their growth targets. Teachers 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/stakeholders to measure parent/stakeholder-level indicators they generate.
   For example, teachers can conduct interviews with parents/stakeholders or a brief parent/stakeholder survey to see if they improved on their growth target.
Arriving at a Parent/Stakeholder Feedback Rating

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Below Standard (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeded the goal</td>
<td>Met the goal</td>
<td>Partially met the goal</td>
<td>Did not meet the goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Outcomes Related Indicators

Student Outcomes Related Indicators capture a teacher’s impact on student growth & development and comprise half of the teacher’s final summative rating. The inclusion of student outcomes indicators acknowledges that teachers are committed to the learning and growth of their students and carefully consider what knowledge, skills and talents they are responsible for developing in their students each year. As a part of the evaluation and support process, teachers document their goals of student learning and anchor them in data.

Two components comprise this category:
- Student Growth and Development, which counts for 45%; and
- Whole-School Student Learning, which counts for 5% of the total evaluation rating.

These components will be described in detail below.

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

Overview of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)

Each teacher’s students, individually and as a group, are different from other teachers’ students, even in the same grade level or subject at the same school. For student growth and development to be measured for teacher evaluation and support purposes, it is imperative to use a method that takes each teacher’s assignment, students and context into account.
SLOs are carefully planned, long-term academic 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. Research has found that educators who set high-quality SLOs often realize greater improvement in student performance.

The SLO process, as outlined within the SEED model, will support teachers in using a planning cycle that will be familiar to most educators:

Developing SLOs is a process rather than a single event. The purpose is to craft SLOs that serve as a reference point throughout the year as teachers document their students’ progress toward achieving the IAGD targets. Teachers may develop them through consultation with colleagues in the same grade level or teaching the same subject. The final determination of SLOs and IAGDs is made through mutual agreement between the teacher and his/her evaluator. The four phases of the SLO process are described in detail below.

**PHASE 1: Review the Data**

This first phase is the discovery phase which begins with reviewing program initiatives and key priorities, school/program improvement plans and the building administrator’s goals. Once teachers know their class rosters, they should examine multiple sources of data about their students’ performance to identify an 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.

**Examples of Data Review**

A teacher may use the following data in developing an SLO:

a) **STAR 360 data**

b) Initial performance for current interval of instruction (writing samples, student interest surveys, pre-assessments etc.)

c) Results from other standardized and non-standardized assessments

d) Results from diagnostic assessments

e) Conferences with students’ families

f) Individual Educational Plans (IEPs) and 504 plans for students with identified special education needs

g) Attendance records

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.
PHASE 2: Set Two SLOs

Based on a review of program data, teachers will develop two SLOs that address identified needs. A form for the development of SLOs can be found on the SEED website. To create their SLOs, teachers will follow these four steps:

**Step 1: Decide on the SLOs**

The SLOs are broad goal statements for student learning and expected student improvement (5). 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., CT Core Standards) or program standards for the grade level or course. Depending on the teacher’s assignment, an SLO statement might aim for content mastery or else it might aim for skill development.

SLO 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.

The following are examples of SLOs based on student data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade/Subject</th>
<th>Student Learning Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade Social Studies</td>
<td>Students will produce effective and well-grounded writing for a range of purposes and audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade Information Literacy</td>
<td>Students will master the use of digital tools for learning to gather, evaluate and apply information to solve problems and accomplish tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade English/Language Arts</td>
<td>Students will cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st and 2nd Grade Tier 3 Reading</td>
<td>Students will improve reading accuracy and comprehension leading to an improved attitude and approach toward more complex reading tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Social Worker</td>
<td>As a result of participating in a 6-week targeted intervention using an evidence-based social skills curriculum, 6th grade students will improve their respectfully greet peers and staff members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. Each SLO must include at least one IAGD but may include multiple, differentiated IAGDs where appropriate. Teachers will develop their two SLOs with IAGDs based on non-standardized measures. Use the following flow chart to determine appropriate IAGDs.

Please note: At least one SLO must include academic IAGD data/progress as indicated by the STAR 360 assessment. It is up to the teacher and administrator to determine if an additional IAGD is warranted.

The second SLO may be non-academic including behavioral progress, attendance, or other agreed upon focus area and must include SMART goals/data.

**STAR 360** will be administered at least 3 times per year. First, at the beginning of the school year to gather baseline data. Second, prior to the mid-year conference. Lastly, prior to the end of year conference.

If the teacher and administrator agree that the results of an assessment do not accurately represent a student’s ability, you may re-administer the assessment within one week.

It may be administered two more times throughout the year for other purposes including PPTs or other important meetings as agreed upon by the teacher and administrator.

**PLEASE NOTE**: We do not want to over administer assessments for our students. Please limit sessions to 5 per school year (roughly once every two months).

Rushford’s “Business Rule:” Only students on the roster by the goal setting date and for the end of year assessment will be counted on the STAR 360 SLO. Students entering after goals have been set, or discharging prior to the end of year assessment will not be counted. If the sample size of students meeting this requirement in a class is two or fewer, the teacher and administer will meet to discuss whether more data will be required to reach an appropriate rating.

IAGDs should be written in SMART goal language:
- **S** = Specific and Strategic
- **M** = Measurable
- **A** = Aligned and Attainable
- **R** = Results-Oriented
- **T** = Time-Bound

Rushford’s “Business Rule:” Only students on the roster by the goal setting date and for the end of year assessment will be counted on the STAR 360 SLO. Students entering after goals have been set, or discharging prior to the end of year assessment will not be counted. If the sample size of students meeting this requirement in a class is two or fewer, the teacher and administer will meet to discuss whether more data will be required to reach an appropriate rating.

IAGDs should be rigorous, attainable and meet or exceed program 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 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. Additionally, individual teachers may establish multiple differentiated targets for students achieving at various performance levels.

Taken together, an SLO and its IAGD(s) provide the evidence that the objective was met. The following are some examples of IAGDs that might be applied to the previous SLO examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade/Subject</th>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>IAGD(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6th Grade Social    | Students will produce effective and well-grounded writing for a range of purposes and audiences.                                                                                                         | **By May 15:**  
  - Students who scored a 0-1 out of 12 on the pre-assessment will score 6 or better.  
  - Students who scored a 2-4 will score 8 or better.  
  - Students who scored 5-6 will score 9 or better.  
  - Students who scored 7 will score 10 or better.  
  *This is one IAGD (assessment/measure of progress) that outlines differentiated targets based on pre-assessments.*                                                                                       |
| Studies             |                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 9th Grade Information Literacy | Students will master the use of digital tools for learning to gather, evaluate and apply information to solve problems and accomplish tasks.                                                                 | **By May 30:**  
  - 90%-100% of all students will be proficient (scoring a 3 or 4) or higher on 5 of the 6 standards (as measured by 8 items) on the digital literacy assessment rubric.  
  *This is one IAGD (assessment/measure of progress) illustrating a minimum proficiency standard for a large proportion of students.*                                                                 |
| 11th Grade Algebra 2 | Students will be able to analyze complex, real-world scenarios using mathematical models to interpret and solve problems.                                                                                                                                  | **By May 15:**  
  - 80% of Algebra 2 students will score an 85 or better on a program Algebra 2 math benchmark.  
  *This is one IAGD (assessment/measure of progress) illustrating a minimum proficiency standard for a large proportion of students.*                                                                    |
| 9th Grade ELA       | Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly, as well as inferences drawn from the text.                                                                                                                       | **By June 1:**  
  - 27 students who scored 50-70 on the pre-test will increase scores by 18 points on the post test.  
  - 40 students who scored 30-49 will increase by 15 points.  
  - 10 students who scored 0-29 will increase by 10 points.  
  *This is one IAGD (assessment/measure of progress) that has been differentiated to meet the needs of varied student performance groups.*                                                                 |
| 1st and 2nd Grade Tier 3 Reading | Students will improve reading accuracy and comprehension leading to an improved attitude and approach toward more complex reading tasks. | By June:  
IAGD #1: Students will increase their attitude towards reading by at least 7 points from baseline on the full scale score of the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey, as recommended by authors, McKenna and Kear.  
IAGD #2: Students will read instructional level text with 95% or better accuracy on the DRA.  
*Grade 1-Expected outcome - Level 14-16.  
Grade 2-Expected outcome - Level 22-24.  
*These are two IAGDs using two assessments/measures of progress. IAGD #2 has also been differentiated to meet the needs of varied student performance groups. |
| School Social Worker | As a result of participating in a 6-week targeted intervention using an evidence-based social skills curriculum, 6th grade students will improve their respectfully greet peers and staff members. | For each 6-week cycle:  
Pre and post-assessment data on appropriate social greetings, as articulated in an evidence-based curriculum:  
*80% of students will not demonstrate incidents of inappropriate greetings following the 6th week of intervention when entering or leaving school, when entering and exiting a classroom and when passing in the hallway.  
*20% of students will demonstrate a 50% decrease in the use of inappropriate greetings following the 6th week of intervention when entering or leaving school, when entering and exiting a classroom and when passing in the hallway. |
| Speech and Language Pathologist | Students will increase their ability to comprehend and respond to “wh-” questions regarding a story or event. | By June:  
*12/14 students will respond appropriately to “who”, “what”, “where”, “when” and “why” questions regarding a story or event as measured by a program developed assessment. |
Step 3: Provide Additional Information

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

- Baseline data used to determine SLOs 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 SLOs.

Step 4: Submit SLOs to Evaluator for Review

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/Measures of Progress
- Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs)/Growth Targets
- Instructional Strategies and Supports

An SLO Development Guide is provided for programs to use in this process. The evaluator may provide written comments and discuss the feedback with the teacher during the Goal-Setting Conference.

PHASE 3: Monitor 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 Conference as mutually agreed upon by the evaluator and the teacher.
PHASE 4: Assess Student Outcomes Relative to SLOs

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

1. Describe the results and provide evidence for each 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 learning going forward.

If a case can be made that the STAR 360 assessment is not an accurate representation of a student’s progress, other concrete evidence may be presented to and reviewed by the administrator.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeded (4)</td>
<td>All or most students met or substantially exceeded the target(s) contained in the indicator(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met (3)</td>
<td>Most students met the target(s) contained in the indicators within a few points on either side of the target(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Met (2)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Meet (1)</td>
<td>A few students met the target(s) but a substantial percentage of students did not. Little progress toward the goal was made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For SLOs with more than one IAGD, 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 two SLO scores. For example, if one SLO was “Partially Met” for a rating of 2, and the other SLO was “Met” for a rating of 3, the Student Growth and Development rating would be 2.5 [(2+3)/2]. The individual SLO ratings and the Student Growth and Development rating will be shared and discussed with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference.

| Averaged Domain-Level Score |  
|-----------------------------|---|
| SLO 1                       | 2 |
| SLO 2                       | 3 |
| Student Growth and Development Rating | **2.5** |
Component #4: Whole-School Student Learning Indicator (5%)

Whole-School Student Learning Indicator

A teacher’s indicator rating shall be equal to the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for his/her administrator’s evaluation rating. This will be based on the school the administrator’s progress on SLO targets, which correlates to the Student Learning rating on an administrator’s evaluation (equal to the 45% component of the administrator’s final rating).

See example of the interrelationship between Whole-School Student Learning Indicator (5%) for teachers and Multiple Student Learning Indicators (45%) for administrators on page 6.

Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring

Summative Scoring

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

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 (see Appendix 2).
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 (5%) and whole-school student learning indicator or student feedback (5%).
3. Use the Summative Matrix to determine the Summative Rating.

Each step is illustrated below:

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

The observation of teacher performance and practice counts for 40% of the total rating and parent or 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score (1-4)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Points (score \times weight)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Teacher Practice Related Indicators Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Practice Related Indicators Points</th>
<th>Teacher Practice Related Indicators Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-80</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-126</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-174</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175-200</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Calculate a Student Outcomes Related Indicators rating by combining the student growth and development score and whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback score.

The student growth and development component counts for 45% of the total rating and the whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback component counts for 5% 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score (1-4)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Points (score x weight)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth and Development (SLOs)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>157.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole School Student Learning Indicator or Student Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>172.5 → 173</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points</th>
<th>Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-80</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-126</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-174</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175-200</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Use the Summative Matrix to Determine the 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.
Adjustment of Summative Rating

Summative ratings must be provided for all teachers with at least 2 weeks remaining before the school session closes for the year and reported to the CSDE per state statute. Adjustments may be made up to June 30th.

Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

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

Novice teachers shall generally be deemed effective if said educator receives at least two sequential proficient ratings, one of which must be earned in the fourth year of a novice teacher’s career. A below standard rating shall only be permitted in the first year of a novice teacher’s career. There should be a trajectory of growth and development as evidenced by a subsequent rating of developing or higher in year two and sequential proficient ratings in years three and four.

A post-tenure educator (after 4 years at Rushford) shall generally be deemed ineffective if said educator receives at least two sequential developing ratings or one below standard rating at any time.

Dispute-Resolution Process

If consensus cannot be made regarding the goal/objective setting, the evaluation period, feedback or the professional development plan, the Assistant Director of School Programs will conduct a Dispute Resolution Meeting with the evaluator and teacher and review relevant data including, but not limited to, artifacts entered or uploaded into Bloomboard. The Assistant Director will utilize the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching or Service Delivery to help both parties determine an agreed upon rating.

In the event that the Assistant Director of School Programs serves at the evaluator for a teacher with a dispute, the Director of School Programs will assign another principal to review the relevant data and conduct the Dispute Resolution Meeting with the evaluator and teacher.

If a resolution cannot be reached during the Dispute Resolution Meeting, all relevant data will be forwarded to the Director of School Programs who will speak to the evaluator and teacher. The ultimate decision regarding a teacher’s overall rating will be made by the Director of School Programs’ interpretation of the available data in relation to the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching or Service Delivery.

PLEASE NOTE: A Guidebook for Student and Educator Support Specialists (SESS) is available via www.connecticutseed.org.
Flexibility from Core Requirements for the Evaluation of Teachers

1. Student and Educator Support Specialists (SESS) shall have a clear job descriptions and delineation of their role and responsibilities in the school to guide the setting of IAGDs, feedback and observation.

2. Because of the unique nature of the roles fulfilled by Student and Educator Support Specialists, Rushford is granted flexibility in applying the Core Requirements of teacher evaluation in the following ways:
   a. Programs shall be granted flexibility in using IAGDs to measure attainment of goals and/or objectives for student growth. The Goal-Setting Conference for identifying the IAGDs shall include the following steps:
      i. The educator and evaluator will agree on the students or caseloads that the educator is responsible for and his/her role.
      ii. The educator and evaluator will determine if the indicator will apply to the individual teacher, a team of teachers, a grade level or the whole school.
      iii. The educator and evaluator should identify the unique characteristics of the population of students which would impact student growth (e.g., high absenteeism, highly mobile population in school).
      iv. The educator and evaluator will identify the learning standard to measure: the assessment/measure of progress, data or product for measuring growth; the timeline for instruction and measurement; how baseline will be established; how targets will be set so they are realistic yet rigorous; the strategies that will be used; and the professional development the educator needs to improve their learning to support the areas targeted.
   b. Because some Student and Educator Support Specialists may not have a classroom or be involved in direct instruction of students, the educator and evaluator shall agree to appropriate venues for observations and an appropriate rubric for rating practice and performance at the beginning of the school year. The observations will be based on standards when available. Examples of appropriate venues include but are not limited to: observing Student and Educator Support Specialist staff working with small groups of children, working with adults, facilitating professional learning, working with families, participating in team meetings or Planning and Placement Team meetings.

Currently available on the SEED website are white papers developed by various discipline-specific workgroups and the CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2014. Specifically, this rubric was identified for use with:

- School Psychologists;
- Speech and Language Pathologists;
- Comprehensive School Counselors; and
- School Social Workers.

PLEASE NOTE: The rubric is available for use with any educators whose roles and responsibilities fall within the realm of service delivery or are considered caseload specialists.
Administrator Evaluation and Support

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CDSE)-designed model for the evaluation and support of administrators in Connecticut is based on the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (Core Requirements), developed by a diverse group of educators in June 2012 and based upon best practice research from around the country. The contents of this document are meant to guide programs in the implementation of Rushford’s System for Educator Evaluation and Development Administrator Evaluation and Support model.

The Policies, Procedures and Standards for APSEPs identify required administrative positions which include a designated Chief Administrator and a designated Education Director. Per the Standards, the Chief Administrator role does not require CSDE certification and limits the duties to those administrative responsibilities which do not include supervision and evaluation of other certified personnel. An Education Director must hold both 092 certification and additional certification in comprehensive special education or certification in a related service area, allowing for the supervision and evaluation of other certified personnel. Per the standards, the Chief Administrator and the Education Director positions may be filled by a single individual who must hold an 092 certification as well as a Special Education teaching certificate or a Related Service certification (Speech and Language Pathologist, School Counselor, School Psychologist or School Social Worker) which allows them to supervise and evaluate other certified personnel.

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

- Observation of Leadership
- Performance and Practice (40%)
- Stakeholder Feedback (10%)
- Student Learning (45%)
- Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%)

Additional Requirements for Administrator Evaluation and Support Plans

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

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

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

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

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader;
- Meeting expectations in at least 2 other areas of practice;
- Meeting 1 target related to stakeholder feedback;
- Meeting and making progress on 3 Student Learning Objectives aligned to school and program priorities; and
- Having more than 60% of teachers proficient on the student growth portion of their evaluation.

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

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

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

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

1. **Leadership Practice Related Indicators:** An evaluation of the core leadership practices and skills that positively affect student learning. This category is comprised of two components:
   (a) **Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)** as defined in the Common Core of Leading (CCL): Connecticut School Leadership Standards.
   (b) **Stakeholder Feedback (10%)** on leadership practice through surveys.

2. **Student Outcomes Related Indicators:** An evaluation of administrator’s contributions to student academic progress, at the school and classroom level. This area is comprised of two components:
   (c) **Student Learning (45%)** assessed in equal weight by: progress on the performance and growth on locally-determined measures.
   (d) **Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%)** as determined by an aggregation of teachers’ success with respect to Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).

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

- **Exemplary** – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
- **Proficient** – Meeting indicators of performance
- **Developing** – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
- **Below Standard** – Not meeting indicators of performance
### Guidance on Evaluators of Administrators in APSEPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator Being Evaluated</th>
<th>Evaluator of Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The APSEP Education Director/Principal holds 092 or 093 certification | **Option 1:** The Chief Administrator is the evaluator, holds an 092 or 093, and has attended a CSDE-sponsored Administrator Evaluation: Foundational Skills for Evaluators of Administrators training.  
**Option 2:** The Chief Administrator is the evaluator and has attended a CSDE-sponsored Administrator Evaluation: Foundational Skills for Evaluators of Administrators training.  
**Option 3:** A member of the APSEP’s Governing Board is the evaluator and has attended a CSDE-sponsored Administrator Evaluation: Foundational Skills for Evaluators of Administrators training.  
**Option 4:** Contract for evaluator services through a third party, or enter into a cooperative arrangement with another APSEP or school program. Evaluator must hold an 092 and must have attended a CSDE-sponsored Administrator Evaluation: Foundational Skills for Evaluators of Administrators training. |
| 2. The same individual holds the positions of Chief Administrator and the Education Director or Principal | **Option 1:** A member of the APSEP’s Governing Board is the evaluator and has attended a CSDE-sponsored Administrator Evaluation: Foundational Skills for Evaluators of Administrators training.  
**Option 2:** Contract for evaluator services through a third party, or enter into a cooperative arrangement with another APSEP or school program. Evaluator must hold an 092 and must have attended a CSDE-sponsored Administrator Evaluation: Foundational Skills for Evaluators of Administrators training. |
| 3. Assistant Director/Assistant Principal holds 092 or 093 certification | **Option 1:** Director/Principal is the evaluator, holds an 092 and has attended a CSDE-sponsored Administrator Evaluation: Foundational Skills for Evaluators of Administrators training.  
**Option 2:** Contract for evaluator services through a third party, or enter into a cooperative arrangement with another APSEP or school program. Evaluator must hold an 092 and must have attended a CSDE-sponsored Administrator Evaluation: Foundational Skills for Evaluators of Administrators training. |
Process and Timeline

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

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

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

The Director of School Programs can determine when the cycle starts. Most principals will begin the process in August of the upcoming school year.

**Figure 1:** This is a typical timeframe:
Step 1: Orientation and Context-Setting

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

1. Student learning data are available for review by the administrator and the state has assigned the school a School Performance Index (SPI) rating.
2. Stakeholder survey data are available for review by the administrator.
3. The Director of School Programs 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 two 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.”

![Diagram](Image)

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 indicators of the *CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2015*, which is aligned with the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. While administrators are rated on all four domains, administrators are not expected to focus on improving their practice in all areas in a given year. Rather, they should identify two specific focus areas of growth to facilitate professional conversation about their leadership practice with their evaluator. It is likely that at least one and perhaps both, of the practice focus areas will be in instructional leadership, given its central role in driving student achievement. What is critical is that the administrator can connect improvement in the practice focus areas to the outcome goals and survey targets, creating a logical through-line from practice to outcomes.

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

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

The evaluator and administrator also discuss the appropriate resources and professional learning needs to support the administrator in accomplishing his/her goals. Together, these components – the goals, the practice areas and the resources and supports – comprise an administrator’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 focus areas, goals, activities, outcomes and time line will be reviewed by the administrator’s evaluator prior to beginning work on the goals. The evaluator may suggest additional goals as appropriate.

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

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

The Evaluation and Support Plan Form on the following page can be used to develop an administrator’s evaluation and support plan for the year.
### Evaluation and Support Plan Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrator’s Name</th>
<th>Evaluator’s Name</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings from Student Achievement and Stakeholder Survey Data</th>
<th>Outcome Goals—3 SLOs and 1 Survey Target</th>
<th>Leadership Practice Focus Areas (2)</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Evidence of Success</th>
<th>Additional Skills, Knowledge and Support Needed</th>
<th>Timeline for Measuring Goal Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 1:</td>
<td>Focus Area 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 2:</td>
<td>Focus Area 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Target 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 3: Plan Implementation and Evidence Collection

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

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

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

Building on the administrator’s evaluation and support plan, the administrator and his/her evaluator may want to discuss possible sources of evidence to collect information about the administrator’s practice in relation to his/her focus areas and goals.

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.

A note on the frequency of school site observations:

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

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

School visits should be frequent, purposeful and adequate for sustaining a professional conversation about an administrator’s practice.
Step 4: Mid-Year Formative Review

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

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

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

Step 5: Self-Assessment

In the spring, the administrator takes an opportunity to assess his/her practice on all indicators and domains of the CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2015. For each indicator, the administrator determines whether he/she:

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

The administrator should also review his/her focus areas and determine if he/she considers him/herself on track or not. In some evaluation systems, self-assessment occurs later in the process after summative ratings but before goal setting for the subsequent year. In this model the administrator submits a self-assessment prior to the end-of-year summative review as an opportunity for the self-reflection to inform the summative rating.

Step 6: Summative Review and Rating

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

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

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

Administrators will be expected to engage in the CSDE-sponsored multi-day training for SEED. This comprehensive training will give evaluators the opportunity to:

- Understand the various components of the administrator evaluation and support system;
- Understand sources of evidence that demonstrate proficiency on the CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2015;*
- Establish a common language that promotes professionalism and a culture for learning through the lens of the CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2015;
- Establish inter-rater reliability through calibrations of observer interpretations of evidence and judgments of leadership practice; and
- Collaborate with colleagues to deepen understanding of the content.

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

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

Points for Program Consideration

- Development or selection of an evaluation framework/rubric to measure and provide feedback on leader performance and practice
- Identification of criteria to demonstrate proficiency (optional)
- Provision of ongoing calibration activities
- Determination of frequency for proficiency status renewal, if applicable
The evaluator completes the summative evaluation report, shares it with the administrator and adds it to the administrator’s personnel file with any written comments attached that the administrator requests to be added within two weeks of receipt of the report.

Summative ratings must be completed for all administrators by June 30, of a given school year.

Support and Development

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

Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning

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

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

Points for Program Consideration

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

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

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

This is accomplished by:

- Developing well-supported and effective coaches, teacher leaders and principals who are strategically selected based on valid
indicators of effectiveness; empowered to support and monitor teacher learning; and provide meaningful, evidence-based, actionable feedback that supports teachers’ reflection and analysis of their practice.

• Creating structures and systems that enable teams of educators to engage in job-embedded professional learning on an ongoing basis.

**Improvement and Remediation Plans**

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

**Stages of formal support:**

1. **Structured Support:** An administrator would receive structured support when an area(s) of concern is identified during the school year. This support is intended to provide short-term assistance to address a concern in its early stage.

2. **Special Assistance:** An administrator would receive special assistance when he/she earns an overall performance rating of *developing* or *below standard* and/or has received structured support. An educator may also receive special assistance if he/she does not meet the goal(s) of the structured support plan. This support is intended to assist an educator who is having difficulty consistently demonstrating proficiency.

3. **Intensive Assistance:** An administrator would receive intensive assistance when he/she does not meet the goal(s) of the special assistance plan. This support is intended to build the staff member’s competency.

**Points for Program Consideration**

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

• Clearly identify targeted supports, in consultation with the administrator, which may include specialized professional development, collegial assistance, increased supervisory observations and feedback, and/or special resources and strategies aligned to the improvement outcomes.

• Clearly delineate goals linked to specific indicators and domains within the observation of practice framework/rubric that specify exactly what the administrator must demonstrate at the conclusion of the Improvement and Remediation Plan in order to be considered *proficient*.

• Indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is developed. Determine dates for interim and final reviews in accordance with stages of support.

• Include indicators of success, including a rating of *proficient* or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.
Career Development and Growth

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

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

Points for Program Consideration

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

Leadership Practice Related Indicators

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

- Observation of Leadership Practice, which counts for 40%; and
- Stakeholder Feedback, which counts for 10%.
Component #1: Observation of Leadership Practice (40%)

An assessment of an administrator’s leadership practice – by direct observation of practice and the collection of other evidence – is 40% of an administrator’s summative rating. Leadership practice is described in the Common Core of Leading - Connecticut School Leadership Standards (CCL-CSLS) 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.

Please see the *CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2015*
Comparison of *CT Leader Evaluation Rubric and CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2015*

In the revised rubric, the six Performance Expectations of the CCL-CSLS have been reorganized into four domains and renamed to capture the most essential skills of a leader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCL-CSLS</th>
<th>CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Expectation 1: Vision, Mission and Goals: Element A: High Expectations for All</strong>&lt;br&gt;Element B: Shared Commitments to Implement and Sustain the Vision, Mission and Goals&lt;br&gt;Element C: Continuous Improvement toward the Vision, Mission and Goals</td>
<td><strong>Domain 1: Instructional Leadership</strong>&lt;br&gt;Indicator 1.1 Shared Vision, Mission and Goals Indicator 1.2 Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Indicator 1.3 Continuous Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Expectation 2: Teaching and Learning</strong>&lt;br&gt;Element A: Strong Professional Culture Element B: Curriculum and Instruction Element C: Assessment and Accountability</td>
<td><strong>Domain 2: Talent Management</strong>&lt;br&gt;Indicator 2.1 Recruitment, Selection and Retention&lt;br&gt;Indicator 2.2 Professional Learning&lt;br&gt;Indicator 2.3 Observation and Performance Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Expectation 3: Organizational Systems and Safety</strong>&lt;br&gt;Element A: Welfare and Safety of Students, Faculty and Staff&lt;br&gt;Element B: Operational Systems&lt;br&gt;Element C: Fiscal and Human Resources</td>
<td><strong>Domain 3: Organizational Systems</strong> Indicator 3.1 Operational Management&lt;br&gt;Indicator 3.2 Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Expectation 4: Families and Stakeholders</strong>&lt;br&gt;Element A: Collaboration with Families and Community Members&lt;br&gt;Element B: Community Interests and Needs&lt;br&gt;Element C: Community Resources</td>
<td><strong>Domain 4: Culture and Climate</strong>&lt;br&gt;Indicator 4.1 Family, Community and Stakeholder Engagement&lt;br&gt;Indicator 4.2 School Culture and Climate&lt;br&gt;Indicator 4.3 Equitable and Ethical Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Expectation 5: Ethics and Integrity</strong>&lt;br&gt;Element A: Ethical and Legal Standards of the Profession&lt;br&gt;Element B: Personal Values and Beliefs&lt;br&gt;Element C: High Standards for Self and Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Expectation 6: The Education System</strong>&lt;br&gt;Element A: Professional Influence&lt;br&gt;Element B: The Educational Policy Environment&lt;br&gt;Element C: Policy Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comparison Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2015 – At a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence Generally Collected Through Observations</th>
<th>Evidence Generally Collected Through Non-classroom/Review of Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 1: Instructional Leadership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Domain 2: Talent Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by developing a shared vision, mission and goals focused on high expectations for all students, and by monitoring and continuously improving curriculum, instruction and assessment.</td>
<td>Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by implementing practices to recruit, select, support and retain highly qualified staff, and by demonstrating a commitment to high-quality systems for professional learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 <strong>Shared Vision, Mission and Goals</strong> — Leaders collaboratively develop, implement and sustain the vision, mission and goals to support high expectations for all students and staff.</td>
<td>2.1 <strong>Recruitment, Selection and Retention</strong> — Recruits, selects, supports and retains effective educators needed to implement the school or program’s vision, mission and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 <strong>Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment</strong> — Leaders develop a shared understanding of standards-based best practices in curriculum, instruction and assessment.</td>
<td>2.2 <strong>Professional Learning</strong> — Establishes a collaborative professional learning system that is grounded in a vision of high-quality instruction and continuous improvement through the use of data to advance the school or program’s vision, mission and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 <strong>Continuous Improvement</strong> — Leaders use assessments, data systems and accountability strategies to monitor and evaluate progress and close achievement gaps.</td>
<td>2.3 <strong>Observation and Performance Evaluation</strong> — Ensures high-quality, standards-based instruction by building the capacity of educators to lead and improve teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 3: Organizational Systems</strong></td>
<td><strong>Domain 4: Culture and Climate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by managing organizational systems and resources for a safe, high-performing learning environment.</td>
<td>Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by collaborating with families and other stakeholders to respond to diverse community needs and interests, by promoting a positive culture and climate, and by modeling ethical behavior and integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 <strong>Operational Management</strong> — Strategically aligns organizational systems and resources to support student achievement and school improvement.</td>
<td>4.1 <strong>Family, Community and Stakeholder Engagement</strong> — Uses professional influence to promote the growth of all students by actively engaging and collaborating with families, community partners and other stakeholders to support the vision, mission and goals of the school and program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 <strong>Resource Management</strong> — Establishes a system for fiscal, educational and technology resources that operate in support of teaching and learning.</td>
<td>4.2 <strong>School Culture and Climate</strong> — Establishes a positive climate for student achievement, as well as high expectations for adult and student conduct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 <strong>Equitable and Ethical Practice</strong> — Maintains a focus on ethical decisions, cultural competencies, social justice and inclusive practice for all members of the school/program community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership practice based on all six of these performance expectations contributes to successful schools. As improving teaching and learning is at the core of what effective educational leaders do, **Domain 1 (Instructional Leadership)** is weighted twice as much as any other domain. The other three domains are equally weighted.

These weightings should be consistent for all principals. For assistant principals the domains are weighed equally, reflecting the need for emerging leaders to develop a 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 principal ship. For other school or program-based 092 certificate holders, including central office administrators, evaluators may limit the rating to those domains that are relevant to the administrator’s job duties, which must be established by the evaluator as part of the goal setting conference at the start of the school year.
In order to arrive at the ratings, leadership practice is measured against the *CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2015* which describes leadership actions across four performance levels for each of the four domains and their respective indicators. The four performance levels are as follows:

- **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.

- **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.

**Potential Sources of Evidence** are provided for each Domain of the rubric. While these Potential Sources 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 Potential Sources of Evidence and generate additional examples from their own experience that could also serve as evidence of Proficient practice.

### Strategies for Using the *CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2015:* *

**Developing a growth mindset:** The rubric is designed to be developmental in use. It contains a detailed continuum of performance for every indicator in the *CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2015* in order to serve as a guide and resource for school leaders and evaluators to talk about leadership practice, identify specific areas for growth and development, and describe leadership actions that will lead to school and program improvement.

**Making judgments about administrator practice:** Administrators may demonstrate different levels of performance within a domain or an indicator. In these cases, the evaluator will use judgment to determine the overall level of performance for each domain based on preponderance of evidence.

**Assigning ratings for each Domain:** While evaluators provide ratings for each of the four domains, reviewing and discussing an administrator’s performance at the indicator and attribute levels can be helpful in determining areas of strength and areas of focus for continued growth.
Arriving at a Leadership Practice Summative Rating

Summative ratings are based on the evidence for each Domain in the *CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2015*. Evaluators observe the administrator’s leadership practice and collect artifacts of the administrator’s performance related to the four domains of the rubric. Specific attention is paid to leadership performance areas identified as needing development.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Exemplary</em> on Instructional Leadership +</td>
<td>At least <em>Proficient</em> on Instructional Leadership +</td>
<td>At least <em>Developing</em> on Instructional Leadership +</td>
<td><em>Below Standard</em> on Instructional Leadership or <em>Below Standard</em> on the 3 other Domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Exemplary</em> on at least 2 other Domains +</td>
<td>At least <em>Proficient</em> on 2 other Domains +</td>
<td>At least <em>Developing</em> on 2 other Domains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No rating below <em>Proficient</em> on any Domain</td>
<td>No rating below <em>Developing</em> on any Domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

Administrators will use data from the same survey administered for the educator feedback portion of the evaluation system. Therefore, principal representation on the PDEC committee is required during the survey’s creation and at least one question will be specific to the principal.

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 program averages or averages of schools in similar situations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Step 6** - Assign a rating, using this scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substantially exceeded target</td>
<td>Met target</td>
<td>Made substantial progress but did not meet target</td>
<td>Made little or no progress against target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 in equal weight by performance and growth on locally-determined measures.

Locally-Determined Measures
(Student Learning Objectives)

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

- All measures must align to Connecticut Core Standards and other Connecticut content standards. In instances where there are no such standards that apply to a subject/grade level, programs 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.

Administrators have broad discretion in selecting indicators, including, but not limited to:

- Students’ progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation.
- Students’ performance or growth on school-or classroom-developed assessments in subjects and grade levels for which there are not available state assessments. Below are a few examples of SLOs for administrators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level/Role</th>
<th>SLO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Science</td>
<td>78% of students will attain proficient or higher on the science inquiry strand of the CMT in May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>9th grade students will accumulate sufficient credits to be in good standing as sophomores by June.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The process for selecting measures and creating SLOs should strike a balance between alignment to program 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 program establishes student learning priorities for a given school year based on available data including STAR 360.
- 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 his/her own evaluation that are:
  (a) aligned to program priorities (unless the school is already doing well against those priorities) and
  (b) aligned with the school improvement plan.
- The administrator chooses measures that best assess the priorities and develops clear and measurable SLOs for the chosen assessments/indicators (see the Administrator’s SLO Handbook, SLO Form and SLO Quality Test).
- The administrator shares the SLOs with his/her 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Met all 3 objectives and substantially exceeded at least 2 targets</td>
<td>Met 2 objectives and made at least substantial progress on the 3rd</td>
<td>Met 1 objective and made substantial progress on at least 1 other</td>
<td>Met 0 objectives OR Met 1 objective and did not make substantial progress on either of the other 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 80% of teachers are rated <em>proficient</em> or <em>exemplary</em> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation or adequate evidence of support has been provided to the Director of School Programs to meet this threshold</td>
<td>&gt; 60% of teachers are rated <em>proficient</em> or <em>exemplary</em> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation or adequate evidence of support has been provided to the Director of School Programs to meet this threshold</td>
<td>&gt; 40% of teachers are rated <em>proficient</em> or <em>exemplary</em> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation or adequate evidence of support has been provided to the Director of School Programs to meet this threshold</td>
<td>&lt; 40% of teachers are rated <em>proficient</em> or <em>exemplary</em> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation or adequate evidence of support has been provided to the Director of School Programs to meet this threshold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When an educator is rated at Developing or Below Standard, evidence of support may be provided to the Director of School Programs to increase the administrator’s rating.
Summative Administrator Evaluation Rating

Summative Scoring

Every educator will receive one of four performance ratings:

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

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

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

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader;
- Meeting expectations in at least 2 other areas of practice;
- Meeting and making progress on 1 target related to stakeholder feedback;
- Meeting state accountability growth targets on tests of core academic subjects;
- Meeting and making progress on 3 student learning objectives aligned to school and program 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 program-wide or even statewide. Few administrators are expected to demonstrate exemplary performance on more than a small number of practice elements.

A rating of **developing** means that performance is meeting proficiency in some components but not others. Improvement is necessary and expected and two consecutive years at the developing level is, for an experienced administrator, a cause for concern. On the other hand, for administrators in their first year, performance rating of **developing** is expected. If, by the end of three years, performance is still rated **developing**, there is cause for concern. A rating of **below standard** indicates performance that is below proficient on all components or unacceptably low on one or more components.
Determining Summative Ratings

The rating will be determined using the following steps:
1. Determining a Leader Practice Rating;
2. Determining an Student Outcomes Rating; and
3. Combining the two into an overall rating using the Summative Matrix.

Each step is illustrated below:

**A. PRACTICE: Leadership Practice (40%)**

+ Stakeholder Feedback (10%) = 50%

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score(1-4)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Summary Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation of Leadership Practice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LEADER PRACTICE-RELATED POINTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Practice-Related Points</th>
<th>Leader Practice-Related Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-80</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-126</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-174</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175-200</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. OUTCOMES: Student Learning (45%) + Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%) = 50%

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points</th>
<th>Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-80</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-126</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-174</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175-200</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
Adjustment of Summative Rating:

Summative ratings must be completed for all administrators by June 30, of a given school year. Please note that this is different from the Annual Appraisal administered by HHC.

Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

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

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

Dispute-Resolution Process

The local or regional board of education shall include a process for resolving disputes in cases where the evaluator and administrator cannot agree on goals/objectives, the evaluation period, feedback or the professional development plan. When such agreement cannot be reached, the issue in dispute will be referred for resolution to a subcommittee of the professional development and evaluation committee (PDEC). The Director of School Programs and the administrator will each select one representative from the PDEC and/or hospital management team to constitute this subcommittee, as well as a neutral party, as mutually agreed upon between the Director of School Programs and administrator. In the event that the designated committee does not reach a unanimous decision, the issue shall be considered by the Director of School Programs whose decision shall be binding.
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Flexibilities to the Guidelines for Educator Evaluation Adopted by Connecticut State Board of Education on February 6, 2014

Section 2.9: Flexibility Components

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

a. Each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select 1 goal/objective for student growth. For each goal/objective, each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select multiple Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD) and evidence of those IAGDs based on the range of criteria used by the program. For any teacher whose primary responsibility is not the direct instruction of students, the mutually agreed upon goal/objective and indicators shall be based on the assigned role of the teacher.

b. One half (or 22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goal/objective is met shall be based on standardized indicators other than the state test (CMT, CAPT, or SBAC) for the 2014-15 academic year, pending federal approval. Other standardized indicators for other grades and subjects, where available, may be used. For the other half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development, there may be:
   1. A maximum of one additional standardized indicator other than the state test (CMT, CAPT or SBAC) for the 2014-15 academic year, pending federal approval, if there is mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute resolution procedure as described in 1.3.
   2. A minimum of one non-standardized indicator.

c. Teachers who receive and maintain an annual summative performance evaluation designation of proficient or exemplary (or the equivalent annual summative ratings in a pre-existing program evaluation plan) during the 2012-13 or any subsequent school year and who are not first or second year teachers shall be evaluated with a minimum of one formal in-class observation no less frequently than once every three years, and three informal in-class observations conducted in accordance with Section 2.3(2)(b)(1) and 2.3(2)(b)(2) in all other years, and shall complete one review of practice every year. Teachers with proficient or exemplary designations may receive a formal in-class observation if an informal observation or review of practice in a given year results in a concern about the teacher’s practice. For non-classroom teachers, the above frequency of observations shall apply in the same ways, except that the observations need not be in-classroom (they shall instead be conducted in appropriate settings). All other teachers, including first and second year teachers and teachers who receive a performance evaluation designation of below standard or
developing, will be evaluated according to the procedures in 2.3(2)(c) and 2.3(2)(d). All observations shall be followed with timely feedback. Examples of non-classroom observations or reviews of practice include but are not limited to: observations of data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, reviews of lesson plans or other teaching artifacts.

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

**Section 2.10: Data Management Protocols**

a. On or before September 15, 2014 and each year thereafter, professional development and evaluation committees established pursuant to 10-220a shall review and report to their board of education the user experience and efficiency of the program’s data management systems/platforms being used by teachers and administrators to manage evaluation plans.

b. For implementation of local evaluation plans for the 2014-15 school year, and each year thereafter, data management systems/platforms to be used by teachers and administrators to manage evaluation plans shall be selected by boards of education with consideration given to the functional requirements/needs and efficiencies identified by professional development and evaluation committees.

c. For implementation of local evaluation plans for the 2014-15 school year, and each year thereafter, educator evaluation plans shall contain guidance on the entry of data into a program’s data management system/platform being used to manage/administer the evaluation plan and on ways to reduce paperwork and documentation while maintaining plan integrity. Such guidance shall:

1. Limit entry only to artifacts, information and data that is specifically identified in a teacher or administrator’s evaluation plan as an indicator to be used for evaluating such educators, and to optional artifacts as mutually agreed upon by teacher/administrator and evaluator;
2. Streamline educator evaluation data collection and reporting by teachers and administrators;
3. Prohibit the SDE from accessing identifiable student data in the educator evaluation data management systems/platforms, except as needed to conduct the audits man-dated by C.G.S. 10-151b(c) and 10-151i, and ensure that third-party organizations keep all identifiable student data confidential;
4. Prohibit the sharing or transference of individual teacher data from one program to another or to any other entity without the teacher or administrator’s consent, as prohibited by law;
5. Limit the access of teacher or administrator data to only the primary evaluator, Director of School Programs or his/her designee, and to other designated professionals directly involved with evaluation and professional development processes. Consistent with Connecticut General Statutes, this provision does not affect the SDE’s data collection authority;
6. Include a process for logging the names of authorized individuals who access a teacher or administrator’s evaluation information.

d. The SDE’s technical assistance to school programs will be appropriate to the evaluation and support plan adopted by the program, whether or not the plan is the state model.
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CT State Board of Education-Adopted Revisions: Guidelines for Educator Evaluation May 7, 2014

Dispute-Resolution Process

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

Rating System

2.1: 4-Level Matrix Rating System

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

(a) The performance levels shall be defined as follows:
   - Exemplary – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
   - Proficient – Meeting indicators of performance
   - Developing – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
   - Below standard – Not meeting indicators of performance

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

45% Student Growth Component

(c) One half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goals/objectives are met shall not be determined by a single, isolated standardized test score, but shall be determined through the comparison of data across assessments administered over time, including the state test for those teaching tested grades and subjects or another standardized indicator for other grades and subjects where available. A state test can be used only if there are interim assessments that lead to that test, and such interim assessments shall be included in the overall score for those teaching tested grades and subjects. Those without an available standardized indicator will select, through mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute-resolution procedure as described in section 1.3, an additional non-standardized indicator.

a. For the 2015-16 academic year, the required use of state test data is suspended, pending USED approval, pursuant to PEAC’s flexibility recommendation on January 29, 2014 and the State Board of Education’s action on February 6, 2014.
b. Prior to the 2015-16 academic year, the SDE will work with PEAC to examine and evolve the system of standardized and non-standardized student learning indicators, including the use of interim assessments that lead to the state test to measure growth over time.

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

a. A maximum of one additional standardized indicator, if there is mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute resolution procedure as described in section 1.3.
b. A minimum of one non-standardized indicator.
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2015-16 Draft Business Rules for Student Learning Goals/Objectives (SLOs) for Educators in CSDE – APSEPs

The Approved Providers of Special Education Programs (APSEPs) serve students who cannot be effectively served in LEAs. Students in these programs may have additional cognitive and/or non-cognitive disabilities that prevent them from fully accessing the academic curriculum. Each individual APSEP will have a professional staff with specific expertise to serve students with certain disabilities. Teachers and Student and Educator Support Specialists (SESS) are employed to provide the academic program and to address the disabilities that may impact the ability of the student to be successful in the academic program.¹

Within the context of the State educator evaluation and support system, 45% of the evaluation is comprised of one or more Student Learning Goals/Objectives (SLOs) using multiple indicators of academic growth and development to measure those objectives. While student growth as defined in Connecticut’s Guidelines for Educator Evaluation includes “academic growth,” some educators in APSEPs will not have an academic assignment or will have an assignment that has a dual purpose of addressing a student’s disability and providing academic instruction. In these instances, student development rather than academic growth may be appropriate.

Additionally, because of the unique nature of a student’s disability or the mission of a specific APSEP, students are often not in attendance full time for the traditional school year. These draft business rules for SLOs are designed to address issues that are unique to the educator/student interaction in these programs. Some of these business rules may have to be adjusted since it is not possible to capture all scenarios relating to educators’ assignments.

Educators in APSEPs can consider the following when developing their SLOs:

1. Align to the mission of the APSEP
   - SLOs should be focused on growth central to student learning. Whether the growth is academic or non-academic, the SLO should directly relate to the mission of the APSEP - the reason why the LEA initially referred the student to the program

2. Identify the scope of the educator’s assignment.
   - If a majority of the assignment is focused on student academic growth, then the SLO should measure the educator’s impact on student academic growth.
     - The non-academic component of the educator’s assignment can be assessed either through a second SLO or through evidence collected through the educator observation component of the evaluation.
   - If less than a majority of the educator’s assignment involves academic instruction, the SLO can be written to measure either academic growth or non-academic growth, or both.

¹ Teachers and Student and Educator Support Specialists (SESSs) are collectively referred to as educators throughout these business rules.
If the SLO is designed to measure only academic growth, the non-academic component of the educator’s assignment can be assessed either through a second SLO or through evidence identified through the educator observation component of the evaluation.

3. Determine how the educator will measure growth. (This should address SLO outcomes and not IEP Goals that are determined by the PPT.)

- Select the appropriate type of growth based on the student population: Common, banded, growth to mastery, rubric/achievement level increase, or differentiated student growth. (see page 36 in the Student Learning Goals/Objectives 2014: A Handbook for Administrators and Teachers for guidance on measuring growth in Student Learning Goals/Objectives.
- There may be educational settings where students of varying academic ability are grouped together. In these instances, differentiated student growth targets may make the most sense.
- Given the unique needs of the students in these programs, it is likely that assessments to measure growth will have to be developed or modified to be used within the SLO. The APSEP must develop a process to review educator-developed assessments to be used to measure objectives, if they are non-standardized assessments. Please refer to Appendix A – Non-standardized Assessment Options for Measuring Student Growth, located in Student Learning Goals/Objectives 2014: A Handbook for Administrators and Teachers for guidance on factors to address when creating assessments for use in SLOs.
- A core issue for any SLO is the expected amount of student growth and whether the student growth target is rigorous but attainable. During this required pilot, the educators and the evaluators will gain experience in setting growth targets. However, initially each APSEP should determine what student growth expectations are based on past cohorts of students who attended the program, the expected interval of instruction, and the cognitive and non-cognitive characteristics of the students served.

4. Interval of Instruction and Attendance.

Students in APSEPs are less likely to have their interval of instruction align to a traditional school year. Very often the goal is to limit a student’s time in the program and return the student to his or her home school as soon as possible. Additionally, with IEPs, the interval of instruction will be defined and may vary for each student. Crafting SLOs for less than a full year of instruction is appropriate but may have to account for a number of issues unique to the mission of the APSEP. Specifically:

- During the interval of instruction for an educator’s SLO, the educator and his/her evaluator must consider student mobility and students being taken out of class for other services and supports. A good rule of thumb is to only count student growth for students that are in attendance for at least 80% of the interval of instruction.
- There may be educational settings where students enter and exit at varying times, resulting in multiple intervals of instruction for the educator’s students. While it may not be possible to create an approach that will account for all students, below are some suggested guidelines:
Formative assessments can be used at selected intervals to assess student growth.

A plan can be developed that allows for results on formative assessments as well as the summative assessment (for students still in attendance) to be used in calculating an educator’s overall SLO rating.

Using this approach, the attendance of students will still be a factor. For example, if a student is not in attendance for at least 80% (or whatever percentage is set by the APSEP) during the period of time leading up to the formative assessment, that assessment should not be included in calculating the educator’s SLO rating.

During focus groups with educators from APSEPs, a few program participants identified educational settings where there is a limited time period when educators are engaged with students. To assess the effectiveness of these educators, the following guidance is suggested:

- Identify the period of time where an SLO would not be practical because of the length of time the student is with the educator and/or the educator/student interaction is not appropriate for measuring student growth.
- The educator and evaluator identify the purpose of the interaction between the student and educator. They also agree on what each of the four levels of performance would look like for exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard. Rather than just using the description, “substantially exceeding indicators of performance” for exemplary, describe actual student outcome targets (whether they are academic or non-academic) for each student in that class. Since outcomes will not be measured with standardized assessments, it’s important that educators and evaluators agree on what is considered either successful or unsuccessful attainment of the outcome(s).
- The ratings for an agreed upon number of intervals of instruction with different cohorts of students are aggregated to form the 45% student learning indicators.

5. Individual Education Plans (IEPs)

In limited instances, it may be appropriate to use the IEP goals for the SLO. This approach may be appropriate for SESSs that are not engaged in academic instruction. There are several issues that should be addressed when using the IEP goals within the SLO.

- IEPs may identify a team of educators whose assignments will all contribute to the student’s success in meeting the IEP goals. In some instances, specific IEP goals can be identified for each educator, and for other goals, this may not be possible. In the latter instance, care must be taken to not overly attribute success or failure to individual educators who are part of the IEP team for that student. For example, shared goals could be given less weight towards an educator’s SLO rating than individual IEP goals.
- IEPs may have intervals of instruction with varying time periods as identified in #4 above. One approach could be as follows:
  - The students with IEPs assigned to the educator from September 1 thru October 15th will constitute the student population for the educator’s SLO.
  - The overall SLO statement will be to effectively meet the IEP goals attributed to the work of the educator.
Given the nature of the IEP goals for each student and the work of the educator to successfully attain those goals, an appropriate weighting of the IEP goals is developed and used to determine the educator’s SLO rating.

6. Alternative Approaches

The CSDE recognizes that some APSEPs may not be able to use these business rules due to the mission of the institution and the cognitive and non-cognitive needs of the students that they serve. Any alternative approach submitted by an APSEP for approval by the CSDE should include a rationale for why the proposed approach is the most appropriate for the educators in the APSEP.
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Clarifications and Additional Adaptations in the Evaluation and Support of APSEP Teachers and Administrators

Based on feedback from APSEP educators during the 2015-16 Required Pilot

Common Themes from APSEP Teacher and Administrators Focus Groups (May 2016)

Observation of Teacher Practice and Performance:

- Overall, teachers appreciated focused observations and specific feedback from their evaluators. In turn, evaluators shared that this component of the evaluation and support system provided valuable information that they could use to support their teachers. APSEPs are encouraged to consider how they can integrate formal and informal in-class observation requirements into their current system of oversight and support.
- A concern that was raised was that teachers felt it was difficult to demonstrate their practice at an exemplary level based on the language of the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014. This concern was also voiced by K-12 program teachers during multiple focus groups and feedback opportunities as part of a multi-year validation process of the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching. As a result, an updated 2016 CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching, will be released in late summer/early fall 2016 for PDECs to consider for use in the observation of teacher practice and performance for the 2016-17 academic year.
- Administrators discussed the amount of scripting they were completing as part of the observation process for teachers. Administrators are encouraged to continue to use scripting as one method of collecting evidence of a teacher’s practice, but to also consider other methods of collecting observation of practice evidence that capture student engagement and student learning, and which align with their regular day-to-day operations and mission of their program.

Developing Student Learning Goals/Objectives (SLG/Os):

Common concerns that were raised included

- developing SLG/Os for students who participated in the APSEP for less than a year;
- developing SLG/Os for older students (18+ years) who focus mainly on transition, vocation, and community living skills;
- developing SLG/Os for students with IEP goals that focus on mental health, behavioral and executive functioning skills; and
- aligning SLG/Os with student learning needs identified in student IEPs.

In response to these concerns, educators are encouraged to review Appendix C of the 2016 SEED Handbook-Adopted for APSEPs, which outlines a series of business rules for developing SLG/Os, given different APSEP contexts and settings. Overall, teachers are encouraged to consider the mission of their APSEP and develop SLG/Os which support this mission. In addition, this is an area that the CSDE, in partnership with the Northeast Comprehensive Center (NCC), will work with educators in APSEPs to provide resources and guidance in developing SLG/Os that reflect the concerns described.
above.

**Stakeholder Feedback:**

Both teachers and administrators had flexibility to expand their stakeholder groups from whom they sought feedback (mainly via surveys). Both groups reported favorable feedback but acknowledged that the results did not highlight specific areas for growth. Educators in APSEPs are encouraged to discuss how they envision working with parents and other stakeholders to foster continuous improvement in the services they provide and to discuss strategies to implement with stakeholders. Successful implementation of these strategies could contribute to a rating for this component of the educator’s evaluation and support system.