Meeting Objectives

• Further establish meeting norms and processes going forward, including a decision-making protocol;

• Define subcommittees (topics, membership) and timeline;

• Develop an understanding of the rubric validation process and learn about the current progress of this work;

• Finalize a revised Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (June 2015) document and hear other general updates; and

• Confirm key topics for future meetings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Welcome/Introductions</th>
<th>9:00-9:10am</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Meeting Protocols</td>
<td>9:10-10:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Rubric Presentation</td>
<td>10:00-11:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Additional Updates</td>
<td>11:00am-12:00pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome/Introductions
A conference on promising practices in educator evaluation and professional learning.

Educators in Action Video
February 26, 2015
Meeting Norms/Processes
PEAC Meeting Norms

• Listen carefully and with respect; one person speaks at a time.
• Agree to disagree, but disagree with ideas, not with people.
• Bring voices not in the room.
• Keep in mind, this is a “meeting in public,” not a “public meeting.”
• Participate as equals and share air time.
• Bring all perspectives, as appropriate.
• Participate fully.
• Capture questions that arise, and keep momentum going.
• Begin and end on time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (all Wednesdays):</th>
<th>Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 10, 2015</td>
<td>9am-12pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16, 2015</td>
<td>9am-12pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9, 2015</td>
<td>9am-12pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2016</td>
<td>9am-12pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decision-making Process

• Consensus-building tools:
  – Try to Maximize Joint Gains
  – Use Straw Polls (“Fist to Five” or Negative Poll)
  – Seek Unanimity
  – Make Every Effort to Satisfy Concerns of Holdouts
  – Settle for Overwhelming Level of Support
• When consensus cannot be reached, then the facilitator will motion to move to a majority vote
  – In the event of moving to a majority vote, each association is permitted to cast one vote
• If the association is not represented during a decision-making process, then the association forfeits its vote
Membership

- Per statute, 1 representative from each of the identified associations as designated by the association;
- A “person with expertise in performance evaluation processes and systems;” and
- “Any other person the Commissioner deems appropriate.”

In the event a member cannot attend a meeting, the association can send another representative to attend, however, s/he should participate as part of the audience and will not participate in any decision-making processes.
### Subcommittee Charge and Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations for Partial-Year Employment Update</strong></td>
<td>Implementation/Development Team subcommittee</td>
<td>Sept. 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Proficiency &amp; Calibration of Evaluators/Training Plan</strong></td>
<td>Implementation/Development Team subcommittee</td>
<td>Sept. 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric Validation Presentation

Sandy Greenberg, VP for Research and Advisory Services

Pat Muenzen, Director of Research Services
CSDE-ProExam Partnership

• Dates back to 1988
  – Job Analysis Validation Studies
  – Connecticut Competency Instrument
  – Connecticut Administrator Test

• Rubric validation (2013 – present)
  – Teacher
  – Service Provider/Student and Educator Support Specialists (SESS)
  – Administrator
Rubric Development and Validation

• Main purpose for rubric
  – High stakes performance evaluation
  – Professional development
• Rubrics are “living” documents
  – Ongoing review and refinement
• Work conducted by subject-matter experts representing range of stakeholder groups
• Process facilitated by ProExam and grounded in psychometric principles
Drivers for Development

• Identifying behaviors that foster positive outcomes for students, teachers, schools, families and other key stakeholders in the education system

• Providing the basis for constructive, actionable feedback

• Defensibility
  – Reliability
  – Validity
Three Rubrics

• **CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching** - 2014
• **CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery** - 2015
• **CT Leader Evaluation Rubric** - 2015
Rubric Review Committee Composition

- 20 – 25 members
- Target audience: teachers, support personnel, and/or administrators
- Trained observers of target audience
- Union representatives
- RESC Alliance
- CAS and CAPSS
- Private special education educators
- District- and state-level employees
- Higher education representatives
Revision Process

1. Identification of “Pain Points” and Needs
2. Committee Proposes Rubric Updates
3. Stakeholder Review
4. Committee Revisions
5. Rubric in Use
6. Validation Evidence Gathered
Guiding Principles

• Rubric should
  – reflect all experience levels
  – apply across settings, districts and positions
  – focus on components that impact positive outcomes
  – integrate key aspects of applicable standards
  – facilitate a consistent interpretation of the behaviors/actions being measured
  – translate into high-quality, actionable feedback
Group Process

• Large-group discussions
• Small-group work and peer review
• Integrate content from literature
Committee Member Experience

David Levenduski
Principal
Benjamin Franklin Elementary School
Meriden Public Schools

Katherine Lopez
Kindergarten Teacher
Benjamin Franklin Elementary School
Meriden Public Schools
Upcoming Validation Activities

• Surveys to gather content validity evidence from three constituencies
  – Target audience: teachers, service providers, and/or administrators
  – Trained observers of target audience
  – Additional stakeholders (may include employers, supervisors, district-level personnel)
Upcoming Validation Activities

• Fairness reviews
• Reliability reviews
• Online focus panels with rubric users
• Observer post-observation confidence surveys
Where we are in process

• Teacher Rubric
  – Revised rubric implemented in 2014 – 2015
  – Validation activities: Fall 2015 and ongoing

• Service Delivery and Leader Rubrics
  – Revised rubrics to be implemented in 2015 – 2016
  – Validation activities: Winter 2015 and ongoing
“In reading [the revised Leader Rubric] for the first time, I used the rubric as a reflection of my own practice as an educational leader. This could become a very powerful tool in supervising administrators on any level and as a tool for developing improvement plans and setting building and district goals. This document feels to be more “user friendly” than the current rubric used for administrators.”

– Superintendent of Schools

“I thought [the revised Leader Rubric] was comprehensive and addressed a number of very important if sometimes overlooked aspects of leadership. Specifically, I appreciated the attention paid to building capacity in others to exert leadership - whether through decision-making or monitoring practice.”

– University Professor
“The experience of coming together with other Student and Educator Support Specialists and evaluators was extremely valuable. Being able to take a look at the rubric and hear from people with various lenses not only helped to modify the rubric in a way that considered all of the different support specialists but also allowed us to have irreplaceable conversations about ways to improve our own practice and get the most out of the evaluation process!”

– Director of School Counseling
General Updates
Review an updated version of the *Guidelines for Educator Evaluation*, which integrates the following:

- PEAC Flexibilities- February 6, 2014
- SBE-Adopted Revisions- May 7, 2014
The CSDE continues to engage a broadly representative group of stakeholders to collaborate on the development of a new system for professional learning to support educators across their career continuum. Since our last update, we have accomplished the following:

• Secured SBE adoption of the *CT Definition for Professional Learning* and the *CT Standards for Professional Learning*;

• Rolled out an information awareness presentation on the PL work to various audiences including Curriculum Councils, Alliance Districts, and Teacher of the Year semi-finalists;

• Convened a Professional Learning Advisory Council (PLAC) subcommittee dedicated to crafting rationales for each of the 8 standards; and

• Identified subcommittees to continue the work into the 2015-16 academic year.
# 2015-16 Educator Evaluation & Support Plan Review

## Status of Submission (as of 6/5/15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete and reviewed</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete and under review</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension requests</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>196</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Waiver Requests; n= 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEARN/Shoreline Framework</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New requests</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat requests from previous year</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• CT's new Educator Evaluation and Support System wasn't designed with Adult Education in mind
  – Implementation challenges
  – Not the intent/focus of the USED

• **PROPOSAL**: present participation in the new Educator Evaluation and Support process as OPTIONAL for adult educators given their unique context
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Calendar of Discussion Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>June 10, 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAC Meeting Norms/Protocols including</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making Process &amp; Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge/Parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProExam Presentation on Rubric Validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/Update on Revised Rubrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Updates – Updated Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document/Professional Learning Update/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16 Plan Submission Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 9, 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Designators/Tested Grades &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Update (NEW subcommittee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Updates – Professional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work; Training Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closing/Q&A