Connecticut Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) Meeting

September 16, 2015
Meeting Objectives

• Identify membership, next steps, and timeline for ad hoc subcommittees;

• Develop greater awareness among PEAC members of the existing evaluator training program, with a focus on Collegial Calibrations;

• Provide additional updates related to the ESEA flexibility waiver, professional learning, and the evaluation and support plan review/approval process; and

• Discuss key topics for future meetings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Welcome/Introductions</td>
<td>9:00-9:10am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Subcommittee Discussion</td>
<td>9:10-10:00am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Training Presentation</td>
<td>10:00-11:15am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Additional Items for Discussion</td>
<td>11:15-11:50am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Adjournment/Closing</td>
<td>11:50am-12:00pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome/Introductions
PEAC Meeting Norms

- Listen carefully and with respect; one person speaks at a time.
- Agree to disagree; 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.
Discussion of Subcommittees
PEAC Ad Hoc Subcommittees

- Recommendations for Partial-Year Employment/Unique Roles & Functions
- Ongoing Proficiency & Calibration of Evaluators
- Performance Designators/Tested Grades & Subjects

Membership: Email Shannon.Marimon@ct.gov or call 860.713.6816 by Friday, September 18, 2015
## Subcommittee Charge and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Partial-Year Employment/Unique Roles &amp; Functions</td>
<td>Develop a set of recommendations and/or business rules for implementing the educator evaluation and support system in instances when educators are employed in a part-time or partial-year capacity. Other unique position considerations may also be addressed.</td>
<td>Dec. 2015 Final Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Membership: Email [Shannon.Marimon@ct.gov](mailto:Shannon.Marimon@ct.gov) or call 860.713.6816 by Friday, 9/18/15
## Subcommittee Charge and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Proficiency &amp; Calibration of Evaluators</strong></td>
<td>Review the current evaluator support currently offered through the Development Team work; make recommendations for where we might expand the training supports for evaluators of teachers and administrators.</td>
<td>Dec. 2015 &amp; March 2016 Status Reports. At March 2016 meeting, determine if subcommittee will continue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Membership: Email [Shannon.Marimon@ct.gov](mailto:Shannon.Marimon@ct.gov) or call 860.713.6816 by Friday, 9/18/15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Designators/</td>
<td>Develop a set of recommendations and best practices related to the appropriate use of standardized assessments as part of the educator evaluation process; Propose any revised language as it may apply to the <em>CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation</em>, specific to performance designators and tested grades/subjects.</td>
<td>Dec. 2015 &amp; March 2016 Status Reports. At March 2016 meeting, determine if subcommittee will continue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tested Grades &amp; Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Membership: Email Shannon.Marimon@ct.gov or call 860.713.6816 by Friday, 9/18/15
Evaluator Training Presentation
• Development Team

• Process to review/revise current offerings

• Revisions to the *Foundation Skills for Evaluators*

• Additional offerings to expand on the foundational training

• Educator Evaluation & Support Conference - February 25, 2016
Ongoing Calibration of Evaluators: Establishing Teacher Feedback for Growth
Assessing Professional Learning

Other Models for Calibration & Evaluation

• Inspection

• Focus on Accuracy

• External Assessment

• Individual Focus

ReVision Learning's Collegial Calibrations™

• Feedback for Growth

• Focus on Feedback

• Building District Capacity

• Collaborative Focus
Guiding Principles

• Adaptive Leadership (Heifetz & Linsky)

• Professional Capital (Michael Fullan)

• Challenge with Support (Sir Michael Barber)

• The Power of Feedback (John Hattie)
Building Evaluator Capacity

Rubric Understanding

Clear Communication

Awareness of Bias

Supportive Yet Critical Feedback

Observation Methods

Quantitative & Qualitative

Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment

The inter-rater agreement and on-going reliability of evaluator rating associated with a set of performance standards
Evaluator’s Learning Progression

Observation  Analysis  Feedback
CSDE-Sponsored
CAS and RVL Train the Trainer

• 26 CT Districts participating in 2014-2015

• Services
  – 3 Days of Train the Trainers
  – 2 Days of Face-to-Face Support Meetings
  – 2 Days of On-Site Support
  – 3 Days of Extension Workshops for Coaching through Feedback

• 34 District CC Facilitators trained
RVL Collegial Calibrations™

• Currently implemented in 33 CT Districts

• Over 750 Evaluators have participated since 2013-2014

• Facilitated over 1200 observations with reviews of evidence during Collegial Calibrations™ sessions
First Steps - District

• Communicate/Discuss with Staff

Size: West Hartford, Hartford
Specific Needs: Canton, Norwich

• Create District Teams with Administrators/Evaluators

• Generate a calendar rotating site visits across the district
## Site Visit Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Hour</strong></td>
<td>The group reflects and discusses areas of existing discrepancy from previous reviews of practice. Specific behaviors from discrepancy areas will be identified and will provide the focus for the classroom visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hour Two-Three</strong></td>
<td>2 – 4 Classroom Observations (with an opportunity for a short discussion and lesson deconstruction between observations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hour Four</strong></td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hour Five</strong></td>
<td>Participants organize and connect evidence to the framework/rubric language. Groups discuss and collaboratively score indicators/domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hour Six</strong></td>
<td>Participants self-reflect to identify strengths and opportunities for growth and work in ReFLECT™ to develop written feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ReVision Learning staff reviews and assesses participants’ written submissions using the *ReVision Learning Supervisory Continuum™* and the ReFLECT™ system. Feedback is provided to each participant to help support his or her individualized development needs.
## Evaluator Supervisory Continuum

### Domain 1: Evidence-Based Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.</strong> Evidence cited is directly tied to the appropriate indicators of practice and accurately represents the levels of performance.</td>
<td>Evidence of teaching practice is often misaligned with the appropriate performance indicators.</td>
<td>There is some evidence of teaching practice that is aligned with the appropriate performance indicators and levels, there are numerous instances where it is not.</td>
<td>Most evidence of teaching practice is aligned with the appropriate performance indicators and levels.</td>
<td>All evidence of teaching practice is aligned with the appropriate performance indicators and levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of teaching practice is not associated with levels of performance.</td>
<td>Some evidence of teaching practice is associated with levels of performance.</td>
<td>Most evidence of teaching practice is associated with levels of performance.</td>
<td>All evidence of teaching practice is associated with levels of performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little to no connections have been made between teaching practice and performance indicators.</td>
<td>There are some/ a few connections that are made between teaching practice and performance indicators.</td>
<td>Most connections are made between teaching practice and performance indicators, some of which are clear and explicit.</td>
<td>There are clear and explicit connections made between all teaching practice and performance indicators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Domain 2: Qualitative and Quantitative Evidence

|                  | Evidence cited about teaching practice includes only one type of data.                                     | While the evidence cited is a mix of qualitative and quantitative data, it lacks the specificity needed to support teacher growth and improvement. | The evidence cited is a mix of qualitative and quantitative data. It includes enough specificity needed to support some teacher growth and improvement. | The evidence cited is balanced between qualitative and quantitative data and specific facts that provide supportive suggestions and potential benchmarks for teacher growth and improvement. |
|                  | Evidence is not specific enough to support teacher growth and improvement.                                  |                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                       |                                                                                                       |

© ReVision Learning Partnership, LLC All Rights Reserved
The Continuum

1.A Rubric Understanding

1.B Observation Methods

1.C Curriculum, Understanding and Assessment

1.D Supportive Yet Critical Feedback

1.E Awareness of Bias

1.F Clear Communication
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Hour</th>
<th>The group reflects and discusses areas of existing discrepancy from previous reviews of practice. Specific behaviors from discrepancy areas will be identified and will provide the focus for the classroom visits.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hour Two-Three</strong></td>
<td>2 – 4 Classroom Observations (with an opportunity for a short discussion and lesson deconstruction between observations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour Four</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour Five</td>
<td>Participants organize and connect evidence to the framework/rubric language. Groups discuss and collaboratively score indicators/domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour Six</td>
<td>Participants self-reflect to identify strengths and opportunities for growth and work in ReFLECT™ to develop written feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ReVision Learning staff reviews and assesses participants’ written submissions using the *ReVision Learning Supervisory Continuum™* and the ReFLECT™ system. Feedback is provided to each participant to help support his or her individualized development needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Hour</th>
<th>The group reflects and discusses areas of existing discrepancy from previous reviews of practice. Specific behaviors from discrepancy areas will be identified and will provide the focus for the classroom visits.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hour Two-Three</td>
<td>2 – 4 Classroom Observations (with an opportunity for a short discussion and lesson deconstruction between observations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour Four</td>
<td>LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour Five</td>
<td>Participants organize and connect evidence to the framework/rubric language. Groups discuss and collaboratively score indicators/domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour Six</td>
<td>Participants self-reflect to identify strengths and opportunities for growth and work in ReFLECT™ to develop written feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ReVision Learning staff reviews and assesses participants’ written submissions using the *ReVision Learning Supervisory Continuum™* and the ReFLECT™ system. Feedback is provided to each participant to help support his or her individualized development needs.
Change is a process, not an event.
Learning is a Social Construct.

Lev Vygotsky
Where the magic happens

Your comfort zone
Active Engagement
Graphing Learning Progressions

Purpose
- Find evidence to support a non-fiction article focusing on a social issue identified by the class as a major theme of common read text.

Tasks
- Find articles relevant to group's common book
- Completion of worksheet
- 8/25 started by 9/5

Student Understanding
- Table 1: Purpose is to support social topic
- 2: Not sure of article purpose
- 3: Half and half
- 4: Purpose is to support social topic

Strengths
- Explicit description of collaboration on search techniques
- Some partnerships formed among students
- Team of librarians
- Topics

Map
- Low level invitation to participate by adding to themes
- Teacher conferred with tables asking

* Teacher conferred with tables asking
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Framework Report Form - as filled out by ReFLECT</th>
<th>Maya Angelou</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date : 6/10/14</td>
<td>School : Hometown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher : Mr. McBride</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade : 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3a. Implementing instructional content for learning.

**Areas of Strength**
Some of your evidence speaks more to Domain 1. Here, we are not necessarily looking at flow, but the content scaffolding and the logical step-by-step process from the intro of the objective, the opening activity and then the main learning tasks.

**Areas of Development**
Expand on the evidence around the idea of clarification and academic vocabulary. This is a good catch. What could it mean? A need for a shift? That the lesson wasn’t properly scaffolded? Try to help the teacher discover a change in practice based on the evidence. For this indicator, really focus on whether there was a clearly established purpose and then that the tasks that followed set students up to work successfully and demonstrate learning. What evidence can you provide about those elements?

| 2 |

### 3b. Leading students to construct meaning and apply new learning through the use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies.

**Areas of Strength**
All evidence is directly connected to the indicator.

**Areas of Development**
The CCSS shift involving text-evidence supports the use of the text predominantly to extract meaning. Additional resources might be used as text sets with similar themes, devices, etc., alternate perspectives on a topic, etc. This would extend students’ level of thinking. We are also coaching teachers now to only provide background knowledge when meaning cannot be extracted solely through the text. This is the indicator to really focus on HOT. What level of thinking was required of students during the tasks and the questions? Try to capture those (and with quotes) and match the levels so it is very clear to the teacher.

| 2 |

### 3c. Assessing student learning, providing feedback to students and adjusting instruction.

**Areas of Strength**
Try to take your feedback here one step further. When we are assessing feedback, we want to ensure it is specific and leads students to further understanding and/or advancing their own learning. What did he say or ask at the tables? What impact did that have?

**Areas of Development**
Good suggestion from the rubric but more is needed. Try to let a teacher know at which point during a lesson should that have occurred, how you knew it and what the shift should have been

| 1 |
RVL Continuum

Domain 1 - Evidence-Based Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Evidence cited is focused on meaningful student engagement and learning and is directly connected to a specific teaching strategy and/or teacher action and impact on students.</td>
<td>Little to no connections have been made between teacher action and learning outcome or impact on students.</td>
<td>Some feedback statements contain connections between teacher action and learning outcome or impact on students.</td>
<td>Most feedback statements contain connections between teacher action and impact on student engagement and/or learning process and outcome.</td>
<td>The detailed feedback strongly links observed teaching practice/teacher actions to expected student learning objectives, impact on student engagement or learning process and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continue to connect observed behaviors or outcomes as direct effects of teacher actions and then provide solutions or new strategies that do the same. (Good ex. This will confirm understanding of the objective.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Exceptional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Feedback contains areas of strengths and areas of growth explicitly connected to the indicator and observed practice/evidence and are developed based on indicator language and the key levers between ratings.</td>
<td>Clear areas for teacher growth have not been identified and/or areas of strength have not been recognized. They have little to do with observed lesson and teaching practice. The areas of strength and growth are not directly connected to evidence and/or the indicator language. Key levers between ratings are not utilized for developing the areas of growth and areas of strength.</td>
<td>Some areas for teacher growth along with areas of strength have been identified. They are at least partially connected with observed lesson and teaching practice. The feedback for areas of strength and growth include some connections to the evidence and/or the indicator language. Key levers between ratings are addressed and sometimes connected and utilized for developing the areas of growth and areas of strength.</td>
<td>Clear areas for teacher growth along with areas of strength have often been identified and are often connected with observed lesson and teaching practice. Key levers between ratings are clearly articulated to the areas of strength and growth and often utilized for developing specific feedback.</td>
<td>Feedback statements clearly articulate and define the areas of strength and areas of growth with specific data and evidence. They are clearly connected to the indicators and build on the key levers. Feedback provides explicit evidence that supports areas of growth across multiple indicators of the teacher performance rubric while reinforcing positive practice through articulation of effective teaching practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your statements did always include a strength with areas for development based on the rubric. Just be sure to include detailed evidence to support your growth statements.
Group 2 RVL Continuum after Round 1

Session One (orange=2, yellow=3)

Aggregate Scores Against RVL Continuum Indicators

Indicators as Areas of Improvement
B. Qualitative and quantitative evidence cited in feedback is aligned, appropriate and facilitates targeted growth and improvement.

C. Evidence cited is focused on meaningful student engagement and learning and is directly connected to a specific teaching strategy and/or teacher action and impact on students.

F. Feedback report serves as a comprehensive learning tool containing clearly articulated evidence-based feedback and explicit connections.

A. Evidence cited is directly tied to the appropriate indicators of practice and accurately represents the levels of performance.

D. Feedback contains areas of strengths and areas of growth explicitly connected to the indicator and observed practices/evidence and are developed based on indicator language and the key levers between ratings.
Group 2 RVL Continuum Comparison

Session 3 (orange=2, yellow=3)

Aggregate Scores Against RVL Continuum Indicators

Indicators as Areas of Improvement

C. Evidence cited is focused on meaningful student engagement and learning and is directly connected to a specific teaching strategy and/or teacher action and impact on students.
ReVision Learning Evaluator Calibration

Evaluator Support

Behavioralization of Instructional Frameworks

Feedback on Feedback

Collegial Calibrations™

Accuracy Measurements RVL Evaluator Continuum Indicator A,D

Using Claim, Connect Action™

On-Going Just In-Time Feedback

Inter-Rater Agreement

Inter-Rater Reliability

Comprehensive Measurement RVL Evaluator Continuum Indicators A-F
Resources

Check out hashtags: #ctedchat
#evaluation #teacher
@ReVision_Learnng

Weekly Newsletter
Voices of ReVision @
www.revisionlearning.com

Additional Requests
atepper@revisionlearning.com
Collegial Calibrations District Experience

Frank Purcaro
Director of Student Learning & Teaching
Wolcott Public Schools

Deborah Osvald
Assistant Principal
Wolcott High School
Wolcott Public Schools
I definitely became more comfortable with the rubric which really assisted me in defining what I needed to change in my observations. Once areas were clarified I got better at making decisions about how I would go about getting the evidence I needed.

Overall the focus on student behavior has been my greatest shift, paying particular attention to their understanding of objective and the relevance they can draw from their learning.

I am now using diagrams, I am looking for more quantitative data, and I am aligning my language and vocabulary with the rubric.

[Effective practices:] The ability of the presenter to adjust to the dynamics and personalities of our group to capitalize on our strengths and support our areas of challenge.
Additional Items for Discussion
CT received approval on its full waiver request in August 2015; Principle 3 addresses “Supporting Effective Instruction & Leadership” and includes:

- Continued flexibility, through the 2015-16 school year, regarding the requirement to incorporate the state test as a measure of student growth in educator evaluation for teachers and administrators in tested grades and subjects;

- Adding additional one-year waiver for full implementation of CT’s Educator Evaluation and Support system in the following unique settings:
  - Pre-K
  - Unified School District #1;
  - Unified School District #2; and
  - Approved Private Special Education Facilities.

- Monitoring requirement and timeline
In collaboration with various partners, the CSDE has continued its work to develop guidance and resources that support high-quality systems for professional learning. Since our last update, we have:

• Released an RFP for Planning Grants to Transform Professional Learning Systems (up to $25k district-level grants);

• Planned a second offering of the CT Academy for Professional Learning (ongoing representatives from CAPSS, CAS, CABE, AFT, CEA, Educator Preparation programs, OEC, as well as TEAM and grantees); and

• Supported ongoing work of the Professional Learning Advisory Council (PLAC) and related subcommittees over the summer months and into the 2015-16 academic year.
Educator Evaluation and Support Submission Process

• 2015-16 Plan Submission Process in Review
  – Waiver reports due in February 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waiver Requests; n= 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEARN/Shoreline Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat requests from previous year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• 2016-17 Plan Submission Timeline
# Proposed Calendar of Discussion Topics

## December 9, 2015

- Recommendations for Partial-Year Employment Update Subcommittee - Final Report
- Performance Designators/Tested Grades & Subjects Subcommittee - Update
- Ongoing Proficiency & Calibration of Evaluators/Training Subcommittee - Update
- Overview of Monitoring Protocol w/ CTAC
- Other...

## March 9, 2016

- Performance Designators/Tested Grades & Subjects Subcommittee - Update
- Ongoing Proficiency & Calibration of Evaluators/Training Subcommittee - Update
- Other...
Thank you.