

**Educator Evaluation and Support 2022 Council
Virtual Meeting 1
April 9, 2021**

Phase I: Recommendations of Flexibilities for 2021-22 School Year CT General Statutes 10-151b(c) and CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation Alignment				
Guideline Requirements	C.G.S. 10-151b(c)	CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation Teacher	CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation Administrator	Can EES 2022 Make Guideline Changes and Recommendations to SBE?
Performance Designations - Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Below Standard	(A) the use of four performance evaluations designators: Exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard;	2.1 4-Level Matrix Rating System (pg. 5) (1) Annual summative evaluations provide each teacher with a summative rating aligned to one of four performance evaluation designators [...]	3.1 4-Level Matrix Rating System (pg. 15) (1) Annual summative evaluations provide each administrator with a summative rating aligned to one of four performance evaluation designators [...]	No Must have a statutory change.
Multiple Indicators of Academic Growth	(B) the use of multiple indicators of student academic growth and development in teacher evaluations;	2.3 Teacher Eval. Components (pgs. 7-8) End-of-year summative review: b. End of Year Conference – [...] evidence will be produced by using the multiple indicators selected to align with each student learning goal/objective. (c) One half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development (IAGDs) should be based on a standardized indicator, when available and appropriate[...] Those without an available standardized indicator will select, through mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute-resolution procedure as described in section 1.3, a non-standardized indicator. [...]While the state mastery test results can be used to identify an area for improvement and focus, they cannot be a measure included in an	3.3 Administrator Evaluation Components (pgs. 17-18) (1)(a) An administrator’s evaluation shall be based on at least three locally-determined indicators which align to Connecticut learning standards. For administrators in high schools, selected indicators must include: 1. 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.	Yes and No Multiple indicators of academic growth must be included in the Guidelines but EES 2022 has the flexibility to determine how indicators are used in educator evaluation.

		<p>educator’s student learning objective (SLO).”</p> <p>The other half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development may be:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A maximum of one additional standardized indicator, if there is mutual agreement[...] 2. A minimum of one non-standardized indicator. <p>2.9 Flexibility Components (1)(a) (pg. 13) [...](a) 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 district.</p>	<p>(1)(b) For all school-based administrators, selected indicators must be relevant to the student population (e.g., grade levels) served by the administrator’s school, [...]</p> <p>(1)(c) For assistant principals, indicators may focus on student results from a subset of teachers, grade levels, or subjects, consistent with the job responsibilities of the assistant principal being evaluated.</p> <p>(1)(d) For central office administrators, indicators may be based on results in the group of schools, group of students, or subject area most relevant to the administrator’s job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.</p>	
How to Assess Academic Growth and Development	(C) methods for assessing student academic growth and development;	<p>2.3 Teacher Eval. Components (pg. 8) (f) [...]In the context of the evaluation of a teacher’s performance, 2.3.f.1 is an opportunity to evaluate the degree to which the teacher provides students fair opportunity and 2.3.f.2 is an opportunity to evaluate the context in which the teacher is working to show that the teacher is given fair opportunity. Indicators of academic growth and development should be fair, reliable, valid and useful to the greatest extent possible.</p>	<p>3.3 Administrator Evaluation Component (1) (pg. 18) In selecting indicators, districts may establish district-wide indicators or may allow administrators and their evaluators to craft mutually agreed-upon student learning objectives specific to that administrator. The school or district must be able to collect adequate information on any chosen indicator to make a fair judgment about whether the administrator met the established goal. When setting targets or objectives, the superintendent or designee must include a review of relevant student</p>	<p>Yes The statute does not describe methods.</p>
	(D) a consideration of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school information system, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-10a, that may influence teacher performance ratings, including, but not limited to, student characteristics, student attendance and student mobility;			<p>Yes The statute requires considerations of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school information system but it is not limited to the list.</p>

			<p>characteristics (e.g., mobility, attendance, demographic and learning characteristics). The evaluator and administrator must also discuss the professional resources appropriate to supporting the administrator in meeting the performance targets.</p> <p>For any administrator assigned to a school in “review” or “turnaround” status in the state’s accountability system, the indicators used for administrator evaluation must align with the performance targets set out in the school’s mandated Improvement Plan. Districts are encouraged to have such alignment for all administrators.</p>	
Scoring System to determine exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard ratings (Matrix, Observation Protocol, Standards-based Observation Model)	(E) minimum requirements for teacher evaluation instruments and procedures, including scoring systems to determine exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard ratings;	<p>2.1 (1)(b) 4-Level Matrix Rating System (pg. 5) Determining summative ratings</p> <p>2.3 Teacher Eval. Components (pgs. 9 – 10) (2) Forty percent (40%) of a teacher’s evaluation shall be based on observation of teacher practice and performance. Observation protocol. Standards-based Observation Model.</p> <p>2.9 Flexibility Components (1)(b) (pg. 13) Observation protocol</p>	<p>3.1 (1)(b) 4-Level Matrix Rating System (pg. 15) Determining summative ratings</p> <p>(3) Forty percent (40%) of an administrator’s evaluation shall be based on ratings of administrator performance and practice by the district superintendent or her/his designee(s). (pgs. 18-19)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The statute requires a minimum requirements for instruments and procedures. The Guidelines define those requirements for instruments and procedures such as the observation protocol.</p>
Evaluation Training	(F) the development and implementation of periodic training programs regarding the teacher evaluation and support program to be offered by the local or regional board of	<p>2.2 Teacher Evaluation Process (pg. 6)</p> <p>(1) Goal-setting conference (a) Orientation on process – To begin the process, the principal or designee provides the teacher with materials outlining the evaluation</p>	<p>3.2 Administrator Evaluation Process (pg. 16)</p> <p>(1)(a) Orientation on process – To begin the process, the superintendent or designee provides the administrator with materials outlining the evaluation process and other</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The statute requires evaluation training but does not describe process.</p>

	<p>education or regional educational service center for the school district to teachers who are employed by such local or regional board of education and whose performance is being evaluated and to administrators who are employed by such local or regional board of education and who are conducting performance evaluations;</p>	<p>process and other information as appropriate and meets and reviews these materials. The orientation shall not occur later than November 15 of a given school year.</p> <p>Pg. (10) (f) Districts shall provide all evaluators with training in observation and evaluation, and how to provide high-quality feedback. Districts shall describe how evaluators must demonstrate proficiency on an ongoing basis in conducting teacher evaluations.</p> <p>2.7 Orientation Programs (pg. 12) The local or regional board of education or regional educational service center for the school district shall offer annual orientation programs regarding the teacher evaluation and support system to teachers who are employed by such local or regional board of education and whose performance is being evaluated.</p>	<p>information as appropriate. Process information provided in orientation must include the rubric used for assessing administrator practice, the instruments to be used to gather feedback from staff, families, and/or students and their alignment to the rubric, the process and calculation by which all evaluation elements will be integrated into an overall rating.</p> <p>3.7 Orientation Programs (pgs. 20-21) The local or regional board of education or regional educational service center for the school district shall offer annual orientation programs regarding the administrator evaluation and support program to administrators who are employed by such local or regional board of education and whose performance is being evaluated and shall train administrators who are employed by such local or regional board of education and who are conducting performance evaluations.</p>	
Professional Development	<p>(G) the provision of professional development services based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process;</p>	<p>2.4 Evaluation-based Professional Learning (pg. 12) Districts and schools shall provide professional learning opportunities for teachers, pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) of Sec. 10-148 of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process. These learning</p>	<p>3.4 Evaluation-based Professional Learning (pg. 20) Districts and schools shall provide professional learning opportunities for administrators, pursuant to subsection (b) of Sec. 10-220a of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process. These learning</p>	<p>Yes The statute requires evaluation training but does not describe process.</p>

		opportunities shall be clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process as it relates to student learning results, observation of professional practice or the results of stakeholder feedback. See appendix for statutory language referenced.	opportunities shall be clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process as it relates to student learning results, observation of professional practice or the results of stakeholder feedback include the provision of useful and timely feedback and improvement opportunities. See appendix for statue language referenced.	
Improvement and Remediation Plans	(H) the creation of individual teacher improvement and remediation plans for teachers whose performance is developing or below standard, designed in consultation with such teacher and his or her exclusive bargaining representative for certified teachers chosen pursuant to section 10-153b, and that (i) identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies, (ii) indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued, and (iii) include indicators of success including a summative rating of proficient or better immediately	2.5 Individual Teacher Improvement and Remediation Plans (pg. 12) Districts shall create plans of individual teacher improvement and remediation for teachers whose performance is developing or below standard, developed in consultation with such teacher and his or her exclusive bargaining representative for certified teachers chosen pursuant to section 10-153b of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), and that (A) identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies, (B) indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued, and (C) include indicators of success including a summative rating of proficient or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.	3.5 Individual Administrator Improvement and Remediation Plans (pg. 20) Districts shall create plans of individual administrator improvement and remediation for principals whose performance is developing or below standard, developed in consultation with such administrator and his or her exclusive bargaining representative for certified administrators chosen pursuant to section 10-153b of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), and that (A) identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies, (B) indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued, and (C) include indicators of success including a summative rating of proficient or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.	Yes The statute requires evaluation training but does not describe process.

	at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan;			
Career Development and Professional Growth	(I) opportunities for career development and professional growth; and	2.6 Career Development and Growth (pg. 12) Districts must provide opportunities for career development and professional growth based on performance identified through the evaluation process. Examples of opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring/coaching early-career teachers; participating in development of teacher improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is developing or below standard; leading Professional Learning Communities for their peers; differentiated career pathways; and targeted professional development based on areas of need.	3.6 Career Development and Growth (pg. 20) Districts must provide opportunities for career development and professional growth based on performance identified through the evaluation process. Examples of opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring/coaching early-career administrators; participating in development of administrator improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is developing or below standard; leading Professional Learning Communities for their peers; differentiated career pathways; and, targeted professional development based on areas of need.	Yes The statute does not describe opportunities or process.
Validation of Ratings	(J) a validation procedure to audit evaluation ratings of exemplary or below standard by the department or a third-party entity approved by the department.			YES C.G.S. 10-151i addresses audits of teacher evaluation and support programs.
Defining Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness		2.8 Defining Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness (pg. 12) Each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system.	3.8 Defining Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness (pg. 21) (1) Each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system.	YES Not addressed in statute.

<p>Student and Educator Support Specialists (SESSs)</p>		<p>4.1 Flexibility from Core Requirements for the Evaluation of Teachers (pg. 22-23)</p> <p>(1) SESSs shall have a clear job descriptions and delineation of their role and responsibilities in the school to guide the setting of indicators of academic growth and development, feedback and observation.</p> <p>(2) Because of the unique nature of the roles fulfilled by SESSs, districts shall be granted flexibility in applying the Core Requirements of teacher evaluation in the following ways:</p> <p>(a) Districts shall be granted flexibility in using Indicators of Academic Growth and Development to measure attainment of goals and/or objectives for student growth</p> <p>(b) Because some SESSs do not have a classroom and may not 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.</p> <p>(c) When student, parent and/or peer feedback mechanisms are not applicable to SESSs, districts may permit local development of short feedback mechanisms for students, parents, and peers specific to</p>		<p>YES Not addressed in statute.</p>
---	--	--	--	---

		particular roles or projects for which the Student and Educator Support Specialists are responsible.		
Central Office Administrators			<p>3.3 Administrator Evaluation Components (pgs. 17-19)</p> <p>(1) Forty five percent (45%) of an administrator’s summative rating shall be based on multiple student learning indicators.</p> <p>(a) For 092 holders serving in central office administrative roles, districts shall rate performance based on results in the group of schools, group of students, or subject area most relevant to the administrator’s job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.</p> <p>(d) For central office administrators, indicators may be based on results in the group of schools, group of students, or subject area most relevant to the administrator’s job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.</p> <p>(3) Forty percent (40%) of an administrator’s evaluation shall be based on ratings of administrator performance and practice by the district superintendent or her/his designee(s).</p> <p>For central office administrators, a rubric is not required. Districts may generate ratings from evidence collected directly from the</p>	

			<p>Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards (CCL:CSLS). Criteria for Proficient should be discussed during the goal-setting conference at the beginning of the year.</p> <p>(4) Ten percent (10%) of an administrator's summative rating shall be based on feedback from stakeholders on areas of principal and/or school practice described in the Connecticut Leadership Standards.</p> <p>Central office administrators shall be rated based on feedback from the stakeholders whom the administrator directly serves.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--