

## Achievement First's Educator Evaluation and Support Plan 24-25

### Connecticut

#### Connecticut Board of Trustees

##### **Amistad**

Lorraine Gibbons  
Patricia B. Sweet  
Jennifer Alexander  
Shannelle Whyte  
Yashira Zwisler  
Camilia Novo-Viano

##### **Bridgeport**

Rajeev Lakra  
Michael Strambler  
Dewey Loselle  
Marlene Macauda  
Dick Kalt  
Ruben Felipe  
Ebrima Jobe  
RoAnne Thomas  
Kelia Lanham

##### **Elm City**

Dick Ferguson  
Laura Saverin  
Stephanie Ma  
Patric Gregory  
Prish Pierce  
LaVonta Bryant  
Alejandra Lopez Valdes

##### **Hartford**

Erwin Hurst, Sr.  
Francoise Deristel-Leger  
Victor De La Paz  
Surbhi Patel  
Lisa Tanen-LaFontaine  
Alice Turner  
Charon Smalls

#### AF PDEC Members

John Sharkey, Chief Academic Officer  
Kat Hall, Managing Director of Social Work  
Stephanie Fox, Bridgeport Middle School Principal  
Jordyn Severino, Amistad Elementary Teacher  
**Corinna Fornabi, Hartford Elementary Paraeducator**

## Vision

All Achievement First (AF) educators and leaders have the opportunity for continuous improvement and development through the educator and leader evaluation and support systems so that all Achievement First students grow and achieve.

## The Purpose of Achievement First's Educator Evaluation and Support Plan

The Achievement First Evaluation and Support Plan is designed to adhere to the comprehensive educator and leader evaluation system adopted by the Connecticut State Board of Education and pursuant to educator evaluation regulations.

In this plan, educators include teachers, student support specialists, and educator support specialists, social workers, and behavior specialists who provide instruction and support services to students and staff. This includes individuals serving in a teaching role or serving in a role of providing support services who hold a valid certificate or permit issued by the CT State Board of Education. All educators at AF will follow the same approach regardless of years of experience.

The AF Educator Evaluation and Support Plan includes model forms, guidance, and rubrics to support the evaluation and development of all CT Achievement First educators and leaders.

## Guiding Principles

AF's Teacher Evaluation Approach is aligned with Connecticut's Model Evaluation and Support Plan's guiding principles and rooted in Achievement First's organizational values. Specifically,

- **Lead for Racial Equity** - AF exists to address the legacy of racism in education. We look at ourselves first. We reflect and talk about the role race plays in our work, experiences, and decisions. We strive to be constantly anti-racist in our words and actions.
- **Strive for Excellence** - We set ambitious goals and don't stop until we achieve them. Then, we set new goals.
- **Embrace Challenge** - We grow when we're challenged. That's why we welcome mistakes and challenges as opportunities to learn and get better.
- **Care for the Whole Person** - We share a journey to fulfill our potential as whole people. We support that journey by honoring each other's identities, emotions, and dreams AND by pushing each other from a place of belief and love.
- **Choose Joy** - We don't wait for joy or fulfillment to come to us - we actively seek out the moments of purpose and joy that are within and around us.
- **Go Further Together** - We accomplish more together than we can alone. We join forces on big and small things. We do what we say we will do. We make choices with our team and family in mind.

## The Professional Development and Evaluation Committee (PDEC)

Pursuant to [Connecticut General Statute 10-220a](#) and [Public Act 23-159 Section 11\(b\)\(3\)](#), each local and regional board of education must establish a professional development and evaluation committee (PDEC). As a charter school, Achievement First does not have any collective bargaining agreements in place with its employees. Thus, PDEC members were selected by the Connecticut Regional Superintendents to represent a range of roles and schools within the district, including representation from a paraeducator.

## Components

As with the design of the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation and Support 2023, the Achievement First Educator and Support Plan incorporates research-based effective practice and includes six elements.

- Standards and criteria
- Goal-setting process
- Professional practice and educator growth
- Evaluator/observer/stakeholder feedback and engagement
- Process elements - largely embedded in descriptions of each component
- Dispute resolution

AF's approach to educator evaluation is an embedded component of AF's larger commitment to educator development through the use of ongoing observations and walkthroughs, lesson plan review, student work analysis, professional learning, and real time coaching. While the process and components are similar for educators and leaders, there are specific elements for teachers and leaders defined within this plan.

## Standards and Criteria for Teachers and Paraprofessionals - Standards Alignment and Tools

In alignment with CT Guidelines regarding standards and criteria, Achievement First has aligned their educator and leader evaluation system to the standards outlined in the [CT Core of Teaching \(2010\)](#), [School Social Work Association of America](#), and the [CT Core of Leading: CT School Leadership Standards](#). The following sections will identify how the district will use internally created tools, aligned to those standards, to evaluate the efficacy of Educators and Leaders.

### Standards and Criteria for Teachers and Paraprofessionals

Achievement First developed the Essentials of Great Instruction Rubric in alignment with the CT Core of Teaching (2010) to 1) clearly define great teaching at Achievement First; 2) provide a framework - the four key questions - for every observation, professional development session, discussion of instruction, etc.; 3) support teacher growth and effectiveness; and 4) monitor the quality of teaching

through educator evaluations. The AF Essentials Rubric (Appendix A) helps us create a standard of excellence for teaching in our schools while maintaining alignment with the CT Core of Teaching standards. To ensure alignment is preserved, the Essentials Rubric has been aligned to both the Core of Teaching Standards and the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching (2014) with one exception: Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership. For this domain, Achievement First will use the associated rubric from the CCT rubric to evaluate educators, thus resulting in a combination of tools that is fully aligned to the CT standards.

CT Core of Teaching Standard	Alignment with CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching (2014)	Aligned with Achievement First Essentials Domains of Great Teaching Rubric
Domain 1: Content and Essential Skills which includes The Connecticut Core Standards <sup>1</sup> and Connecticut Content Standards	<i>Demonstrated at the pre-service level as a prerequisite to certification and embedded within the rubric.</i>	<i>Not required as it is already demonstrated at pre-service level and is a prerequisite for certification.</i>
Domain 2: Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning	Domain 1 Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning	Classroom Environment
Domain 3: Planning for Active Learning	Domain 2 Planning for Active Learning	Rigor, Thinking and Feedback
Domain 4: Instruction for Active Learning	Domain 3 Instruction for Active Learning	Rigor, Thinking and Feedback
Domain 5: Assessment for Learning	Now integrated throughout the other domains	Integrated through the other domains
Domain 6: Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership	Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership	There is no alignment with the Essentials of Great Teaching Rubric. The district will adopt the CCT Rubric for Domain 4, aligned to Domain 6 of the CT Core of Teaching ( <a href="#">p.4</a> ).

## Standards and Criteria for Other Educators (Social Worker, Behavioral Specialists)

Achievement First developed a Professional Growth Plan (included in appendix) to use to evaluate and develop Social Workers and Behavior Specialists. The purpose of this is to 1) clearly define educator skills; 2) provide a framework for evaluation and professional development; 3) support educator growth and effectiveness; and 4) monitor the quality of services through educator evaluations.

The Professional Growth Plan is designed to align with Achievement First standards and National Standards for Social Work. The tool is designed to develop social workers and behavior specialists to provide the strongest supports for students and families possible.

Standards	Descriptor
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation	Element: Identifies school needs and organizes responses consistent with professional social work
Domain 2: The School Environment	Element: Advances student-centered school environments that are conducive to learning, demonstrating respect for differences in culture, background, and learning needs.
Domain 3: Service Delivery	Element: Uses knowledge of social work theory, practice, and research to implement programs and services
Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities	Element: Maintains a commitment to professional conduct that enhances student academic and behavioral success

Like the National Evaluation Framework for School Social Work Practice, Achievement First provides feedback on the key domains of social work and behavior specialist practices.

## Standards and Criteria for Leaders - Professional Standards for School Leaders

Achievement First CT schools will adopt the Professional Standards for School Leaders (PSEL) developed by National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015) as they are best aligned to Achievement First's expectations for their leaders. These standards are detailed in Appendix B. One of the primary goals of the leader evaluation and support system is to ensure the growth and development of their staff so they in turn may develop and enhance personal and professional strengths to meet the needs of all the students they serve.

# Standards and Criteria for Leaders - Professional Standards for School Leaders

## Goal-Setting Process - Educators

Achievement First requires educators to regularly meet with their manager to support their development over the course of the year. Three specific meetings will be identified for formal goal-setting and progress monitoring as part of the evaluation cycle: beginning of year goal-setting, midyear stepback, and end of year stepback. **For the purposes of evaluation, managers/primary evaluators need to also hold a 092 or 093 certificate.** The three required evaluation meetings are outlined as follows:

Beginning of Year Goal-Setting: The educator sets goals with their manager aligned to the goals of the school and the Essentials of Great Teaching or PLEC standards and reflecting on their own practice. **Mutually agreed upon goals will be selected based on evidence, observations, and artifacts of professional practice aligned to the agreed upon standards.** Educators and their evaluators mutually agree upon a high leverage professional practice one-, two-, or three-year goal(s) and develop a plan for professional learning and support that is consistent with their professional status and goals. This process will occur at the end of the first arc of the year (on or about the beginning of November) and include baseline data from beginning of year observations, coaching meetings, and student achievement data. Educators who join later in the year will have 4 weeks to complete this process with their manager.

The goal setting process is documented for each teacher within Achievement First's 2024-25 CT Evaluation Template (See Appendix C). This tool provides space for educators to provide self-reflections and self-assessment on areas of strength and areas of growth, as well as a similar assessment from the manager. This is also where the educator and manager discuss next steps to support growth towards the goals. While a conversation is required at these three touchpoints, data and reflections must be recorded in writing.

Within these goals-setting conversations, Achievement First Educators should set goals for student learning that consider multiple measures and both achievement and growth (See Appendix G). These goals should be aligned to the target priorities of the schools, e.g., improving student attendance. Finally, the educator and manager should agree which Essentials of Great Teaching or key practice that the educator wants to focus on improving in service of student outcomes. **As part of the goal-setting process, at least three artifacts must be used: evidence of planning, evidence of active instruction (action steps from observations), and assessment data (formative or summative). The categories of artifacts align with the CT Core of Teaching Standards.**

Once goals have been agreed upon and set, the educator and manager will develop a professional learning plan to support the educator's improvement over time.

Midyear Stepback: The educator and their manager review data aligned to the goal, including comprehensive observation data, and reflect on progress and next steps to make continued growth.

This will be conducted at the end of the second arc of the year, on or about February), also during the designated reflection day.

Managers should provide quality feedback that meets the following criteria:

- Is based on multiple and varied quantitative and qualitative indicators of evidence, standards, and goal(s)
- Is personalized
- Is learning-focused or growth-oriented
- Provides reflective opportunities to rework, refine, and reorder knowledge, attitudes, skills, and/or practices

**End of Year Stepback:** The educator and their manager review data aligned to the goal, including comprehensive observation data, and reflect on progress over the course of the year and how that may inform the following year's goals and supports. The manager provides a concise summary based upon evidence related to the mutually agreed upon educator goal(s) and identified standards and will make a distinction regarding the educator's successful completion of the professional learning process. This process should be completed by the end of the final arc, on or about June 30th.

While Achievement First recognizes that there are varying levels of teacher and leader practice, we believe that this evaluation process is integral to the development of educators and leaders and the culture of our network; therefore, we will not differentiate the evaluation protocol based on levels (e.g. novice, provisional, professional, transfers, etc.). Any incoming staff will be required to engage in goal-setting within 4 weeks of their start date and will continue with the regularly scheduled cycles throughout the school year.

## Goal-Setting Process - Leaders

Over the course of the year, a leader and their evaluator engage in a continuous learning process. **The primary evaluator needs to hold a 092 or 093 certificate.** The aim is for the leader or educator to attain their goals. They should collect evidence of their progress toward their goals and pursue learning opportunities that will support their growth and development. The evaluator should regularly offer and seek feedback in order to support the educator attaining their goals.

**Goal(s) Setting (Completed at the end of the first arc):** Leaders also set goals with their managers aligned to the goals of the school and the individuals they supervise. **Mutually agreed upon goals will be selected based on evidence, observations, and artifacts of professional practice aligned to the agreed upon standards.** Leaders and their evaluators mutually agree upon a high leverage professional practice one-, two-, or three-year goal(s) and develop a plan for professional learning and support that is consistent with their professional status and goals (see appendix B). Goals must always be connected to standards.

The educator sets goals with their manager aligned to the goals of the school and the Essentials of Great Teaching or PLEC standards and reflecting on their own practice. Mutually agreed upon goals will be selected based on evidence, observations, and artifacts of professional practice aligned to the agreed upon standards. This process will occur at the end of the first arc of the year (on or about the beginning of November) and include baseline data from beginning of year observations, coaching meetings, and student achievement data. Educators who join later in the year will have 4 weeks to complete this process with their manager.

This is a process of feedback, reflection, goal setting, opportunities for professional learning, observations by an evaluator, and collection of multiple measures of leader growth, educator growth, and impact on student learning, growth, and achievement. Within this process, the leader collaborates in a learning partnership with their evaluator. The continuous learning process begins with dialogue around leaders' self-reflection (based on review of evidence and practice) to the identified rubric while collecting and analyzing evidence to identify and support an area for leader practice, educator and student outcomes, and organizational growth.

The leader will:

- Self-assess using the identified rubric.
- Identify a high leverage goal that impacts leadership practice and educator and organizational growth.
- Identify an individual or a collaborative goal.
- Develop a proposed professional learning plan to build knowledge and skill.

The leader shares the above with their evaluator during an initial goal setting conference that consists of dialogue around the proposed goal(s) and professional learning plan. During this conference, reciprocal dialogue between the evaluator and leader takes place to refine the proposed goal and professional learning plan as needed. **The goal setting conference should take place after a minimum of four site visits and leverage no less than three artifacts to support the goal-setting process: evidence of system level planning, evidence of people development/coaching (action steps from observations), and student assessment data (formative or summative).** In partnership, the leader and evaluator come to mutual agreement on the goal(s), multiple measures of evidence, professional learning plan, and support to drive progress toward goal attainment.

Midyear Check-in (Completed at the end of the second arc): The midyear check-in provides an opportunity for the leader to self-reflect and review multiple and varied qualitative and quantitative indicators of evidence of impact on professional leadership practice; organizational growth; educator growth; and impact on student learning, growth, and achievement.

Through reciprocal dialogue, the evaluator provides specific feedback based on evidence, standards, and the leader's goal(s). This is an overview of where the leader is in the process and what steps need to be taken to assist in continuous learning. During this check-in, revisions to the goal or learning plan, direction to tiered support, and next steps are documented.



End-of-Year Reflection/Summative Review (Completed after the final arc): End-of-year reflection provides an opportunity for the leader and evaluator to engage in reciprocal dialogue, similar to the midyear check-in, to discuss progress toward the leader's goal(s); professional learning as it relates to the leader's professional growth and professional practice; and impact on student learning, growth, and achievement as evidenced by multiple and varied qualitative and quantitative indicators of evidence. A written end-of-year summary includes the impact on leader practice and growth; possible next steps for the upcoming year; any concerns with the continuous learning process; new learning; and highlights of impact on educators, students, and school community; and completion of current goal or rationale for continuing the goal the following year. Analysis of evidence from the end-of-year summary is important for the leader's subsequent self-assessment and goal setting revisions or new goal(s).

This summary is based upon the mutually agreed upon goal(s) and identified standards and will make a distinction regarding the leader's successful completion of the professional learning process.

## **Orientation, Ongoing Training, and Support for Educators and Leaders**

Orientation for Evaluators: Achievement First is developing an orientation for all leaders on the Achievement First educator evaluation and support plan to be conducted on October 17, 2024. This will continue to occur annually as required by C.G.S. 10-151b. Specifically, leaders will be oriented to the following:

- How to collaboratively determine educator's goals and professional learning plans
- Norming on both the AF Essentials Rubric and the Professional Standards for Education Leaders (PLEC, 2015)
- Best practices in observations and site visits
- Models of tiered supports
- How to resolve disputes
- Strategies and best practices for engaging in and providing reciprocal feedback connected to AF's Essentials of Great Teaching and Professional Standards for Education Leaders (PLEC, 2015)

This will ensure our leaders are well-prepared to well-execute the new educator evaluation and support plan. This training is a part of our broader goals around professional development, focused on: 1) Professional standard and management of people 2) Development of technical skills (i.e. observation and feedback, looking at student work, deep content knowledge, tiered supports for students and differentiation) and 3) Emotional intelligence. We will also review the process for leader evaluation.

Orientation for Teachers: Achievement First is supporting school-based training to be held at the end of the first arc to coincide with the goal-setting stepback conversation. This will occur during the

scheduled day of professional development for all staff at the end of the arc and will be held in the first week of November (may vary by school site).

Ongoing Training for Evaluators: Achievement First will hold monthly leader development meetings that will revisit and build upon topics introduced in the orientation.

Ongoing Support for Educators: Achievement First will support future school-based sessions to coincide with the end of the second, third, and fourth (final) arc of the year. The focus of these future training sessions will consist of how to document progress, availability of additional supports to achieve goals, and additional resources available to educators.

## Evaluator/Observer Feedback and Engagement

Evaluators should regularly observe educators and leaders, provide feedback, and reflect with the leader or educator on progress toward their goals.

For leaders, evaluators conduct regular site visits, co-observing classrooms, attending meetings, and regularly communicating with other members of the school community to hear feedback on the leader's work. The evaluator should regularly share feedback to help the leader grow and improve.

In all cases, feedback should be aligned to the standards and goals agreed upon in the goal-setting process, but may also include other topics relevant to observations. Feedback should be timely and provided within 5 days. Progress monitoring feedback outside of the context of the identified formal goal-setting and stepback meetings may be verbal or written (though both are encouraged). Feedback summarizing agreed upon goals and progress to date during formal stepbacks must be documented in writing.

Achievement First leaders also regularly observe teachers and document progress against Achievement First Essentials of Great Teaching. Specifically,

- Teachers must be observed at least 3 times per observation cycle. Most teachers will receive more than that.
- Teachers receive ratings on each Essential supported by evidence collected from informal observations throughout the year.

From these regular, frequent observations, leaders provide teachers with one beginning of year, one middle of year, and one Spring Comprehensive Evaluation. The Comprehensive Essentials Evaluations summarize a teacher's performance in the classroom as rated by AF's Essentials of Great Teaching. They are a powerful moment for teachers and managers to "zoom out" of weekly observation and feedback cycles to reflect on the trajectory of their growth over a longer span of time, align their current performance to the bar of excellence set by the Essentials, track progress against the educator's goals, and make a plan to continue growing in the most high-impact areas over the

months to come. Additional guidance on completing a Comprehensive Evaluation and how to run a stepback meeting are included in Appendix D and Appendix E.

Achievement First chose to have leaders document progress over time rather than have a few high stakes observations as this approach reduces teacher anxiety; it helps us normalize observation and feedback as development strategy to improve practice; and it allows leaders to have more data and time to assess an individual educator's performance for evaluation. Additionally, the Rand study found that the TNTP rubric's validity increased when observations were conducted frequently (McEachin, Schweig, Perera, and Opper, 2018).

## **Growth Criteria**

Successful completion of the learning process is determined through multiple forms of evidence and reflection that is demonstrated by:

- Reflection supported with evidence of the impact of the leader's new learning on their practice/goal
- The impact the leader's new learning and practice had on the leader's practice, organizational growth, educator growth, and student outcomes.
- Next steps that document how the individual can continue growing in a given area.

## **Tiered Support and Corrective Support Planning**

All leaders and educators require access to high-quality, targeted professional learning support to improve practice over time. Educators and their evaluators thoughtfully consider and apply three tiers of support, as appropriate, with an evaluation process. All three tiers of support must be implemented prior to the development of a Corrective Support Plan.

A pattern of persistent lack of growth and reflection or resistance to growth-oriented feedback should lead to advancing levels of support with a defined process for placing an educator or leader on a Corrective Support Plan with indicators of success for transitioning out of it. Evaluators must utilize and document all three tiers of support prior to the development of a Corrective Support Plan.

Achievement First provides Tier 1 professional learning opportunities for all leaders and educators, inclusive of, but not limited to, collegial conversations, school site visits, resources (e.g., books, articles, videos, etc.), formal professional learning opportunities developed and extensive leadership coaching).

If the educator or leader requests or the evaluator suggests it is needed, Achievement First provides Tier 2 supports which may be more intensive in duration, frequency and focus.

In the rare instance where Tier 1 and Tier 2 supports are not resulting in improved performance, the leader or evaluator may move to a Tier 3 support. Tier 3 supports have clearly articulated areas of focus, duration of time, and criteria for success, and may include a decision to move to an

Performance Improvement Plan (Achievement First's Corrective Action Plan). Tier 3 supports shall be developed in consultation with the evaluator or leader and should include a clear start date and duration of time that the educator (or leader) will receive that support.

## Performance Improvement Plan

If the supports do not lead to improved performance, the leader or evaluator develops a performance improvement plan that includes:

- Clear areas for improvement,
- Resources, support, and interventions that may address the area of concern; and
- A timeline for review of this plan.

## Dispute Resolution

If an educator or leader and their evaluator cannot agree on the data to support progress towards goals, they may escalate it first to the principal of the school, then their Regional Superintendent, and then Achievement First Team Talent (or Employee Relations Team).

Any such matters will be handled as expeditiously as possible, and in no instance will a decision exceed thirty (30) workdays from the date the leader initiated the dispute resolution process. Confidentiality throughout the resolution process shall be conducted in accordance with the law.

## Local and State Reporting

Achievement First will report the following:

1. The status of teacher evaluations to the relevant charter school board of directors on or before June 1 of each year; and
2. The status of the implementation of the teacher evaluation and support program, including the frequency of evaluations, the number of teachers who have not been evaluated, and other requirements as determined by the Department of Education, to the Commissioner of Education on or before September 15 of each year.

For purposes of this section, the term "teacher" shall include each professional employee of a board of education, below the rank of superintendent, who holds a certificate or permit issued by the State Board of Education.

## APPENDIX A - AF's Essentials of Instruction (Spring 2024)

### *Purpose of the Essentials*

- Clearly define Great Teaching at AF
- Provide a strong framework – the four key questions – for every observation, PD, discussion of instruction, etc.
- Support teacher growth and effectiveness
- Monitor the quality of teaching within educator evaluations

### *The Four Essentials*

- **Classroom Environment:** Do the relationships and expectations create the conditions for powerful learning?
- **Rigor:** Are scholars engaged in reasoning aligned to the College Ready Bar?
- **Thinking:** Are scholars doing the heavy lifting? Does instruction foster deeper conceptual understanding?
- **Feedback:** Are scholars improving the depth and precision of their thinking?

### *Scoring Guidance*

- Determine what rating best answers the big question for each Essential: ineffective, emergent, solid, strong, or exemplary. The evidence does not need to meet every single indicator as the overall score is not an average of the indicators beneath it; it is more about the rating based on the preponderance of evidence.
- The indicators are listed in order of importance, so if someone is especially weak or strong on indicators towards the top of the page, it should influence the overall rating.
- A score of “3: Solid” indicates that the teacher is meeting the bar for effective instruction.
- A score of “5: Exemplary” means that all the level 4 indicators are present and the level of instruction matches the descriptors listed under the level 5. To reach a 5, there may not always be evidence of all of the exemplary indicators, but there cannot be evidence that goes against them.

## CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT | Do the relationships and expectations create the conditions for powerful learning?

5: EXEMPLARY	4: STRONG	3: SOLID	2: EMERGENT	1: INEFFECTIVE
<p><i>All Level 4 descriptors and...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All scholars are doing the work asked of them.</li> <li>• The overall tone of the classroom is one of deep interest and enthusiasm for learning as well as love and rapport for one another.</li> <li>• All scholars take pride in their work and maximize work time to do their very best.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Belief and Belonging</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ALL or ALMOST ALL classroom interactions (teacher to scholar, scholar to scholar) demonstrate evidence of respect and love and create a feeling of belonging.</li> <li>• The overall tone of the classroom is marked by enthusiasm, love and care, and purposeful focus.</li> <li>• There is a palpable positive energy in the classroom and many moments of enthusiasm and joy.</li> <li>• The teacher FREQUENTLY recognizes and narrates positive scholar behaviors (rather than calling out the negative) and uses challenge and aspiration to motivate.</li> <li>• The teacher ALWAYS or ALMOST ALWAYS projects a calm, upbeat confidence.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Focused Learning</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ALMOST ALL scholars are doing the work asked of them at all times. They immediately jump to the work and demonstrate authentic engagement (are “into” the lesson) via actively listening (looking at the speaker, taking notes), asking/answering questions, and showing their thinking through chat or the content-specific tech platform.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Belief and Belonging</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOST classroom interactions (teacher to scholar, scholar to scholar) demonstrate evidence of respect and love and create a feeling of belonging.</li> <li>• The overall tone of the classroom is one of respect and focused work.</li> <li>• There is an overall positive energy in the classroom and some moments of enthusiasm and joy.</li> <li>• The teacher OFTEN recognizes and narrates positive scholar behaviors (rather than calling out the negative) and uses challenge and aspiration to motivate.</li> <li>• The teacher USUALLY projects a calm, upbeat confidence.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Focused Learning</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOST scholars are doing the work asked of them at all times. They jump to the work and demonstrate authentic engagement via actively listening (looking at the speaker, taking notes), asking and answering questions, and showing their thinking through chat or the content-specific tech platform.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Belief and Belonging</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SOME classroom interactions (teacher to scholar, scholar to scholar) demonstrate evidence of respect and love and create a feeling of belonging.</li> <li>• The overall tone of the classroom is neutral – neither clearly positive or notably negative.</li> <li>• There are few moments of enthusiasm or joy.</li> <li>• The teacher SOMETIMES recognizes and narrates positive scholar behaviors (rather than calling out the negative) or uses challenge and aspiration to motivate.</li> <li>• The teacher SOMETIMES projects a calm, upbeat confidence.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Focused Learning</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SOME scholars are doing the work asked of them at all times. Scholar behavior tends toward the compliant as opposed to academically engaged.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Belief and Belonging</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FEW to NO classroom interactions (teacher to scholar, scholar to scholar) demonstrate evidence of respect and love and create a feeling of belonging.</li> <li>• The overall tone of the classroom tends toward the negative and/or overtly sluggish.</li> <li>• The classroom is not a joyful place.</li> <li>• The teacher RARELY or NEVER recognizes and narrates positive scholar behaviors (rather than calling out the negative) or uses challenge and aspiration to motivate.</li> <li>• The teacher RARELY projects a calm, upbeat confidence.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Focused Learning</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FEW or NONE of the scholars are doing the work asked of them at all times. Scholars are not complying and doing the work.</li> </ul>

5: EXEMPLARY	4: STRONG	3: SOLID	2: EMERGENT	1: INEFFECTIVE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In ALL or ALMOST ALL situations, the teacher matches the move to the situation (a combination of tone, economy of language, rationale, off-stage intentionality, focusing on the behavior not trait, expressing deep belief) to address the behavior, maintain strong on task, and maintain a strong scholar-teacher relationship.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Culture of Learning</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher FREQUENTLY communicates high expectations for scholar work, celebrates risk taking, normalizes error, and conveys belief in scholars.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In MOST situations, the teacher matches the move to the situation (a combination of tone, economy of language, rationale, off-stage intentionality, focusing on the behavior not trait, expressing deep belief) to address the behavior, maintain strong on task, and maintain a strong scholar-teacher relationship.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Culture of Learning</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher SOMETIMES communicates high expectations for scholar work, celebrates risk taking, normalizes error, and conveys belief in scholars.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In SOME situations, the teacher matches the move to the situation (a combination of tone, economy of language, rationale, off-stage intentionality, focusing on the behavior not trait, expressing deep belief) to address the behavior, maintain strong on task, and maintain a strong scholar-teacher relationship.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Culture of Learning</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher INFREQUENTLY communicates high expectations for scholar work, celebrates risk taking, normalizes error, and conveys belief in scholars.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In FEW to NO situations, the teacher matches the move to the situation (a combination of tone, economy of language, rationale, off-stage intentionality, focusing on the behavior not trait, expressing deep beliefs) to address the behavior, maintain strong on task, and maintain a strong scholar-teacher relationship.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Culture of Learning</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher RARELY communicates high expectations for scholar work, celebrates risk taking, normalizes error, and conveys belief in scholars.</li> </ul>

## RIGOR of TASK/CONTENT | Are scholars engaged in reasoning aligned to the College Ready Bar?

5: EXEMPLARY	4: STRONG	3: SOLID	2: EMERGENT	1: INEFFECTIVE
<p><i>All Level 4 descriptors and...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overarching focus of the lesson is on critical thinking that rivals the level of cognitive demand of the country's most rigorous classrooms.</li> <li>Oral and written responses lead to and/or showcase exemplary analysis and insight.</li> <li>Overwhelmingly, scholars use the technical vocabulary and lens of viewing problems appropriate to the discipline.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Cognitive Demand</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ENTIRE lesson places an appropriate level of cognitive demand on scholars.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Scholar Reasoning</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ALL or ALMOST ALL scholars appropriately and accurately use domain-specific vocabulary and reference strong background knowledge on the topic.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Pacing</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scholars spend ALMOST ALL of class time on the core learning task or the most productive struggle (aligned to key concepts from grade-level standards and high cognitive demand) in the lesson.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Differentiation</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Differentiation puts the lesson in the zone of proximal development for all scholars (just right levels of scaffolding or challenge for scholars).</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Cognitive Demand</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MOST of the lesson places an appropriate level of cognitive demand on scholars.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Scholar Reasoning</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MOST scholars appropriately and accurately use domain-specific vocabulary and reference strong background knowledge on the topic.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Pacing</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scholars spend MOST of class time on the core learning task or the most productive struggle (aligned to key concepts from grade-level standards and high cognitive demand) in the lesson.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Differentiation</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Differentiation puts the lesson in the zone of proximal development for most scholars (appropriate levels of scaffolding or challenge).</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Cognitive Demand</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SOME parts of the lesson place an appropriate level of cognitive demand on scholars.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Scholar Reasoning</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SOME scholars appropriately and accurately use domain-specific vocabulary and reference strong background knowledge on the topic.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Pacing</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scholars spend SOME of class time on the core learning task or the most productive struggle (aligned to key concepts from grade-level standards and high cognitive demand) in the lesson.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Differentiation</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Differentiation is attempted but fails to put the lesson in the zone of proximal development for scholars (too much or too little scaffolding or challenge).</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Cognitive Demand</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FEW or NO parts of the lesson place an appropriate level of cognitive demand on scholars.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Scholar Reasoning</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FEW scholars appropriately and accurately use domain-specific vocabulary and reference strong background knowledge on the topic.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Pacing</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scholars spend LITTLE to NO class time on the core learning task or the most productive struggle (aligned to key concepts from grade-level standards and high cognitive demand) in the lesson.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Differentiation</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Differentiation is not leveraged or largely absent from the lesson.</li> </ul>



## THINKING | Are scholars doing the heavy lifting? Does instruction foster deeper conceptual understanding?

5: EXEMPLARY	4: STRONG	3: SOLID	2: EMERGENT	1: INEFFECTIVE
<p><i>All Level 4 descriptors and ...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The class functions effectively with scholar facilitation. The teacher could step away, and the scholars could lead the class and push deep thinking on their peers (prompting each other to ‘stretch it,’ ‘prove it,’ and/or explain their logic).</li> <li>Scholars actively revise their own thinking in light of other scholars’ responses and annotate and jot down new ideas without prompting.</li> <li>Scholars employ disciplinary reasoning to collectively arrive at meaningful insights.</li> <li>Scholars make connections to previously learned topics or other subjects to explore the broader significance of the learning.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Thought Ratio</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scholars complete ALL or ALMOST ALL of the cognitive work during the lesson (at least 80% of the time).</li> <li>Scholars engage in multiple forms of thinking (e.g., naming ideas and posing questions, synthesizing core ideas and evidence, evaluating ideas and evidence) to construct solutions to open-ended problems.</li> <li>Teacher-talk is overwhelmingly in service of facilitating scholar thinking. Directions and activities are framed in terms of developing thinking, not completing tasks.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Participation Ratio</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ALL or ALMOST ALL scholars actively participate in class; when discourse is used, 75-100% of scholars engage in the discussion and answers questions.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Depth of Scholar Discourse</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In ALL or ALMOST ALL instances, scholars build off of/respond to one another.</li> <li>In ALL or ALMOST ALL instances, scholars argue from evidence to go beyond the surface.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Thought Ratio</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scholars complete MOST of the cognitive work during the lesson (at least 60% of the time).</li> <li>Scholars engage in multiple forms of thinking (e.g., naming ideas and posing questions, synthesizing core ideas and evidence, evaluating ideas and evidence) though more time or increased quality in one of these domains would strengthen the quality of their ultimate solutions.</li> <li>Teacher-talk is mostly in service of facilitating scholar thinking, though there are moments of heavily didactic instruction or procedural talk that distracts from deep thinking.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Participation Ratio</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MOST scholars actively participate in the class; when discourse is used, 50-75% of scholars engage in discussion and answers oral questions.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Depth of Scholar Discourse</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In MOST instances, scholars build off of/respond to each other.</li> <li>In MANY instances, scholars argue from evidence to go beyond the surface.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Thought Ratio</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scholars complete SOME of the cognitive work during the lesson (at least 40% of the time).</li> <li>Scholars may engage in one or more forms of thinking (e.g., naming ideas and posing questions, synthesizing core ideas and evidence, evaluating ideas and evidence) but the thinking is often formulaic, procedural or rote.</li> <li>Teacher-talk attempts to facilitate thinking, but significant time in the didactic and procedural distract from deep thinking.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Participation Ratio</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SOME scholars actively participate in the class; when discourse is used, fewer than 50% of scholars engage in discussion and answers oral questions.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Depth of Scholar Discourse</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In SOME instances, scholars build off of/respond to one another.</li> <li>In SOME instances, scholars argue from evidence to go beyond the surface.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Thought Ratio</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scholars complete LITTLE of the cognitive work during the lesson (less than 40% of the time).</li> <li>Scholar thinking is heavily procedural or formulaic and rote in nature. There is little room for posing questions and grappling with new evidence or interpretations; there is an emphasis on “right” answers.</li> <li>Teacher-talk is primarily procedural and didactic.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Participation Ratio</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FEW scholars actively participate in the class. A small handful of scholars (25% or less) dominate discussion and answer oral questions.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Depth of Scholar Discourse</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In FEW instances do scholars build off of/respond to one another.</li> <li>In FEW instances, scholars argue from evidence to go beyond the surface.</li> </ul>

## FEEDBACK | Are scholars improving the depth and precision of their thinking?

5: EXEMPLARY	4: STRONG	3: SOLID	2: EMERGENT	1: INEFFECTIVE
<p><i>All Level 4 descriptors and...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scholars frequently give each other feedback and are able to give feedback that is rich, nuanced, and aligned to a Vision of Excellence (VOE).</li> <li>The teacher’s implementation of feedback – via conferences, batched feedback – is truly exemplary. It is grounded in an accurate assessment of the data, it is customized to the individual where applicable, and it compels revision (re-visioning) of scholar thinking and work.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Engage with Scholar Ideas</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All or almost all of the feedback prioritizes scholar ideas and deepens conceptual understanding. All or almost all of the feedback supports deeper, more precise thinking, in addition to upholding expectations for top-quality work.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Purposeful &amp; Data-Driven</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher is actively collecting data in a clear and simple way.</li> <li>Especially during the central tasks of the lesson, ALL or ALMOST ALL scholars receive clear, actionable feedback on work quality OR several scholars have extended conferences with the teacher based on areas of need.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Expectations for Scholar Thinking</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher has established explicitly clear and rigorous expectations for scholar thinking and work (e.g., referring to a resource that guides strong thinking, providing scholars with a specific focus – “Make sure your line of reasoning is clear. That means ...”).</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Engage with Scholar Ideas</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most of the feedback prioritizes scholar ideas and deepens conceptual understanding. Most of the feedback supports deeper, more precise thinking, in addition to upholding expectations for top-quality work.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Purposeful &amp; Data-Driven</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher is actively collecting data using that data to respond to scholar needs, but it may not be in a clear, simple way.</li> <li>Especially during the central tasks of the lesson, MOST scholars receive clear, actionable feedback on work quality OR a few scholars have extended conferences with the teacher based on areas of need.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Expectations for Scholar Thinking</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher has established clear expectations for scholar thinking and work (e.g., referring to a resource that guides strong thinking, by providing scholars with a specific focus – “Make sure your line of reasoning is clear. That means ...”).</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Engage with Scholar Ideas</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The feedback may attempt to target conceptual understanding but is largely ineffective at improving the depth, quality and precision of thinking and/or is heavily procedural. Some of the feedback supports deeper, more precise thinking, in addition to upholding expectations for top-quality work.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Purposeful &amp; Data-Driven</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher does not leverage a clear, effective data capturing tool to respond to scholars.</li> <li>Especially during the central tasks of the lesson, SOME scholars receive feedback on work quality OR one or two scholars have extended conferences with the teacher based on areas of need.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Expectations for Scholar Thinking</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher has established somewhat clear expectations for scholar thinking and work, but they might tend towards the procedural.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Engage with Scholar Ideas</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The feedback does not attempt to target conceptual understanding but is absent or ineffective at improving the depth, quality and precision of thinking and/or is heavily procedural. The feedback does not support deeper, more precise thinking or uphold expectations for top-quality work.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Purposeful &amp; Data-Driven</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher is not capturing scholar data.</li> <li>Especially during the central tasks of the lesson, FEW or NO scholars receive feedback on work quality OR one or two scholars have extended conferences with the teacher based on areas of need.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Expectations for Scholar Thinking</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The teacher has NOT established expectations for scholar thinking and work.</li> </ul>

5: EXEMPLARY	4: STRONG	3: SOLID	2: EMERGENT	1: INEFFECTIVE
	<p><b><u>Clear and Actionable</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● ALL or ALMOST ALL feedback is clear and actionable; it helps scholars to identify and correct imprecise, inaccurate or shallow thinking.</li> <li>● ALL or ALMOST ALL scholars are able to improve the quality of their thinking and work based on feedback.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Clear and Actionable</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● MOST feedback is clear and actionable; it helps scholars to identify and correct imprecise, inaccurate, unclear, or shallow thinking.</li> <li>● MOST scholars are able to improve the quality of their thinking and work based on feedback.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Clear and Actionable</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● SOME feedback is clear and actionable; it largely fails to help scholars to identify and correct imprecise, inaccurate or shallow thinking.</li> <li>● SOME scholars are able to improve the quality of their thinking and work based on feedback.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Clear and Actionable</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● LITTLE or NO feedback is clear and actionable; feedback fails to help scholars to identify and correct imprecise, inaccurate or shallow thinking.</li> <li>● FEW to NO scholars are able to improve the quality of their thinking and work based on feedback.</li> </ul>

## Appendix B - Professional Standards for Education Leaders (2015)

STANDARD 1. MISSION, VISION, AND CORE VALUES Effective educational leaders develop, advocate, and enact a shared mission, vision, and core values of high-quality education and academic success and well-being of each student.

STANDARD 2. ETHICS AND PROFESSIONAL NORMS Effective educational leaders act ethically and according to professional norms to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

STANDARD 3. EQUITY AND CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS Effective educational leaders strive for equity of educational opportunity and culturally responsive practices to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

STANDARD 4. CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND ASSESSMENT Effective educational leaders develop and support intellectually rigorous and coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

STANDARD 5. COMMUNITY OF CARE AND SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS Effective educational leaders cultivate an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community that promotes the academic success and well-being of each student.

STANDARD 6. PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL Effective educational leaders develop the professional capacity and practice of school personnel to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

STANDARD 7. PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY FOR TEACHERS AND STAFF Effective educational leaders foster a professional community of teachers and other professional staff to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

STANDARD 8. MEANINGFUL ENGAGEMENT OF FAMILIES AND COMMUNITY Effective educational leaders engage families and the community in meaningful, reciprocal, and mutually beneficial ways to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

STANDARD 9. OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT Effective educational leaders manage school operations and resources to promote each student's academic success and well-being.

STANDARD 10. SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT Effective educational leaders act as agents of continuous improvement to promote each student's academic success and well-being

## Appendix C - Achievement First's CT Educator Evaluation Template

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Z10tkbTw22oWSFeVUO90T\\_fWH1OLH7jJau-q1cwNCgw/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1Z10tkbTw22oWSFeVUO90T_fWH1OLH7jJau-q1cwNCgw/edit?usp=sharing)

## Appendix D - How to Complete a Comprehensive Essentials Evaluation

### Questions to consider when writing an evaluation:

- **How do I manage bias when completing evaluations?**
  - What biases do I have that might be inflating or deflating the ratings for an individual teacher? Biases could include: teaching style, gender, race, personality type, your relationships, etc.
  - What positive or constructive performance conversations do I need to have with teachers during the fall and/or spring so that the teacher is not surprised by their scores and sees them as reflective of their overall performance?
  - What was my first impression of the teacher (realizing it is just a first impression and should not impact the rest of the ratings)?
  - How much does this teacher remind me of me and/or teachers with which I had a positive association? Is this teacher very different from me? Do they remind me of a teacher with which I have a negative association?
  - Are there any assumptions that I might be making that are more related to style vs. output and results?
- **How do I use the feedback I've collected throughout the year to use as evidence for feedback?**
  - When looking at a teacher's informal and formal observations, how has this teacher consistently performed on "X" indicator? What data do I have as evidence?
    - If a teacher's performance ranges between two performance bands, you should err on the conservative side and score lower.
    - In other words, a teacher who is generally scoring somewhere between an "emergent" and a "solid" should receive an evaluation score of "emergent".
    - Where does this teacher's performance fall on the rubric as of today? Is this a new development or has the teacher been performing at this level for at least the last 6 weeks?

## Appendix E - Social Worker / Behavior Specialist Professional Growth Plan

Section I. Executive Summary	
Self-Assessment	Coach/Manager Feedback
<p><i>In this section, please summarize your work over the past year, including three areas of exceptional performance and three areas for growth in the space provided below. You may comment on any section of the PGP when completing your summary. Please comment on the "what" (e.g., accomplishment of goals and outcomes) as well as the "how" (e.g., Core Values, leadership competencies) of your work. The goal is to provide a clear picture of your overall performance in 2022-23.</i></p>	

Section II. Outcomes/Goals						
Focus Area	Top Goals and Indicators	Progress toward Goal (use specific data)	Self-Assessment		Coach/Manager Feedback	
			Rating (Did Not Meet Goal/ Made Progress Toward Goal / Met Goal/ Exceeded Goal)	Evidence	Rating (Did Not Meet Goal/ Made Progress Toward Goal / Met Goal/ Exceeded Goal)	Evidence
Top Outcome/ Goal #1 Owned			▼		▼	
Top Outcome/ Goal #2 Owned			▼		▼	
Top Outcome/ Goal #3 Owned			▼		▼	
Top Outcome/ Goal #4 Owned			▼		▼	
Top Outcome/ Goal #5 Owned			▼		▼	

### Section III. Social Work and Behavior Specialist Responsibilities

		Self-Assessment	Coach/Manager Feedback
		Rating (1-5)	Rating (1-5)
<b>Section I. Direct Service to Scholars</b>			
<b>Mandated and Preventative Services</b>	Demonstrates consistent and appropriate application of pull-out and push-in support options		
	Attends and contributes to scholar IEP Annual Review/Reconvene Meetings for scholars with mandated counseling		
	Scholars on caseload understand and can, in developmentally appropriate manner, identify the purpose, goals, and expectations for their counseling sessions		
	SW/C demonstrates strong, proactive initiative in determining and establishing effective groups to support social, emotional and/or behavioral needs within the school		
	Provides short-term at-risk counseling to students and terminates appropriately (NOTE: coaches should be aware if their SW/C is unable to meet with at-risk students due to high mandated caseloads)		
	Consistently meets with caseload of mandated and non-mandated scholars on a weekly basis, meeting all mandates as outlined in scholar IEP or 504		
	Consistently schedules make-up sessions when session is missed for unexpected reason such as crisis, SW/C or scholar out sick, scholar OSS or ISS/in behavioral reset, school closure due to weather, etc.		
<b>Crisis Communication and Support</b>	Effectively, efficiently and appropriately communicates with key stakeholders the outcome and next steps of safety assessment		
	Post crisis, documents next steps, services offered and communicates this with appropriate leadership team and network staff		
	Proactively debriefs crisis situations/responses/interventions with coach and/or key stakeholders to assess for efficacy and ways to improve future interventions/responses to similar crisis		
	Consistently provides appropriate referrals in writing and verbally to family of scholar in crisis in timely manner (within 24 to 48 hours)		
	Team member consistently demonstrates sound judgement and skills for intervention in a variety of crisis situations.		



Section II. Administrative and Preparation Responsibilities		Self-Assessment	Coach/Manager Feedback
		Rating (1-5)	Rating (1-5)
Administration and Preparation	Updates and individualizes treatment plans for at-risk students as necessary each trimester.		
	Consistently utilizes quantitative and qualitative data from multiple sources as tool to assess and inform goals, objectives and scholar progress		
	Consistently and proactively schedules make-up sessions when scholar session will be missed due to calendaring conflict such as testing, trainings, data days, school holidays		
	Organizes the counseling space to promote a learning environment and ensures that students keep the room neat and orderly.		
	Maintains materials and resources in organized manner, updating and adding resources as appropriate		
	Utilizes backwards planning in order to ensure recurring tasks (i.e. session documentation, progress reports and trimester reviews) are completed on time.		

Section III. Partnerships and Collaborations		Rating (1-5)	Rating (1-5)
<b>Student Relationships</b>	Effectively designs, teaches, and reinforces session expectations, routines and procedures		
	Students understand unambiguously that the SW/C cares about them and their progress		
	Embraces and effectively uses school culture systems (e.g. scholar dollars, transitions, classroom removal, dismissal, etc.); thoughtfully problem-solves adjustments to school culture systems with team members.		
<b>Family Relationships</b>	Works actively to build relationships with families and respects family members' role as partners in their scholar's counseling process		
	Takes initiative to advocate for and with scholars and families for needed services and referrals		
	Families know their scholar's counseling goals, objectives and can articulate scholar's progress		
<b>Community Relationships: School Wide / Network Wide Relationships</b>	Effectively participates in or leads formal/informal meetings and collaborations (sends agendas ahead of time, captures outcomes, summaries and timelines)		
	Effective communication and handling of conflicts in peer and coaching relationships		
	Utilizes knowledge of AF mission, policies and procedures in the service of scholars, families and school community		
	Demonstrates sound judgment while working with scholars, families and staff		
	SW/C works with the interdisciplinary team (instruction, special services, culture) and regularly attends CST meetings to support multi-tiered interventions		
	Appropriately balances relevant scholar information sharing and confidentiality		
<b>Community Relationships: External Relationships</b>	Utilizes a wide range of community organization and referral agencies to support student and family wraparound service need		
	Proactively identifies and connects with outside referral sources through phone contact and/or site visits to build bridges		
	Demonstrates sound judgment while collaborating with community and collateral contacts		
<b>Mandated Reporting</b>	Demonstrates deep understanding of and appropriately utilizes mandated reporting assessment framework, policy, procedure and follow-up requirements		
	Mandated Report Forms are maintained and filed appropriately in locked location		
	Demonstrates sound clinical judgement when conducting assessments to determine reasonable cause		

Section IV. Professional Development		Self-Assessment	Coach/Manager Feedback
		Rating (1-5)	Rating (1-5)
<b>Reflection and Constant Learning</b>	Proactively seeks out learning opportunities both within and outside of the Achievement First network		
	Seeks to improve performance; is eager to get feedback and incorporates feedback in a positive, non-defensive way		
	Actively and consciously applies professional code of conduct to practice		
	Engages in exploration of practice decisions and process to assess for ethical, legal, procedural and culturally relevant implications in order to constantly improve		
<b>Diversity and Inclusiveness</b>	Engages in DEI work as active and open participant		
	Owens process to build cultural context by proactively seeking out resources to develop own capacity		
	Initiative in monitoring own values and biases and their potential impact on the counseling process and overall school culture		
	Strong ability to individualize practice in culturally relevant ways in response to varying cultures, religions, ethnic affiliations, race, sexual orientation, physical characteristics, disabilities and social/emotional development		
<b>Organization and Self-Management</b>	Efficiently manages workload: Has a system for capturing and checking action items and uses them to prioritize work appropriately; Is on time for meetings; Completes and turns in assignments on-time without reminders or proactively reschedules when deadline cannot be met; Scholar sessions begin and end on time.		
	Maintains accurate and clear scholar session attendance and records; Each student on their caseload has a completed IEP goals or for at-risk students, completed treatment plan within 30 days of first session; Session notes for each student session and collateral contact are entered into session notes within a week of the contact; Trimester Reviews and/or Progress Reports are completed for each student on the caseload (mandated and at-risk) by the end of each trimester/semester; Family's receive copy of Trimester Reviews or Progress Reports at the end of each trimester or semester		
	Has exemplary attendance		
<b>Communication</b>	Effectively communicates with school leaders and fellow staff in order to positively problem-solve and advocate for scholars		
	Clearly communicates scholar interventions and supports to key stakeholders, identifying work to be done, responsibilities of all participants and time line for roll out/re-assessments		

<b>Section VI. Clinical Practice Section</b>		Self-Assessment	Coach/Manager Feedback
<i>NOTE: Coaches should be able to provide feedback on most of this section. Coaches have autonomy to skip buckets in this section that they have not observed. For SW/Cs with an AF internal Clinical Supervisor, please expect an additional feedback summary from them on this section.</i>		Rating (1-5)	Rating (1-5)
<b>Clinical Practice and Intervention Skills</b>	Maintains group cohesion while dealing with disruptive behaviors or challenges to group process and constructively uses toward therapeutic outcomes		
	Consistently uses push-in clinical support to enhance student's progress toward clinical goals (i.e. in-class observations, real-time support/coaching of student) in order to support pull-out session interventions		
	Maintains HIPPA requirements around specific session content while appropriately balancing scholar information sharing and confidentiality in order to facilitate best practice supports/interventions/accommodations for students		
	Demonstrates sound clinical judgment while working with scholars, families and staff		
	Demonstrates initiative in monitoring own values and biases and the potential impact on the counseling process		
	Strong ability to individualize practice in culturally relevant ways in response to varying cultures, religions, ethnic affiliations, race, sexual orientation, physical characteristics, disabilities and social/emotional		
	Actively and routinely reflects on use of self throughout the treatment process (transference/counter transference, social location, race, personal opinions, views, beliefs and information sharing)		
	Actively and consciously applies professional code of conduct to practice		
	Appropriately and effectively conducts scholar safety assessments for self-harm, suicidal ideation and/or threats to harm others utilizing Achievement First policy, assessment framework and all process/follow-up protocol		
	Demonstrates initiative in monitoring own values and biases and their potential impact on the safety assessment process		
<b>Administrative</b>	Writes clear and concise treatment plans which support the counseling goals using rigorous, bite sized objectives and interventions to drive counseling		
	Systematically returns to session notes and treatment plan objectives to plan for upcoming session, creating seamless support between sessions and focusing sessions on progress toward objectives		
	Provides both qualitative and quantitative trimester review summaries of scholar progress using trimester review template which accurately reflect scholar's progress in sessions and classroom and clearly outlines action steps for upcoming trimester by the end of each trimester, providing copy to parent/guardian, SSL for scholar IEP file when applicable and discusses the trimester review with each scholar		
	Consistently uses in-class observations, collateral contacts (teachers, staff, parents, scholar) and session notes to inform trimester reviews and session planning		

	<p>Has a system for capturing and checking action items and uses them to prioritize work appropriately and minimize stress</p> <p>Meets expectations for documentation of sessions in Infinite Campus and state IEP software (not applicable in New Haven)</p> <p>Is on-time for meetings; completes and turns in assignments on-time without reminders or proactively reschedules/communicates</p> <p>Effectively communicates with school leaders and fellow staff in order to positively problem-solve and advocate for scholars</p> <p>Clearly communicates scholar interventions and supports to key stakeholders, identifying work to be done, responsibilities of all participants and time lines</p>		
<p><b>Professional Development</b></p>	<p>Engages in exploration of practice decisions and process to assess for ethical, legal, procedural and culturally relevant implications by constantly developing strong ability to individualize practice in culturally relevant ways in response to varying cultures, religions, ethnic affiliations, race, sexual orientation, physical characteristics, disabilities and social/emotional development</p> <p>Engages in DEI work as active and open participant</p> <p>Owns process to build cultural context by proactively seeking out resources to develop own capacity in clinical skills and anti-racist professional development</p> <p>Recognizes own learning patterns and proactively seeks out learning opportunities both within and outside of the Achievement First network</p> <p>Routinely seeks feedback from SW/C peers, school and network coaches and school team members</p> <p>Takes initiative in the evaluation of own practice effectiveness by constantly reflecting on successes and areas of growth around all areas of counseling and school support</p> <p>Seeks to improve performance; is eager to get feedback and incorporates feedback in a positive, non-defensive way</p>		

**Goals for the SY (tie directly to [National Evaluation Framework](#))**

**Goals for Coming School Year**

Goal	What ACTIONS do you plan to take to reach these goals?	WHEN and HOW will we assess progress toward your goals?	What SUPPORT do you need in order to reach your goals?
(Optional) What are your PERSONAL PRIORITIES?	HOW will you maintain your priorities?	What SUPPORT do you need?	

## Appendix F - How to Have MOY and EOY Stepbacks

### Best Practices:

- Schedule the stepback conversation in advance - don't spring it on an educator without notice.
- Avoid focusing the discussion overly on numeric ratings. The ratings are meant to be used as a tool to understand progress over time.
- Depending on the educator, you should decide if it would be better to share the written evaluation **before** the conversation, **during** the conversation, or **after** the conversation (and adjust the agenda accordingly).

Agenda	Suggested Key Points
<b>Framing</b> 3 min	Welcome teacher to debrief: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name that the purpose is to <b>reflect</b> on teaching practice, <b>celebrate</b> strengths and identify areas of <b>growth</b></li> </ul>
<b>Teacher Reflection</b> 5 min	Ask teacher to reflect on their overall practice, probing with questions like: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are your biggest strengths?</li> <li>• Where have you grown the most this year?</li> <li>• Where do you see your biggest areas of growth?</li> </ul>
<b>Share Precise Praise</b> 5 - 10 min	Name the teacher's consistent <b>strengths</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share precise praise, keeping conversation rooted in evidence</li> <li>• When possible, tie praise to <b>previous feedback or growth areas</b></li> </ul> Ask for teacher <b>reflection</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Do these strengths resonate with you? What has helped you build your strengths in this area?"</li> </ul>

<p><b>Share 1-2 Big Rocks</b></p> <p>10 min</p>	<p>Name the teacher's consistent 1-2 big rocks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Keep the conversation rooted in <b>evidence</b>, and NOT rooted in ratings.</li> <li>● To ensure common language, use language from the AF Essentials rubric.</li> <li>● Do an "alignment and investment" check. Ask the teacher, "Does this resonate? How would improving here drive student achievement?"</li> <li>● Walk through specific strategies that the teacher can use to address this area in their future instruction.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Application</b></p> <p>5-10 min</p>	<p>If possible and appropriate, discuss specific applicability to a lesson or lessons next week.</p>
<p><b>Closing &amp; Next Steps</b></p> <p>3 min</p>	<p>Ask teacher to summarize the key takeaways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● "What do you see as your next steps from our debrief?"</li> <li>● "What goals do you have for improving your practice in the next few months?"</li> </ul> <p>Ask for feedback on the process &amp; let teacher know when they'll receive their evaluation.</p>



## Appendix G - Key Performance Indicators

### School Level Key Performance Indicators

In 2022, we developed a series of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that measure the health of an individual school. The KPIs give us a common understanding of the key measures that provide insight into the ongoing performance of our schools. We've selected measures that provide an understanding of the academic achievement, student experience, staff experience, operational health, safety, and financial health of our schools. This data is used by schools, regional superintendents, and RDOs as well as AF's Operating Team to be attentive to these key indicators at each individual school and identify where to intervene. For each measure in the KPI we have set 3 benchmarks:

**Exemplary:** This is the bar for our vision of excellence for our schools for this measure anchored in our values and other external comparisons. This is ultimately what we think excellence looks like for our schools.

**Proficiency:** This is our understanding of strong performance for this measure for the current school year. This benchmark is set based on prior year data, as well as our own values-driven bar of what strong performance would look like at our schools. We want these benchmarks to be ambitious but feasible, meaning some schools should be hitting this target. We also recognize that what we have set as our goal for proficiency may not be feasible for all schools given the current range of performance post-pandemic. While we believe in setting a high bar for all our schools, we also recognize that strong yearly growth represents proficiency in another measure. Most measures have a growth indicator that, if met, would indicate proficient performance for the year even if the absolute measure was below our goal for proficiency.

**Waterline:** We do not think a school should fall below this level of performance. If they do, we should diagnose what is leading to that and make a plan. Some of these waterlines are internal benchmarks while others are driven by requirements of our states or authorizers. Some measures have both an absolute indicator and a growth indicator. This is because while we have a bar at which we become concerned, we also don't want to see schools decline in performance on measures where they have demonstrated strength previously.

Schools should use these KPI measures to understand the bar for performance and set campus-level absolute and growth goals. While these measures are relatively constant year over year, it is possible that we may need to revise and raise them as we make yearly progress. See the overview of our Key Performance Indicators in the subsections that follows:

K-12 Goals:

Type of Measures	Measure	Waterline	Proficient	Exemplary	Strong Growth
Student Experience	<a href="#">Chronic Absenteeism</a>	30%	20%	5%	-8%
	<a href="#">ADA%</a>	90%	93%	95%	1%
	AUNr%	3%	2%	<2%	-1%
Staff Experience	Certification Goal: (see lines 50-53)	By 3/1, 75% of teachers at each school are either certified or hold an approved exemption. 100% of uncertified teachers are meeting certification deadlines or have received appropriate professionalism follow ups.			
	Staff retention	80%	85%	95%	5%
	Org Health: Q12 percentile in the industry	Q12 overall score is 40th percentile compared to K-12 benchmark with a 85% response rate.	Q12 overall score is the same/higher than last cycle OR at the 50th percentile compared to K-12 benchmark with a 85% response rate.	Q12 overall score is the same/higher than last cycle OR at the 70th percentile compared to K-12 benchmark with a 90% response rate.	Two years of growth in overall Q12 score
AOTY	Average Score on End of Arc Walkthroughs (Scale 0-5)	2.5	3	3.5	0.5
Operations	Annual average on Top Priority Assessments ( <a href="#">TPAs</a> ) (Scale 0-5)	3.5	4	4.5	0.5
Safety	Average on monthly safety assessments	85%	90%	95%	5%
Budget	School meets their overall Board-approved budget or ends with a surplus variance	Meets/ Surplus			

Elementary Differentiated Goals (K-4):

Type of Measures	Measure	Waterline	Proficient	Exemplary	Strong Growth
<b>Student Achievement</b>	% of students proficient in Counting Proficiency Assessment (CPA) (K-2)	90%	100%	100%	N/A
	% of students proficient in grade level strategy and access (CGI)	70%	80%	90%	10%
	% of students proficient on Math Interim Assessments & Mocks (K-4) and Math State Test	70%	80%	90%	10%
	% of students proficient on ELA Interim Assessments & Mocks (3-4) and ELA State Test	70%	80%	90%	10%
	% of students are reading at or above benchmark on MCLASS (K-4)	70%	80%	90%	10%
	% of students at or above average growth on MCLASS (K-4) compared to national data set	70%	80%	90%	10%
	SWD Differential: % of students at or above average growth on MCLASS (K-4) compared to national data set	10%	5%	1%	
	MLL Differential: % of students at or above average growth on MCLASS (K-4) compared to national data set	10%	5%	1%	
	% proficient Foundations (K-3)	70%	80%	90%	10%
<b>Student Experience</b>	Student Experience Survey, Fall/ Spring	80%	80%	85%	1%
	AUNr%	3%	2%	<2%	-1%
	1+ ISS/OSS/BusS/Exp %	5% or 8%	2%	<2%	-1%
	3+ ISS/OSS/BusS/Exp %	0.2%	0.1%	0.05%	-0.05%

Middle School Differentiated Goals (5-8):

Type of Measures	Measure	Waterline	Proficient	Exemplary	Strong Growth
Student Achievement	% of students proficient on Math Interim Assessments, Mocks and State Tests (5-8)	60%	70%	80%	10%
	% of students proficient on ELA Interim Assessments, Mocks and State Tests (5-8)	60%	70%	80%	10%
	% proficient on Science Interim Assessments and State Test	60%	70%	80%	10%
	% proficient on History End of Unit (Unit B) Assessments	60%	70%	80%	10%
	% Proficient on STAR Reading	60%	70%	80%	10%
	<10% Differential of proficiency for SWD	15%	10%	5%	3%
	<10% Differential of proficiency for MLLs	15%	10%	5%	3%
Student Experience	Choice attrition rate (% of students that leave the school by choice)	5%	2%	<2%	-1%
	Student Experience Survey, Fall/ Spring	50%	58%	60%	2%
	<a href="#">ADA%</a>	90%	93%	95%	1%
	AUNr%	3%	2%	<2%	-1%
	1+ ISS/OSS/BusS/Exp %	8%	6%	<5%	-1%
	3+ ISS/OSS/BusS/Exp %	1%	0.5%	0.2%	-0.3%

High School Differentiated Goals (9-12):

Type of Measures	Measure	Waterline	Proficient	Exemplary	Strong Growth
Student Achievement	New: % On Track for College Readiness on STAR Reading	40%	50%	60%	10%
	<10% Differential of proficiency for SWD	15%	10%	5%	3%
	<10% Differential of proficiency for MLLs	15%	10%	5%	3%
	NY Living Environment Mock Regents and Regents	65%	70%	75%	10%
	NY Algebra Mock Regents and Regents	50%	60%	85%	10%
	NY ELA Mock Regents and Regents	65%	75%	85%	10%
	NY HISTORY Mock Regents and Regents- Global History	60	65	70	10%
	NY HISTORY Mock Regents and Regents- US History	60	65	70	10%
	% of students proficient on IAs in Algebra I, Geo, Algebra II	0% growth YoY on EOY Assessment	5% growth YoY on EOY Assessment	10% growth YoY on EOY Assessment	N/A
	% of students proficient on IAs in ELA 1 and ELA 2	0% growth YoY on EOY Assessment	5% growth YoY on EOY Assessment	10% growth YoY on EOY Assessment	N/A
	% of students proficient on IAs in ELA 3 and 4 (Growth is from IA 1 to EOY)	0% growth	5% growth	10% growth	N/A
	% of students on track to meet state requirements to graduate	90%	95%	98%	N/A
	% of students with GPA >3.0	35%	40%	50%	5% from LY
Student Experience	Choice attrition rate (% of students that leave the school by choice)	5%	4%	<2% (from S&D)	-1%
	Student Experience Survey, Fall/ Spring	50%	56%	58%	2%
	<a href="#">ADA%</a>	90%	93%	95%	1%
	AUNr%	3%	2%	<2%	-1%
	1+ ISS/OSS/BusS/Exp %	8%	6%	<5%	-1%
	3+ ISS/OSS/BusS/Exp %	1%	0.5%	0.2%	-0.3%

## References

McEachin, Andrew, Jonathan Schweig, Rachel Perera, and Isaac M. Opper, *Considerations for Implementing the TNTP Core Rubric*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2018. [https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_briefs/RB10033.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB10033.html).

McEachin, Andrew, Jonathan Schweig, Rachel Perera, and Isaac M. Opper, *Validation Study of the TNTP Core Teaching Rubric*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2018. [https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR2623.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2623.html).

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015). *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015*. Reston, VA: Author.

*TNTP (2014). TNTP Core Teaching Rubric: A Tool for Conducting Common Core-Aligned Classroom Observations*. Brooklyn, NY: Author.