



BARKHAMSTED

Professional Educator & Leader

Review of Practice

Evaluation & Support Plan

2024 - 2025

**Using High Quality Feedback to Support Effective
Instruction & Improve Student Learning**

Table of Contents

Topic	Page Number
<u>Background Information</u>	3
<u>Purpose and Rationale</u>	3
<u>Theory of Action</u>	3
<u>Focus for Instructional Practice</u>	3
<u>Barkhamsted Portrait of the Successful Student</u>	3
<u>Professional Educator and Leader Review of Practice (PELROP) Overview</u>	4-7
<u>Core Design Principles</u>	4
<u>CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation 2023</u>	4-5
<u>Alignment of PELROP to the CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation 2023</u>	5-7
<u>Key Components of Professional Educator Review of Practice</u>	7
<u>PELROP Process and Timeline Overview</u>	8-12
<u>Annual PELROP Process and Schedule</u>	8
<u>Goal Setting and Planning</u>	8-9
<u>Action Research Through Professional Learning Cycles</u>	10
<u>End-of-Year/Cycle Review of Practice</u>	10-12
<u>Options for Support within PELROP</u>	12-13
<u>Complimentary Observers</u>	13-14
<u>Evaluator Training: Ensuring Fairness, Accuracy, and Calibration</u>	14
<u>Dispute Resolution Process</u>	14-16
<u>Local and State Reporting</u>	16
<u>PELROP Resources</u>	17
<u>Sources Referenced/Consulted</u>	17

District Board of Education Members	District PDEC Members
Caprice Shaw, Chair Robert Brainard III, Vice Chair MaryKate Terzini, Secretary Jaclyn Dombrowski, Board Member Jennifer Grant, Board Member Staci Heath, Board Member Suzie Larson, Board Member	Danielle Radke, Co-chair Math Coach - educator Erika Sacharko, Co-chair Curriculum Coordinator - leader Mo Barton Grade 5 Teacher - educator Christy Dzubay Grade 2 Teacher - educator Jessica Garand Interventionist - paraeducator Abby Harwood Grade 1 Teacher - educator Laura Hedenberg Library Media Specialist - BEA President Kristen Plocki Principal - leader Karen Ransom Special Education Teacher - educator

A note for local district Professional Development and Evaluation Committees (PDEC): The Professional Educator & Leader Review of Practice (PELROP) Growth and Evaluation Model focuses on improving practice and outcomes by aligning professional learning systems (edTPA, TEAM, evaluation) and focusing on high leverage action research, multiple sources of evidence, and high-quality feedback in alignment with the new CSDE Educator Growth and Evaluation design principles. ***As expected by the CSDE design principles, the PELROP model includes opportunities for PDEC involvement and decision making at the local level.***

Background Information

Purpose and Rationale

The Professional Educator & Leader Review of Practice (PELRP) model is designed to increase the likelihood that educator evaluation and support process will have a positive impact on student learning and achievement, as well as on teacher professional practice.

Theory of Action

When we cultivate a community focused on fostering individual passions linked to high leverage student competencies and educator practices, and structure environments that prioritize use of the innovation design process, our educators and leaders are empowered, inspired and free to unleash their creative potential and SOAR to Success.

Focus for Instructional Practice

In working toward building an educational system that supports innovation and creativity, we will identify, design, and facilitate a professional learning plan that is aligned with individualized learning goals and supports the development of high leverage student competencies and teacher practices.

Portrait of the Successful Student

The successful Barkhamsted School student is: inspired to demonstrate intellectual curiosity, continuously growing and developing academic and artistic passions, becoming an innovator of tomorrow and leaving school empowered to SOAR to SUCCESS.

Inspiring Intellectual Curiosity & Continuous Growth Empowering Students to SOAR to Success As

Responsible Citizens

Who demonstrate:

- Integrity
- Commitment
- Empathy

Informed Thinkers

Who are:

- Creative
- Curious
- Innovative

Confident Risk Takers

Who are:

- Flexible
- Empowered
- Resilient

Competent Problem Solvers

Who are:

- Resourceful
- Persistent
- Reflective

Thoughtful Team Players

Who:

- Collaborate
- Communicate
- Compromise



INSPIRE ⌘ EMPOWER ⌘ SOAR

Professional Educator & Leader Review of Practice (PELROP)

Core Design Principles

The following research-based elements guided the design of Barkhamsted’s evaluation model:

- Incorporate a process for **providing specific and concrete feedback to educators and leaders** during the evaluation process, as such feedback on teaching practices during pre- and post-observation conferences contributes to teacher self-efficacy;
- Align evaluation practices with **subsequent professional development** and support resources to ensure that educators and leaders have the tools to engage in mastery experiences and improve their practice;
- Incorporate **action research and/or reflective action** to build self-awareness and mastery skills. This might require creating space in school leaders’ time and workload to ensure that they have the capacity to engage in thorough evaluations and provide specific feedback that leads to increases in educators’ sense of efficacy.
- **Focus on things that matter** - “Leaders of districts and schools would be wise to engage in discussions about priorities. What skills and outcomes are most important in the near term? In the far term? How can districts better prepare school leaders to evaluate and support teachers in these areas? How can districts provide teachers with the tools to self-assess the extent to which they are developing these skills?” (Donaldson, p. 73)
- **Accountability is an ineffective motivator** - “... accountability aims of evaluation do not generally inspire teachers or leaders. Improving one’s craft, on the other hand, generates much more enthusiasm.” (Donaldson, p. 108)
- **Emphasize growth and development...** “... evaluation works best when embedded in a larger culture of continuous learning. Thus, it cannot be considered a panacea but instead one of many structures that can hold teachers accountable and improve instruction.”

Focused Professional Learning using the CAPA Framework

- Set mutually agreed upon goals focused on learning priorities and high leverage practices to maximize improvement.
- Use the CAPA professional learning cycle – *Collect, Analyze, Process, Act* – to engage in deep study of professional practice and take action for improvement.

Multiple Sources of Evidence

- Review multiple sources of evidence, including educator reflection, observational evidence, and evidence of student learning aligned to goal.
- Reflect on practice using high leverage CCT-aligned standards framed as single points for increased clarity to support improvement.

High-Quality Feedback

- Feedback based on the quality of evidence, reflection, learning and action within the professional learning process.
- Ongoing formative feedback and opportunities to collaborate with evaluators, colleagues, students and/or families through the professional learning process.

CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation 2023

The CT Guidelines 2023, adopted by the State Board of Education on June 14, 2023, represent the collaborative work of the [Educator Evaluation and Support \(EES\) Council 2022](#) to reimagine educator and leader evaluation and support. The foundational elements of the new model includes cyclical processes of continuous

improvement; professional learning and action research; and reflective practice, feedback and support. 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. The primary goal of the educator evaluation and support system is to strengthen individual and collective practices to increase student learning, growth, and achievement.

Guiding Principles:

The EES Council 2022 engaged in a collaborative process to reach consensus on the design principles that would most impact the design of a transformative educator evaluation and support system that uses high-quality professional learning to improve educator practice and student outcomes. These include:

- **Allow for differentiation of roles** - (for example, teachers, counselors, instructional coaches, student support staff and leaders - Central office, principal, assistant principal, etc.)
- **Simplify and reduce the burden** - (for example, eliminate the technical challenge, reduce the number of steps, paperwork)
- **Focus on things that matter** - (Identify high leverage, mainstream goal focus areas.)
- **Connect to best practices aimed at the development of the whole child** - (including, but not limited to, academic, social, emotional, and physical)
- **Focus on educator growth and agency** - (Meaningfully engage professionals by focusing on growth and practice in partnership with others aligned to a strategic focus - see above, focus on things that matter.)
- **Meaningful connections to professional learning** (Provide multiple pathways for participants to improve their own practice in a way that is meaningful and impactful)
- **Specific, timely, accurate, actionable, and reciprocal feedback**

Design Elements:

The design elements of the *CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (2023)* - (*Guidelines 2023*) represent several shifts from what has become common practice when implementing the [Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation \(2017\)](#). These shifts are based on research and best practices from Connecticut educators and from other states, and represent changes in the following areas for both educators and leaders:

- Standards and Criteria
- Goal Setting Process
- Professional Practice and Educator Growth
- Evaluator/Observer/Stakeholder Feedback and Engagement
- Process Elements
- Dispute Resolution

Alignment of PELROP to the CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation 2023

The PELROP model focuses on a simplified process for meaningful professional learning in high-leverage areas with evidence-based reflection and feedback for improved practice and outcomes for each learner. PELROP aligns with non-negotiables and best practice preferences identified within the Guidelines 2023, including:

Standards and Criteria for Educators and Leaders:

- Educator practice discussions are based on [high-leverage CCT-aligned standards framed as single points](#)

for increased clarity. These standards have been mutually agreed upon by the PDEC. The following professional practice standards ground this model's framework. ([CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching Indicators: 1a, 3b, 3c](#) and [CCT Rubric for Service Delivery Indicators: 1a, 3b, 3c](#)). Full rubrics may be used to develop feedback and support reflection as needed.

- Leader practice discussions are based on the [Professional Standards for School Leaders \(PSEL\)](#).
- [Professional Educator Review of Practice Success Criteria](#) is a single point competency and used to reflect, determine next steps, and support the written summary of practice.

Professional Learning Standards and Structures:

Professional learning is essential to the CT Guidelines 2023 model. [Learning Forward Professional Learning Standards \(2022\)](#), serve as a tool for how professional learning happens to deepen one's knowledge of their practice to impact learning, growth, and achievement. As a tool, the professional learning standards help educators and leaders intentionally design learning, address content and consider how to accomplish the expected learning transformation desired. Together the professional standards for educators, leaders and professional learning serve as the three visions that work together to lay the foundation for meaningful feedback in a continuous learning process.

The Continuous Learning Process: Goal Setting, Professional Practice and Evaluator/Observer/Stakeholder Feedback and Engagement

The evaluation and support model is designed as a continuous learning process. The goal of the continuous learning process is to provide educators with continuous learning opportunities for professional growth through self-directed analysis and reflection, planning, implementation, and collaboration. Regular dialogue and feedback, coupled with the opportunity to reflect on and advance practice, drive the continuous learning process. In this process, the educator serves as the learner who actively engages in and directs their learning and feedback. The evaluator serves as a learning partner who supports the educator through the learning and growth process. Within the process, the educator collaborates and serves as a reflective practitioner to determine mutually agreed upon educator goals, professional practice and educator growth, and observation and feedback focus.

Goal Setting:

- Through self-reflection and mutual agreement with their evaluator, educators/leaders set a strategy/goal focus for the cycle. A focus on high leverage goals aligns with a district's vision of a successful student and informs professional learning and collaboration.
- Goals may be set for multi-year periods. Goals may be developed individually or collaboratively.
- Beginning teachers in TEAM have a choice to set aligning evaluation and induction goals to focus and streamline improvement efforts.

Professional Practice and Student Growth:

- PELROP Success Criteria focus on evidence-based reflection and growth in the following areas: professional learning and improving practice, improving student learning and learner outcomes, and positively impacting community.
- Multiple sources of evidence to inform reflection and growth, which may include but is not limited to evidence of learning aligned to goal, peer site visit/observation, professional learning, collaboration with colleagues, feedback from colleagues/families/students, and other artifacts of teaching and learning.

- Observations with written and/or verbal feedback aligned to educator/leader’s strategy/goal focus.

Evaluator/Observer/Stakeholder Feedback and Engagement

- Opportunities for additional feedback from evaluators and collaboration with colleagues/other stakeholders as is helpful throughout the professional learning cycle.
- End-of-cycle review of practice to support holistic reflection and feedback aligned to PELROP Success Criteria.


Process Elements:

- PELROP Orientation for all staff new to the process.
- Innovation design framework guides at least one annual cycle of action research, reflection, and improvement in a focused, high-leverage instructional area: positive learning environment, cognitive engagement, or feedback for active learning that also aligns to Barkhamsted’s Portrait of the Successful Student.
- Each cycle includes a goal setting conversation, observational feedback at the beginning and end of each cycle, and end-of-cycle review of practice discourse.
- Ongoing calibration and feedback training for evaluators.
- Beginning teachers have the option to: use TEAM ROP content and process as part of their PELROP evaluation process; or complete their PELROP evaluation process separately - and ideally, aligned - to their TEAM ROP content and process, saving both time and effort.

Differentiation/Dispute Resolution:

- Options for differentiation to promote educator growth, to support educators needing additional support within the cycle, and to support educators who have consistently not met the minimum standard.
- Any disputes regarding ratings in the PELROP model shall be resolved using the existing resolution process of the district.

Key Components of Professional Educator & Leader Review of Practice



PELROP Process and Timeline Overview


Annual PELROP Process and Schedule

Orientation

Evaluators/PDECs facilitate an orientation for educators new to the process that will result in educators being able to describe the purpose, goals, process, and documentation requirements of PELROP and explain what makes for a successful Action Research cycle.

Process

To support a focus on meaningful strategy/goal focus areas and comprehensive action research that will enhance deep learning, each professional CAPA cycle is designed to take approximately 8-12 weeks. Year 1 or 2 beginning teachers in TEAM may complete their CAPA cycle in alignment with TEAM instructional modules. Specific PELROP process timelines for all educators are determined yearly by the local PDEC.



Scheduling Flexibility

PELROP provides evaluators flexibility in scheduling professional evaluation cycles to level out the required workload throughout the year and give educators the attention and feedback they need to support improved practice. Evaluators may gather and use input from staff to inform scheduling and consider existing professional learning structures and how they may support ongoing reflection and improvement aligned to the high-leverage indicators and CAPA cycle work. The administration in collaboration with PDEC will determine specific timelines and may customize the schedule to meet local needs each year.

Goal-Setting and Planning

Goal Setting Aligned to Guidelines 2023

In alignment with the Guidelines 2023, evaluation and support will be an on-going, cyclical progress monitoring process with evaluator and educator(s)/teams conferences throughout the year.


- Educators will meet with their supervisor three times a year at a minimum for (fall goal setting, mid-year/mid-CAPA-cycle check-in, and end-of-year/end-of-cycle PELROP reflection). The meetings should be approached in a spirit of continuous improvement, reflection, and collaboration. Goals should always be connected to adopted PDEC standards.
- The first meeting will be focused on review of contextual planning, goal setting, and action planning, which can be completed either as an individual or as a collaborative group depending on the goal.
- In this process, the end-of-year meeting/end-of-CAPA-cycle PELROP conversation should be used as a time to reflect on the current year/cycle and how it might inform/launch the next evaluation cycle.

Goal Setting Steps and Resources within PELROP

Within PELROP, each cycle includes a goal setting conversation, mid-year/cycle check-in, and an end-of-year/cycle review of practice conversation to support growth and next steps aligned to the PELROP Success Criteria. Through self-reflection and mutual agreement with their evaluator, educators set a strategy/goal focus for the cycle, including:

1. Contextual planning information and evidence used to develop the goal.
2. Evidence used to track whether or not the goal has been achieved.
3. The high-leverage student competency linked to the goal with a description of the connection between them.
4. The high-leverage teacher practice used as a focus to support the goal.
5. The action steps planned to achieve the goal and an anticipated timeline.

Goals focus on high leverage instructional areas (positive learning environment, cognitive engagement, feedback for active learning) and high leverage learning competencies aligned to districts’ portrait of a successful student. Goals may be developed individually or collaboratively and may span a multi-year time period.



Action Research Through Professional Learning Cycles

CAPA Cycle Framework

Educators/Leaders use the CAPA (collect, analyze, process, act) framework to guide focused professional learning and feedback for at least one annual cycle of action research, reflection, and improvement in a focused high-leverage instructional area:

- Positive learning environment,
- Cognitive engagement,

- Feedback for active learning,
- Other indicator for special circumstances.

During the CAPA cycle, educators/leaders use the guiding prompts to engage in the cycle of continuous improvement and document ongoing reflection and analysis of multiple sources (including evidence of student learning aligned with strategy/goal focus, observation/feedback, etc.). Documentation is individualized by role and is customized by each educator, but includes all required elements to the PELROP process.

Additional sources of evidence to inform educator/leader reflection and improvement may include evidence of student learning aligned to the goal and may include peer site visit/observation, collaboration with colleagues, feedback from colleagues/families/students, and/or other artifacts of teaching and learning. Educators may engage in peer observation, share resources, or collaborate with colleagues to deepen understanding and improve practice and outcomes.

Evaluator Observations and Feedback Throughout the Cycle

There are multiple opportunities throughout the cycle for educators/leaders to receive focused feedback, tied to their identified high-leverage strategy/goal focus, to identify strengths and areas for advancement.

Within the context of the CAPA cycle, observations with written and/or verbal feedback include:

- Minimum of 2 informal observations and/or review of practice for teachers with more than two years of experience
- Minimum of 3 informal observations and/or review of practice for non-tenured teachers

Observation Definitions

- **Information Observation:** In-class observations usually lasting 20 minutes or less, with verbal and/or written feedback within a timely manner.
- **Review of Practice:** Reviews of practice/non-classroom observations include, but are not limited to: observations of data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring, other teacher artifacts (including the end-of-cycle PELROP)
- **For non-Classroom Based Educators, who are being evaluated using the Effective Service Delivery CCT rubric/single point competencies, review of practice/non-classroom observations may be used in place for informal observations** (e.g., diagnostic reports, summary of counseling strategies used and impact on student progress, evidence of supporting students with the most significant needs, etc.).

One observation typically occurs early in the cycle to support the educator’s goal setting and/or “Contextual Planning” step; another observation may take place at the end of the cycle to observe for evidence of improvement as a result of reflection and growth within the cycle.

Evaluators may schedule and conduct additional observations with feedback as needed to support the educator’s learning process, and they may provide additional support and feedback as needed throughout the educator’s cycle.

End-of-Year/Cycle Reflection

Understanding and Planning for an End-of-Cycle PELROP Conversation

During the course of the CAPA cycle, educators/leaders collect multiple measures of learning, including evidence of student learning aligned to the educator’s strategy/goal focus. Additional sources of evidence to inform reflection and improvement, may include but are not limited to:

- Peer site visit/observation
- Collaboration with colleagues
- Lesson plans
- Feedback from colleagues, students, and/or families
- Other artifacts of teaching and learning

During the end-of-cycle reflection conversation, the educator and evaluator meet to reflect holistically on the work, learning, and improvement that occurred during the cycle aligned to the PELROP Success Criteria. The educator/leader’s documentation of the process is referenced during the conversation to support evidence-based reflection. The PELROP Success Criteria are also referenced within this conversation.

To plan for the conversation, evaluators should/may:

- Reflect on evidence and feedback, including areas of strength/growth.
- Review the [PELROP Success Criteria](#) and the variety of possible sources of evidence that may align.
- Revisit the educator’s documentation.
- Other as needed ...

To plan for the conversation, educators should:

- Ensure all evidence and reflection is documented on the [provided template](#).
- Plan for the conversation by reflecting on the experience (e.g., *What did you learn? How did you change your practice? How have student outcomes improved within your CAPA cycle? Consider the [PELROP Success Criteria](#).*)
- Be ready to add additional evidence to their documentation during the conversation if deepened reflections/learning emerge.

CAPA Cycle Success Criteria

A successful CAPA cycle includes:

- Mutually agreed upon goal.
- Evidence of work that reflects focused professional learning.
- Documented evidence, reflection, and growth aligned to the goal.
- Participation in observations and feedback conversations as required.
- Self-reflection and self-assessment aligned to PELROP Success Criteria prior to the end-of-cycle conference.
- Participation in the end-of-cycle conference to discuss evidence-based reflections on practice, learning, and growth within the cycle aligned to success criteria. Evaluators share their determination regarding whether or not the criteria have been successfully met. Should there be a discrepancy or scoring disagreement, the evaluator will assign the final score.

Evaluator feedback about the CAPA cycle is based on the quality of evidence-based reflections related to practice, learning, and growth within the cycle process, in alignment with the [PELROP Success Criteria](#). The PELROP Educator Success Criteria is a single-point competency and is used to reflect, determine next steps, and support the written summary of teacher practice.

The PELROP Success Criteria supports evaluators and educators in reflecting holistically on the collection and analysis of multiple sources of evidence that resulted in new learning and improved practice and outcomes within each action research cycle. Multiple sources include evidence of student learning aligned to the educator’s strategy/goal focus, as well additional sources of evidence.

The PELROP Educator Success Criteria includes:

PEROP Success Criteria	Possible Sources of Evidence
<p>Development of New Learning & Impact on Practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educator can demonstrate how they developed new learning within the CAPA cycle through multiple sources (e.g., analyzing student learning, observational feedback, etc.) and how they used their new learning to improve practice aligned to their CAPA cycle goal/strategy focus. <p>Impact on Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educator can demonstrate how they positively impacted student learning within the CAPA cycle using example evidence, and can articulate connections/rationale between the improved learning and their own changes in practice. <p>Impact on Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educator can demonstrate how they worked effectively with colleagues/families/community to support learning and improvement within the CAPA cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Required observational evidence • Required student learning evidence aligned to high-leverage indicator focus and portrait competency • Lesson plans(s) • Teacher created learning materials • Observational teacher evidence • Numeric information about time, teacher practice, student participation, resource use, classroom environment, frequency of meetings/communications, etc. • Teacher and/or student self-reflection • Student learning artifacts • Mastery-based demonstrations of academic achievement observational data of students’ words, actions, interactions (including quotations when appropriate) • Rubrics, interim or benchmark assessments, other assessments • Evidence of communications and/or collaborations with parents, colleagues, community • Other artifacts/sources ...

Educator/Leader Status Determines Future Cycles

In alignment with the Guidelines 2023, an appropriate summary of educator/leader growth achieved through the process and the provision of a platform to consider future work will be provided by the evaluator on an annual basis. This summary should be tied to the agreed upon standards and goals upon which the process was based and will make a distinction regarding the educator/leader’s successful completion of the evaluative cycle.

During the end-of-cycle conversation, the evaluator informs the educator of any immediate needed next steps and identifies any support that may be necessary (e.g., revise evidence and schedule a follow up, etc.). Based on the outcome of the Review of Practice, the evaluator informs the educator regarding their status condition and next steps, including another CAPA cycle if needed. A [Written Summary of PELROP Success Determination](#) is completed by both the educator and evaluator.

Options for Support within ROP

Tiered Support

All educators/leaders require access to high-quality, targeted professional learning support to improve practice over time. Educators/leaders and their evaluators thoughtfully consider and apply three tiers of support, as appropriate, within an evaluation process. For educators/leaders who consistently have not met the minimum evidence standards in the CAPA cycle (criteria not met for multiple cycles), a focused support and development is needed.

Tier 1 - It is the expectation that all educators consistently access opportunities for professional growth within their district. Tier 1 supports are broadly accessible professional learning opportunities for all, such as, collegial professional conversations, classroom visits, available district resources (e.g., books, articles, videos, etc.), formal professional learning opportunities developed and designed by district PDEC, and other general support for all educators (e.g., instructional coaching). These resources should be identified through a goal setting process by mutual agreement.

Tier 2 - In addition to Tier 1, Tier 2 supports are more intensive in duration, frequency, and focus (e.g., engaging in a professional learning opportunity, observation of specific classroom practices, etc.) that can be either suggested by the educator and/or recommended by an evaluator.

Tier 3 - In addition to Tiers 1 and 2, Tier 3 supports are responsive to unresolved, previously discussed concerns and are developed in collaboration with the educator and may be assigned by the evaluator. Tier 3 supports have clearly articulated areas of focus, duration of time, and criteria for success, and may include a decision to move to a Corrective Support Plan. Tier 3 supports shall be developed in consultation with the evaluator, educator and their exclusive bargaining representative for certified educators chosen pursuant to C.G.S §10-153b. The start date and duration of time an educator is receiving this level of support should be clearly documented.

Corrective Support Plan - All three tiers of support must be implemented prior to the development of a corrective plan. The Corrective Support Plan is separate from the normal educator growth model and must contain:

- clear objectives specific to the well documented area of concern;
- resources, support, and interventions to address the area of concern;
- well defined timeframes for implementing the resources, support, and interventions; and
- supportive actions from the evaluator.

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 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. The Corrective Support Plan shall be developed in consultation with the evaluator, educator and their exclusive bargaining representative for certified educators chosen pursuant to C.G.S §10-153b. At the conclusion of the Corrective Support Plan period, a number of outcomes are possible as determined in consultation with the evaluator, educator, and bargaining unit representative.

Complementary Observers

Adapted from the CT SEED Handbook 2017

The primary evaluator for most teachers will be the school principal or assistant principal who will be responsible for the overall evaluation process. The primary evaluator for administrators will be the superintendent who will be responsible for the overall evaluation process. Some districts may also decide to use complementary observers to assist the primary evaluator. Complementary observers are certified educators/leaders. They may have specific content knowledge, such as department heads or curriculum coordinators. Complementary observers must be fully trained as evaluators in order to be authorized to serve

in this role.

Complementary observers may assist primary evaluators by conducting observations, including collecting additional evidence, reviewing CAPA strategy/goal focus statements, and providing additional feedback. A complementary observer should share their feedback with the primary evaluator as it is collected and shared with educators.

Primary evaluators will have responsibility for the written summary and completion of PELROP determination. Both primary evaluators and complementary observers must demonstrate proficiency in conducting standards-based observations.

Evaluator Training: Ensuring Fairness, Accuracy, and Calibration

Adapted from the CT SEED Handbook 2017

All evaluators, including complementary observers, are expected to complete comprehensive training on the PELROP Evaluation and Support model. The purpose of training is to provide evaluators of educators/leaders with the tools, support, and community necessary to use the PELROP process to foster meaningful professional learning, feedback, and growth in high-leverage areas that results in improved practice and outcomes for each learner.

Comprehensive PELROP training will support evaluators in learning to:

- Explain PELROP's purpose, process, and alignment to professional learning across an educator/leader's career.
- Use deep understanding of high-leverage practices aligned to CCT standards to support goal setting, feedback, and improved learning aligned to high-leverage indicators.
- Use the CAPA framework to multiple measures/evidences to provide focused and effective feedback for improved practice and outcomes.

PELROP training may be regional or customized by district and can be informed by guidance developed by the local PDEC. Ongoing calibration activities will ensure common practices and continuous individual and collective improvement beyond the initial training for evaluators.

Dispute-Resolution Process

The local board of education shall include a process for resolving disputes in cases where the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on goals/objectives, the evaluation period, feedback or the professional development plan. When such agreement cannot be reached, the issue in dispute will be referred for resolution to a subcommittee of the PDEC. The superintendent and the respective collective bargaining unit for the district will each select one representative from the PDEC to constitute this subcommittee, as well as a neutral party as mutually agreed upon between the superintendent and the collective bargaining unit. In the event that the designated committee does not reach a unanimous decision, the issue shall be considered by the superintendent whose decision shall be binding.

The purpose of the dispute resolution process is to secure at the lowest possible administrative level equitable solutions to disagreements, which from time to time may arise related to the evaluation process. The right of appeal is available to all in the evaluation and support system. As our evaluation and support system is designed to ensure continuous, constructive, and cooperative processes among professional educators, educators/leaders and their evaluators are encouraged to resolve disagreements informally.

Ultimately, should an educator disagree with the evaluator's assessment and feedback, the parties are encouraged to discuss these differences and seek common understanding of the issues. As a result of these discussions, the evaluator may choose to adjust the report but is not obligated to do so. The educator being evaluated has the right to provide a statement identifying areas of concern with the goals/objectives, evaluation period, feedback, and/or professional development plan, which may include the individual professional learning plan or a Corrective Support Plan.

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

Process

The educator/leader being evaluated shall be entitled to collective bargaining representation at all levels of the process.

1. Within three school days of articulating the dispute in writing to their evaluator, the educator being evaluated and the evaluator will meet with the objective of resolving the matter informally.
2. If there has been no resolution, the individual may choose to continue the dispute resolution process in writing to the superintendent or designee within three workdays of the meeting with their evaluator (step 1). The educator/leader being evaluated may choose between two options.
 - a. **Option 1** - The issue in dispute may be referred for resolution to a subcommittee of the PDEC, which will serve as a neutral party. The superintendent or designee and the respective collective bargaining unit for the district may each select one representative from the PDEC to constitute this subcommittee, as well as a neutral party as a mutually agreed upon between the superintendent and the collective bargaining unit. It is the role of the subcommittee to determine the resolution of the dispute and to identify any actions to be taken moving forward and to notify the superintendent of the decision.
 - b. **Option 2** - The individual being evaluated may request that the superintendent arbitrate the issue in dispute. In this case, the superintendent will review all applicable documentation and meet with both parties (evaluator and educator being evaluated) as soon as possible, but no longer than five school days from the date of the written communication to the superintendent. The superintendent will act as arbitrator and make a final decision, which shall be binding.

Time Limits

1. Since it is important that appeals be processed as rapidly as possible, the number of days indicated within this plan shall be considered maximum. The time limits specified may be extended by written agreement of both parties.

2. Days shall mean workdays. Both parties may agree, however, to meet during breaks at mutually agreed upon times.
3. The individual being evaluated must initiate the appeals procedure within five workdays of the scheduled meeting in which the feedback was presented. If no written initiation of a dispute is received by the evaluator within five workdays, the educator shall be considered to have waived the right of appeal.
4. The individual being evaluated must initiate each level of the appeal process within the number of days indicated. The absence of a written appeal at any subsequent level shall be considered as waiving the right to appeal further.

Local and State Reporting

The superintendent shall report:

1. the status of educator/leader evaluations to the local or regional board of education on or before June 1 of each year; and
2. the status of the implementation of the educator/leader evaluation and support program, including the frequency of evaluations, the number of educators/leaders 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.

PELROP Resources

[PELROP Documentation Template](#)

[PELROP Success Criteria](#)

[PELROP Written Summary Template](#)

[ROP/CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation 2023 Crosswalk](#)

[Teacher/Service Delivery Provider High Leverage Practice Single Point Competencies](#)

Sources Referenced/Consulted

Connecticut State Department of Education. Connecticut Leader and Educator Evaluation and Support Plans 2024, <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/sde/evaluation-and-support/ctleadereducatorevalsupportplan2024.pdf>

Connecticut State Department of Education. *The Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT) Rubric for Effective Teaching 2017*, <https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/Evaluation-and-Support/CCTRubricForEffectiveTeaching2017.pdf?la=en>

“Developing Efficacy Through Teacher Evaluations,” Hanover Research, June, 2022, 4401 Wilson Blvd #4th, Arlington, VA 22203

Donaldson, Morgaen L. *Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Teacher Evaluation: Understanding the Research and Theory*. Routledge, 2021. Kindle.

“Educator Evaluation and Support Council 2022.” *CT.gov - Connecticut’s Official State Website*, portal.ct.gov/SDE/Evaluation-and-Support/Educator-Evaluation-and-Support-Council. Accessed 20 July 2023.

Hattie, John, and Shirley Clarke. *Visible Learning: Feedback*. Routledge, 2019.

“SEED Handbook - Ct.Gov.” *Educator Evaluation*, 2017, https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/SDE/SEED/2017_SEED_Handbook.pdf

Tepper, Amy, and Patrick Flynn. *Learner-Focused Feedback: 19 Strategies to Observe for Impact*. Corwin, a SAGE Company, 2020.