

# Woodbridge School District Educator Evaluation and Professional Learning Plan



Revised: July 2024

## **Woodbridge School District**

### Board of Education

Lynn Piascyk, Chair	Dr. Lauren Francese	Dr. Jay Dahya
Sarah Beth Del Prete Secretary	Brooke Hopkins	Jeff Hughes
Steven Lawrence, Vice Chair	Dr. Michael Strambler	Erin Williamson

### Superintendent of Schools

Vonda Tencza

### Professional Development/Educator Evaluation Committee Members 2023-2024

Analisa Sherman, Principal - Co-Chair  
Mary Vincitorio, WEA President - Co-Chair  
Carrie Borcharding, Director of Special Services  
Maria DePalma, Teacher  
Kris Hart Rooney, Teacher  
BJ Ahern, Teacher  
Lisa Rosner, Teacher  
Jen Nickle, Literacy Specialist  
Suzanne Sugarman, Paraeducator & CSEA President

## Table of Contents

Introduction: Reimagining Educator Evaluation and Support	3
Mission, Vision and Beliefs of Woodbridge School District/Beecher Road School	3
Guiding Principles	4
Standards and Criteria for Educators	5
Continuous Learning Process	5
Timeline	6
Definition of Cohorts	6
Training/Orientation Meeting & Ongoing Training	7
Initial Goal Meeting	8
Mid-year Meeting	8
End of year Meeting	9
Observation of Professional Practice and Feedback	9
Tiered Supports	10
Corrective Support Plan	11
Dispute Resolution	11
Confidentiality	13
Appendix A: Forms	14
Appendix B: CT Code of Professional Responsibility for Teachers	14
Appendix C: CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching	14
Appendix D: CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery	14
Administrator Evaluation Plan	15- end

## Introduction: Reimagining Educator Evaluation and Support

On February 14, 2024, the Connecticut State Board of Education adopted the Connecticut Leader and Educator Evaluation and Support Plans 2024. The design of the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation and Support represent research based effective practice and include six elements:

- Standards and Criteria
- Goal Setting Process
- Professional practice and educator growth
- Evaluation/observation/stakeholder feedback and engagement
- Process elements
- Dispute resolution

Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Committee members developed the contents of this plan during the 2023-2024 school year. Some of the language in this plan comes directly from the CSDE CT Leader and Educator Evaluation and Support Plans 2024 which can be found [here](#).

## Mission, Vision and Beliefs of Beecher Road School/Woodbridge School District

### **Mission:**

Beecher Road School is a caring, creative community that models and inspires the joy of lifelong learning, embraces diversity, and celebrates the unique qualities of each person.

### **Vision:**

To provide a dynamic educational environment that challenges and empowers students to persevere as innovators and collaborators in preparation for their role as responsible global citizens.

### **We believe that:**

- All students can learn and it is the responsibility of our school system to provide the supports needed to reach high standards and success.
- Academic skills must meet the expectations of the CT Core Standards. The skills and attributes needed for success in the 21st century include critical thinking, collaboration, creativity, curiosity, problem solving, and citizenship.

- Meeting academic, artistic, behavioral, social, emotional, and physical needs is essential in educating the whole child.
- We have a responsibility to prepare our students for a rapidly changing world that includes the integration and use of technology.
- Our educational community will continue to grow and improve when all our staff members are expected and supported to learn.
- Our district has a responsibility to inform and engage the community as partners in education.
- Fiscal responsibility is a foundational tenet of our school system.

## Guiding Principles

The transformational design of the educator evaluation and support model is grounded in six guiding principles that use high quality professional learning to advance educator practice and student learning, growth, and achievement.

- Allow for differentiation of roles (for example for leaders: assistant superintendents, director of pupil services, various leaders in central office, principal, assistant principal; or for educators: teachers, counselors, instructional coaches, student support staff).
- Simplify and reduce the burden (eliminate technical challenges, paperwork, steps).
- Focus on things that matter (identify high leverage 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 development).
- Focus on educator growth and agency (meaningfully engage professionals by focusing on growth and practice in partnership with others aligned to a strategic focus).
- 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.

## Standards and Criteria for Educators

The primary goal of the educator evaluation and support system is to strengthen individual pedagogy and collective practices to increase student learning, growth and achievement. Educator practices are based on a set of state performance standards. The following professional practice standards will be utilized:

- ◆ CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery (2017)
- ◆ CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching (2017)

**All Woodbridge educators/leaders are assigned a primary evaluator that holds an active and utilized 092 certification.**

## Continuous Learning Process

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.

During each school year, a minimum of three check-ins provide an opportunity for a reciprocal discussion of what is happening in the classroom or school, a sharing of evidence of professional learning and impact on growth, and identification of needs and mutually agreed upon next steps. The meetings are approached in a spirit of continuous improvement, reflection, and collaboration. Dialogue is important, however, there must be a balance of written and verbal feedback provided between check-ins based on observations and reviews of practice as required by the plan.

## Timeline

Training/Orientation	Completed by September 30
Initial Goal Meeting	Completed by October 31
Mid-Year Meeting	Completed by mid-February
End of Year Meeting	Completed by mid-June

Additional Timelines of observations are specific to the Cohort the teacher is part of. See the chart under 'Definition of Cohorts.'

## Definition of Cohorts

<b>COHORT 1</b>	<p><b>Who:</b> New to profession (first four years) OR teachers who were non-tenured in a previous district</p> <p><b>What:</b> 4 observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 informal observations before December</li> <li>• 1 Formal before March</li> <li>• 1 informal observation (which can be a review of practice) before June</li> </ul> <p>*Written and verbal feedback within five school days of observation          *Additional observations as mutually agreed upon or deemed necessary</p> <p><b>Timeline:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training/Orientation: Completed by September 30</li> <li>• Initial Goal Meeting: Completed by October 31</li> <li>• 2 Informal Observations: Completed before December 31</li> <li>• Mid-Year Meeting: Completed by mid-February</li> <li>• 1 Formal Observation: Completed by March 30</li> <li>• 1 Informal Observation/Review of Practice: Completed by June</li> <li>• End of Year Meeting: Completed by mid-June</li> </ul>
<b>COHORT 2</b>	<p><b>Who:</b> Educators who have taught in previous districts and received tenure (2 years)</p>

	<p><b>What:</b> 3 observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 informal observation before December</li> <li>• 1 formal before March</li> <li>• 1 informal observation (which can be a review of practice) before June</li> </ul> <p>*Written and verbal feedback within five school days of observation *Additional observations as mutually agreed upon or deemed necessary</p> <p><b>Timeline:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training/Orientation: Completed by September 30</li> <li>• Initial Goal Meeting: Completed by October 31</li> <li>• 1 Informal Observations: Completed before December 31</li> <li>• Mid-Year Meeting: Completed by mid-February</li> <li>• 1 Formal Observation: Completed by March 30</li> <li>• 1 Informal Observation/Review of Practice: Completed by June</li> <li>• End of Year Meeting: Completed by mid-June</li> </ul>
<b>COHORT 3</b>	<p><b>Who:</b> Educators who have completed Cohorts 1 or 2 at BRS</p> <p><b>What:</b> 2 observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 informal observations (1 of which can be a review of practice) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1 to be completed by December</li> <li>○ 1 to be completed before June</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>*Written and verbal feedback within five school days of observation *Additional observations as mutually agreed upon or deemed necessary</p> <p><b>Timeline:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training/Orientation: Completed by September 30</li> <li>• Initial Goal Meeting: Completed by October 31</li> <li>• 1 Informal Observations: Completed before December 31</li> <li>• Mid-Year Meeting: Completed by mid-February</li> <li>• 1 Informal Observation/Review of Practice: Completed by June</li> <li>• End of Year Meeting: Completed by mid-June</li> </ul>

\*Modified schedule per date of hire.

**Ongoing Training yearly for both returning and new staff will be conducted for all stakeholders to ensure that everyone understands the differentiated supports and processes available to facilitate success.**

Training/Orientation - by September 30

To begin the evaluation process, evaluators meet with teachers, in a group or individually. The purpose of this orientation is to provide a broad overview of the evaluation process and their roles and responsibilities within that process. This training also provides an opportunity for evaluators to share district and school goals. This orientation shall also include:

- High leverage goal setting and professional learning plans
- Use of rubrics and standards
- Information on tiered supports
- Information on dispute resolution

#### Initial Goal Meeting - by October 31

The initial goal setting meeting includes a dialogue between the educator and their evaluator around the educator's initial self-reflection, which is based on a review of evidence and an analysis of their own practice to identify and support an area for educator practice and growth, and student learning, growth, and achievement. The educator and evaluator come to mutual agreement on high leverage professional practice one-, two- or three-year goal(s), multiple measures of evidence (at least two measures), professional learning plan, and support that is consistent with their professional status and goals to drive progress toward goal attainment. The educator must also choose which rubric they will be utilizing to address their goal. The two rubric choices are:

- ◆ CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery (2017)
- ◆ CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching (2017)

Beginning educators in the Teacher Education and Mentoring (TEAM) Program, consideration will be given for alignment between professional learning and their TEAM modules.

#### Mid-year Meeting - by mid-February

The midyear check-in consists of reciprocal dialogue between the educator and evaluator and includes an educator self-reflection on their progress toward their goal(s) so far. The reflection shall include an analysis of the impact of their learning on their practice, student learning, growth and achievement and the school community. During this meeting:

- Educators self-reflect and review multiple and varied qualitative and quantitative indicators of evidence of impact on educator's growth, professional practice, and impact on student learning, growth, and achievement with their evaluator.

- The evaluator provides specific, standards-based feedback related to the educator's goal. Observation feedback and evidence aligned to the rubric chosen by the educator during the goal setting process.
- The midyear conversation is a crucial progress check-in. The midyear check-in provides an opportunity to discuss evidence, learning, and next steps. It is at this point that revisions to the educator's goal(s) may be considered based on multiple measures of evidence.

#### End of year Meeting - by mid-June

End-of-year reflection provides an opportunity for the educator and evaluator to engage in reciprocal dialogue, similar to the midyear check-in, to discuss progress toward the educator's goal(s); professional learning as it relates to the educator'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 of new learning on educator practice and growth, impact on student learning, growth and achievement, school community, strengths and concerns, and possible next steps for the upcoming year. Analysis of evidence from the end-of-year summary is important for the educator's subsequent self-assessment and goal setting revisions or new goal. The evaluator 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.

#### Observation of Professional Practice and Feedback

Throughout the evaluation process, evaluators will provide educators with feedback from observations and dialogue, ensure access to supports needed, and collect evidence of educator performance and practice towards their goal(s) through multiple sources, which include observations. This may also include student, staff or family feedback.

Observations occur throughout the continuous learning process. The identified high leverage goal(s) provides a focus for strategic evidence collection and feedback. Evaluators provide educators with specific feedback based on evidence, standards, and the educator's goal; ensure timely access to planned support(s); and continue to collect evidence of educator practice and progress toward goal(s) through multiple sources of evidence, including observation. Feedback, written or verbal, is provided within five school days.

“...when feedback is combined with effective instruction in classrooms, it can be very powerful in enhancing learning.” Hattie, 2019

Quality feedback:

- 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 questions for reflection to refine or revise strategies
- Expands understanding of one’s experiences and their implications for future experiences
- Provides reflective opportunities to rework, refine, and reorder knowledge, attitudes, skills, and/ or practices
- Is timely, frequent and reciprocal

## Tiered Supports

All 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, within an evaluation process. All three tiers of support must be implemented prior to the development of a corrective 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 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 the Woodridge Education Association, if necessary.

**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, inclusive of, but not limited to, 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 Tier 1 and Tier 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 the Woodbridge Education Association (WEA). The start date and duration of time an educator is receiving this level of support should be clearly documented.

### 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 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 educator and a member of the Woodbridge Education Association (WEA).

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
- supportive actions from the evaluator.

At the conclusion of the Corrective Support Plan period, a number of outcomes are possible as determined in consultation with the evaluator, educator, and WEA representative.

### Dispute Resolution

A panel, composed of the superintendent, teacher union president and a neutral third person, shall resolve disputes where the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on objectives/goals, the evaluation period, feedback on performance and practice, or final summative rating. Resolutions must be topic specific and timely. Should the process established not result in resolution of a given issue, the determination regarding that issue will be made by the superintendent.

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.

**Claims that the district has failed to follow the established procedures of the evaluation and support program shall be subject to the grievance procedures set forth by the current collective bargaining agreement.**

**Process:**

The educator 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 his/her/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 his/her/their evaluator (step 1). The educator being evaluated may choose between two options.

- a. Option 1: The issue in dispute may be referred for resolution to a subcommittee of the Professional Development and Evaluation Committee (PDEC), which will serve as a neutral party\*. The superintendent 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 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.

*\*In the instance that a district is too small to have a full PDEC from which to select three individuals, the superintendent and educator may select three mutually agreed upon persons to serve as the neutral party for resolving the dispute. Each individual must be a Connecticut certified educator and may or may not be from within the district.*

b. Option 2: The educator being evaluated requests that the superintendent solely 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 educator 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 educator 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.

Confidentiality
-----------------

All evaluative reports are strictly confidential. A copy of the evaluation will be placed in the educator's personnel file.

## Appendix A: Forms

[Teacher Evaluation Process Spreadsheet](#)

[Educator Corrective Support Plan Sample](#)

[Educator Sample Reflection Questions](#)

[Educator Growth Criteria and Evidence](#)

## Appendix B

[CT Code of Professional Responsibility for Teachers](#)

## Appendix C

[CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching \(2017\)](#)

## Appendix D

[CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery \(2017\)](#)

## Woodbridge School District

### Administrator Evaluation, Professional Learning, and Support Plan 2024

#### **Introduction:** Reimagining Educator and Leader Evaluation and Support

*On February 14, 2024, the Connecticut State Board of Education adopted the Connecticut Leader and Educator Evaluation and Support Plans 2024. The design of the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation and Support represent research-based effective practice and include six elements:*

- *Standards and criteria*
- *Goal setting process*
- *Professional practice and educator growth*
- *Evaluator/observer/stakeholder feedback and engagement*
- *Process elements*
- *Dispute resolution*

*Much of the language in this plan comes directly from the CSDE CT Leader and Educator Evaluation and Support Plans 2024 ([link to document](#))*

#### **Vision**

All Connecticut educators and leaders have the opportunity for continuous learning and feedback, to develop and grow, both individually and collectively, through the educator and leader evaluation and support system so that all Connecticut students experience growth and success. Guiding Principles

#### **Guiding Principles**

The transformational design of the leader evaluation and support model is grounded in guiding principles that use high quality professional learning to advance leader practice, educator practice, and student learning, growth, and achievement.

- Allow for differentiation of roles (director of pupil services, principal, assistant principal)
- Simplify and reduce the burden (eliminate technical challenges, paperwork, steps).
- Focus on things that matter (identify high leverage 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 development).
- Focus on leader growth and agency (meaningfully engage professionals by focusing on growth and practice in partnership with others aligned to a strategic focus).
- 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.

The combined vision, guiding principles, and overall framework for educators and leaders' evaluation and support describe a systematic process of continuous improvement and professional learning leading to high quality professional practice and improved outcomes for students. While components are similar for educators and leaders, there are components specific

to educators and to leaders, resulting in this specific set of guidelines for Woodbridge Administrators, as part of the district's evaluation and support system. The plan is ambitious, but many key ingredients for success already exist. The professional staff of the Woodbridge School District is a highly capable, talented group of teachers led by highly skilled, dedicated school administrators. The strategy is to pursue a systematic approach to evaluation and professional development through the design and implementation of two aligned plans: The Teacher Evaluation and Professional Learning Plan and the Administrator Evaluation and Professional Learning Plan. These plans are built upon a solid base of collegiality and trust and linked by the common goal of expanding the range and depth of student learning.

### **Standards and Criteria for Leaders**

One of the primary goals of the leader evaluation and support system is to ensure the growth and development of Woodbridge staff so they in turn may develop and enhance personal and professional strengths to meet the needs of all learners. Leader practice discussions are based on a set of national or state performance standards set by professional organizations and mutually agreed upon by the PDEC. The professional practice standards, Professional Standards for School Leaders (PSEL) ([link](#)) ground this model's framework. The identified rubric from Maryland's SDE October 2019 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders Rubric ([link](#)) accompanies the standards to serve as support for self-evaluation, dialogue, and feedback.

Professional learning is essential to the CT Guidelines 2023 model. Learning Forward Professional Learning Standards 2022, ([link](#)) serve as a useful tool to illustrate how professional learning can deepen educator and leader knowledge, promote reflection, and maximize leader impact. 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 leaders, educators and professional learning work together to lay the foundation for meaningful feedback and continuous learning.

**All Woodbridge leaders are assigned a primary evaluator that holds a 092 or 093.**

### **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 leaders 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 leader serves as the learner who actively engages in and directs their learning and feedback. The evaluator serves as a learning partner who supports the leader through the learning and growth process. Within the process, the leader collaborates and serves as a reflective practitioner to determine mutually

agreed upon leader goal(s), professional practice and leader growth, and observation/site visit and feedback focus.

Within the continuous learning process, leaders check in with their evaluator a minimum of three times a year (fall goal setting, midyear check-in, and end-of-year reflection) to provide an opportunity for a reciprocal discussion of what is happening in the school or district, a sharing of evidence of professional learning and impact on growth, and identification of needs and mutually agreed upon next steps. The meetings are approached in a spirit of continuous improvement, reflection, and collaboration. Dialogue is important, however, there must be a balance of written and verbal feedback provided between check-ins based on observations/site visits, reviews of practice, and artifacts as required by the district plan, which must be provided periodically. Effective feedback is tied to standards and identifies strengths and areas of focus for growth.

At the core, educators and students learn best when educational leaders foster safe, caring, supportive learning communities, and promote rigorous curricula and instructional and assessment systems. This work requires educational leaders to build and strengthen a network of organizational supports — the professional capacity of teachers and staff; the professional community in which they learn and work; family and community engagement; and effective, efficient management and operations of the school/ district. In all their work, educational leaders are driven by the district/school's mission, vision, and the shared regional portrait of a graduate. They are called to act ethically and with professional integrity, and they promote equity and cultural responsiveness. Finally, educational leaders believe their district/schools, educators, and they themselves, can continuously grow. They are tenacious change agents who model transformational leadership (adapted from PSEL Standards).

Orientation on the leader evaluation and support process shall take place prior to the start of the process, no later than October 15. The orientation shall include:

- High leverage goal setting and professional learning plans
- Use of rubrics and standards
- Observation of practice/site visits
- Tiered supports
- Dispute resolution

Annual training for evaluators as required by C.G.S. 10-151b will include engaging in and providing reciprocal feedback tied to standards and evidence of professional practice.

**Ongoing Training yearly for both returning and new staff will be conducted for all stakeholders to ensure that everyone understands the differentiated supports and processes available to facilitate success.**

#### **Goal(s) Setting (Completed by November 1)**

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 'Definition of Cohorts' Section). Goals should always be connected to standards identified in this document.

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. 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 by March 1):**

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 by June 30)**

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.

### **Professional Practice and Leader Growth**

The implementation of the continuous learning process is shared between the leader and evaluator. For the duration of the learning process, leaders pursue learning and attainment of their goal(s), collecting evidence of practice related to their high leverage professional learning goal. Evaluators will provide leaders with feedback from observations of professional practice/site visits and dialogue, ensure timely access to support and collect evidence of leader performance and practice toward goal(s) through multiple sources, including site visits, student and staff feedback, or family engagement (See ‘Definition of Cohorts’ Section).

### **Observation of Professional Practice/Site Visits and Feedback**

Observation of professional practice or site visits occur throughout the continuous learning process. The identified high leverage goal(s) provides a focus for strategic evidence collection and feedback. Evaluators provide leaders with feedback based on evidence, standards, and the educator’s goal(s); ensure timely access to planned support(s); and collect evidence of leader practice and progress toward goal(s) through multiple sources of evidence including site visits, feedback, written or verbal, that is provided within five school days.

“Feedback is defined as a dynamic, dialogic process that uses evidence to engage a learner, internally or with a learning partner, in constructing knowledge about practice and self. Its primary purpose is learning that guides change” (Killion, 2019).

Quality feedback:

- 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 questions for reflection to refine or revise strategies
- Expands understanding of one’s experiences and their implications for future experiences
- Provides reflective opportunities to rework, refine, and reorder knowledge, attitudes, skills, and/or practices
- Is timely, frequent, and reciprocal

### **Definition of Cohorts**

<b>Cohort 1</b>		<b>Cohort 2</b>	
<b>Who</b>	• New to leadership role (e.g., principal from assistant principal etc.; first two (2) years)	<b>Who</b>	• Leaders who have successfully completed Cohort 1 in Woodbridge District

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New to Woodbridge District (first two (2) years)</li> </ul>		
<b>What</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three observations of professional practice and/or site visits</li> <li>• Feedback written and verbal within five school days</li> <li>• Additional observations of professional practice and/or site visits as mutually agreed upon or deemed necessary</li> </ul>	<b>What</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two observations of professional practice and/or site visits</li> <li>• Feedback written and/or verbal within five school days</li> <li>• Additional observations of professional practice and/or site visits as mutually agreed upon or deemed necessary</li> </ul>

## 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

[See appendix C for further detail.](#)

## Tiered Support and Corrective Support Planning

All leaders require access to high-quality, targeted professional learning support to improve practice over time. Leaders 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 a 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. The Corrective Support Plan shall be developed in consultation with the evaluator, leader and their exclusive bargaining representative (WASA).

### Tier 1

It is the expectation that all leaders consistently access opportunities for professional growth within the Woodbridge district. Tier 1 supports are broadly accessible professional learning opportunities for all, inclusive of, but not limited to, collegial conversations, school site visits, available district resources (e.g., books, articles, videos, etc.), formal professional learning opportunities, and other leader supports (e.g., leadership 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., observation of specific leadership practices, etc.) that can be either suggested by the leader and/or recommended by an evaluator.

### **Tier 3**

In addition to Tier 1 and Tier 2, Tier 3 supports are responsive to unresolved, previously discussed concerns that are collaboratively discussed and may be assigned by an 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, leader and a WASA exclusive bargaining representative for certified leaders 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 ([see appendix H](#)).

### **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 a 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. The Corrective Support Plan shall be developed in consultation with the evaluator, leader and an exclusive bargaining representative for certified leaders chosen pursuant to C.G.S. §10-153b.

#### **The Corrective Support Plan must contain:**

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

At the conclusion of the Corrective Support Plan period, a number of outcomes are possible as determined in consultation with the evaluator, leader and bargaining unit representative.

[See appendix H](#) for a Corrective Support Plan form and example.

### **Dispute Resolution**

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 a leader 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 leader 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 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.

**Claims that the district has failed to follow the established procedures of the evaluation and support program shall be subject to the grievance procedures set forth by the current collective bargaining agreement.**

## **Process**

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

Within three school days of articulating the dispute in writing to his/her/their evaluator, the leader being evaluated and the evaluator will meet with the objective of resolving the matter informally. 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 his/her/their evaluator.

As Woodbridge/Beecher Road School is a one-school district and therefore has limitations on PDEC staff availability, the superintendent and leader may select three mutually agreed upon persons to serve as the neutral party for resolving the dispute. Each individual must be a Connecticut certified leader and may or may not be from within the district. The superintendent or designee and the respective collective bargaining unit for the district may each select one representative to constitute this subcommittee, as well as a neutral party as 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.

## **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 leader 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 leader shall be considered to have waived the right of appeal.
4. The leader 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.

All evaluative reports are strictly confidential. The evaluator and the administrator are expected to sign one copy of the evaluation report, which will be placed in his/her personnel file.

## Appendix- Forms

[Leader Evaluation Process Spreadsheet](#)

Additional Materials for reference:

[Sample Reflection Questions for Leaders](#)

[Example Evidence Types for Leaders](#)

[Sample Corrective Support Plan- Leaders](#)