

Groton Public Schools

Groton, Connecticut

2015-2016

Groton Educator Evaluation, Development and Support Plan For Certified Personnel

April 29, 2015



In compliance with
Connecticut General Statutes
Subsection (a) of Sec. 10-151b (C.G.S.), as amended by P.A. 13-245

Groton Board of Education Members

Kimberly Watson, Chairperson
Rita Volkmann, Vice Chairperson
Andrea Ackerman, Ed.D.
Patricia Doyle
Katrina Fitzgerald
Elizabeth Gianacoplos
Mary Kelly
Joey Schick, Jr.
Jay Weitlauf

Central Office Administrative Staff

Dr. Michael Graner, Superintendent of Schools
Susan Austin, Assistant Superintendent
Michael Emery, Director of Teaching and Learning
Don Meltabarger, Business Manager
Laurie LePine, Human Resource Director
Sam Kilpatrick, Director of Buildings and Grounds
Denise Doolittle, Director of Pupil Personnel Services

**2015-2016 Groton Teaching and Learning Collaborative Evaluation
Sub Committee**

Laura Ambroise	Special Education Teacher Cutler Middle School
Susan Austin	Assistant Superintendent
Karen Bryer	K-12 Technology Coordinator
Chris Dauphinais	Principal Catherine Kolnaski STEAM Magnet School
Donna Duley	Assistant Principal, Charles Barnum Elementary School
Bridgett Ellis	Special Education Teacher Claude Chester/Charles Barnum Elementary School
Michelle Gaiewski	Kindergarten Teacher, Charles Barnum Elementary School
Jamie Giordano	Principal, Claude Chester Elementary School
Terrence Henkle	Science Coordinator
Beth Horler	Kindergarten Teacher, SB Butler Elementary School Groton Education Association, President
Dave Laffargue	Art Teacher Catherine Kolnaksi STEAM Magnet School
Laurie LePine	Director of Human Resources
Judy Leonard	Assistant Principal, Northeast Academy

Carol Marsiglio

Math Interventionist, Claude Chester

Jane Potts

First Grade, Mary Morrison Elementary School

**2014 – 2015 Groton Teaching and Learning Collaborative Evaluation
Sub Committee**

Andrea Ackerman, Ed.D.	Board of Education
Peter Bass	Assistant Principal, Robert E. Fitch High School AGSA President
Karen Bryer	K-12 Technology Coordinator
Larry Croxton	Math Teacher, Robert E. Fitch High School Groton Education Association, Vice President
Chris Dauphinais	Principal Catherine Kolnaski STEAM Magnet School
Andrea Davis	6-12 English/LA Coordinator
Donna Duley	Elementary Coordinator
Michael Emery	6-12 Math Coordinator
Michelle Gaiewski	Kindergarten Teacher, Charles Barnum Elementary School
Jamie Giordano	Principal, Claude Chester Elementary School
Terrence Henkle	6-12, Science Coordinator
Elaine Hess	Library Media Specialist, West Side Middle School
Laura Hoinsky	Special Education Mary Morrison
Beth Horler	Kindergarten Teacher, SB Butler Elementary School Groton Education Association, President
Laura Johnson	Social Studies Teacher West Side Middle School
Dave Laffargue	Art Teacher Catherine Kolnaksi STEAM Magnet School

Desarae Latino-Davis	Special Education Teacher Northeast Academy
Judy Leonard	Assistant Principal Northeast Academy
Carol Marsiglio	Math Interventionist Claude Chester
Sean McKenna	Assistant Superintendent
Robert Pendolphi	Principal, Cutler Middle School
Stacy Popp	Fifth Grade Teacher, Pleasant Valley Elementary School
Jane Potts	First Grade, Mary Morrison Elementary School
Leslie Seifert	English Teacher, Robert E. Fitch High School

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENT	PAGE
A. Plan overview	9
Introduction	9
Purpose & Rationale	9
Responsibilities for Evaluation	11
B. Teacher Educators	13
Yearly Timelines in the Evaluation Process	15
Determining an Educator's Practice Rating	19
Educator Observation Cycles	19
Teacher Summative Evaluation Ratings	21
Teacher Practice: Observation of Teaching Practice 40%; Parent Feedback 10%	21
CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching	21
Determining Evaluation Ratings for Observations	23
Review of Practice for Teachers	23
Use of Stakeholder Feedback for All Educators	24
Student Outcomes: Student Learning 45% (SLO/IAGDs); Whole school learning indicator 5%	25
Determining an Educator's Whole-School Student Learning	27
Determining Summative Evaluation Rating	27
Training for all Educators	28

Determining Effective and Ineffective Educators	29
Educator Improvement and Remediation Plans	29
Dispute Resolution Procedure	32
Evaluator Rating Audit & Validation	33
C. Administrator Educators	35
Yearly Timelines in the Evaluation Process	37
Administrators Summative Evaluation ratings	41
Observation of Practice (40%) and Stakeholder Feedback (10%)	42
Formative Review for Administrators	43
Stakeholder Feedback (10%)	43
Student Learning Indicators (45%) and Teacher Effectiveness (5%)	43
Administrator Student Learning Objectives (SLO) 45%	44
Determining Teacher Effectiveness (5% of Evaluation)	49
Administrator's Leader Practice and Student Outcomes Rating	49
Linking Educator Evaluation to Professional Learning and Growth	52
Determining Effective and Ineffective Educators	53
Educator Improvement & Remediation Plan	53
Dispute Resolution Procedures	56
Evaluator Rating Audit & Validation	57
D. Appendices	59

Introduction

The educator evaluation, development and support process will be based on collaboration and a shared commitment to improve instruction and learning. Groton Public Schools honors the “vision for Teaching and Learning in Connecticut Public Schools” outlined in the Connecticut State Department of Education, 2010 Common Core of Teaching Foundational Skills:

“The philosophy behind the CCT is that teaching requires more than simply demonstrating a certain set of technical skills. It requires command of subject matter and pedagogical skills combined with caring deeply about students and their successes. Effective teaching also requires:

- a deep commitment to student achievement and the belief that all students should be challenged to achieve
- a willingness to work in collaboration with colleagues and families to meet the diverse learning needs of all students
- a commitment to analysis of one’s teaching and continuous professional development”

Groton Public Schools promotes the underlying premise that supervision, evaluation, collaboration and cooperation, and professional development and reflective practice in the areas of planning and preparation, classroom environment, instruction, and professional responsibility are essential to improve student learning.

Trust and confidence, promoted through conversation based on these key elements, are essential in implementing and maintaining successful educational programs, reflective practice, and a professional culture. A district-wide commitment to fostering a professional culture of lifelong learners, both teachers and students, is necessary for learning to thrive.

In Groton, educator is defined as any certified employee below the rank of Superintendent.

Purpose and Rationale

When educators succeed, students succeed. Research has proven that no school-level factor matters more to students’ success than high-quality teachers and effective leaders. The purpose of the new evaluation and support model is to fairly and accurately evaluate educator performance and to help each educator strengthen his/her practice to improve student learning.

To support our teachers and administrators, our goals are to

- clearly define excellent practice and results for all learners,
- give accurate, useful information about educators’ strengths and development areas,
- provide and discuss opportunities for professional learning, self-reflection, growth and recognition
- encourage creativity and innovation in teaching and leadership practices
- help identify supports which may need to be provided for educators.
- create and foster a professional learning community based on respect, trust, responsibility, collaboration and a shared vision of teaching and learning
- enhance an understanding of professional and ethical practices

Core Design Principles

Groton Public School's System for Educator development, growth, and support is based on the work of the Groton Teaching and Learning Collaborative Evaluation Subcommittee. The following principles guided the design of this model:

- Consider multiple standards-based measures of performance
- Emphasize growth over time
- Promote both professional judgment and consistency
- Foster dialogue about student learning
- Encourage aligned professional learning, coaching and feedback to support growth
- Ensure feasibility of implementation

The rationale for each principle follows:

Consider multiple standards-based measures of performance

This is an evaluation and support system that uses multiple sources of information and evidence results in a fair, accurate and comprehensive picture of an educator's performance. Our model defines four components of teacher effectiveness: *student learning* (45%), *teacher performance and practice* (40%), *parent feedback* (10%), and *school-wide student learning indicators* (5%). Our model defines four components of administrator effectiveness: *student learning* (45%), *administrator practice* (40%), *and stakeholder feedback* (10%), and *teacher effectiveness outcomes* (5%).

These four components are grounded in research-based standards for educator effectiveness, Common Core State Standards, as well as Connecticut's standards: The [Connecticut Common Core of Teaching \(CCT\)](#); the Common Core of Leading (CCL): Connecticut School Leadership Standards; the Connecticut Framework K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards; state assessments; and locally-developed curriculum standards.

Emphasize growth over time

The evaluation of an educator's performance should consider his/her improvement from an established starting point. This applies to professional practice focus areas and the student outcomes they are striving to reach. Attaining high levels of performance matters—and for some educators maintaining high results is a critical aspect of their work—but the model encourages educators to pay attention to continually improving their practice. The goal-setting process in this model encourages a cycle of continuous improvement over time.

Promote both professional judgment and consistency

Assessing an educator's professional practice requires evaluators to constantly use their professional judgment. No rubric or formula, however detailed, can capture all of the nuances in how teachers and leaders interact with one another and with students, and synthesizing multiple sources of information into performance ratings is inherently more complex than checklists or numerical averages. At the same time, educators' ratings should depend on their performance, not on their evaluators' biases. Accordingly, the model aims to minimize the variance between evaluations of practice and support fairness and consistency within and across schools.

Foster dialogue about student learning

In the quest for accuracy of ratings, there is a tendency to focus exclusively on the numbers. The model is designed to show that of equal importance to getting better results is the professional conversation between an educator and his/her supervisor which can be accomplished through a well-designed and well-executed evaluation system. The dialogue in the new model occurs more frequently and focuses on what students are learning and what administrators can do to support teaching and learning.

Encourage aligned professional learning, coaching and feedback to support growth

Novice and veteran educators alike deserve detailed, constructive feedback and professional learning tailored to the individual needs of their classrooms and students. The Groton Evaluation, Development and Support plan promotes a shared language of excellence to which professional learning, coaching and feedback can align to improve practice.

Ensure feasibility of implementation

Groton recognizes this new process requires patience, a more integrated approach to evaluation, and a growth mindset. Groton educators will integrate different components of their practice, including assessment, data analysis, instructional strategies, student, family, and collegial relationships and professional development. Appropriate resources, training and personnel need to be made available to ensure the successful implementation of this important work. However, a balance of high expectations and flexibility for the time and resources within Groton Public Schools will help ensure success.

RESPONSIBILITIES FOR EVALUATION

Evaluator

Evaluatee

Coordinators & Special
Education Supervisors in consultation
with Building Principal

Educators, Itinerant Educators, Pupil Personnel

Assistant Principal in consultation
with Building Principal

Educators, Itinerant Educators

Principal

Assistant Principal, Educators, Itinerant Educators

Director of Pupil Personnel Services
in consultation with Building Principals

Supervisors, Educators, and Pupil Personnel

Assistant Superintendents

Building Principals, District Coordinators, Central
Office Administrators

Superintendent

Assistant Superintendent, Central Office
Administrators, Building Principal(s)

Status Report

A status report of educator evaluations will be presented to the Groton Board of Education at the end of the school year. A report to the Connecticut State Department of Education will be made by June 30.

Plan Review

The Groton Teaching and Learning Collaborative Evaluation Subcommittee will annually review the Groton Educator Evaluation, Development and Support Plan and compare to the current regulations from the Connecticut State Department of Education. The committee will take any appropriate actions according to their findings. The committee reserves the right to revise the plan according to feedback, data, and to be in compliance with state guidelines. In the event the committee recommends changes, the revised plan will be vetted by the state and the Groton Board of Education.

TEACHER EDUCATOR


TEACHER EDUCATOR

In order to determine an educator's summative evaluation ratings, the district will use the following:

A 'Student Outcomes Rating', based on multiple indicators of student growth and development (45%) and whole-school student learning (5%).

An 'Educator Practice Rating', based on observations of the educator's performance and practice (40%) and either peer or parent feedback (10%);
Evidence will be examined to determine summative ratings.

Scores from each of the four components will be combined to produce a summative performance rating designation of Exceeding, Meeting, Progressing, and Not Meeting.



YEARLY TIMELINES IN THE GROTON EDUCATOR EVALUATION, DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT PLAN

Month	Task	Year 1, 2, or Progressing or Not Meeting (F=3, I=2) *	Year 3, 4 with Meeting or Exceeding ratings (F=1, I=2,* 1 Review of Practice)	Cycle 1, Year 5+, with Meeting or Exceeding ratings (F=1*, 1 Review of Practice)	Cycle 2, 3, Year 5+, with Meeting or Exceeding ratings (I=3*, 1 Review of Practice)
August	Evaluator Orientation by Superintendent or Designee				
By September 30	Orientation for all staff members by Administrator to review the purpose, procedures, and forms used in the observation and evaluation process. For new staff hired prior to the first day of school, orientation will occur during the summer. For new staff hired after the first day of school, orientation will occur within fifteen (15) days of start date.				
By October ~ November	Educator reflections and goal setting prior to Goal Setting Conference. Proposed draft of goals and objectives to be submitted two (2) days prior to the Goal Setting Conference				
By November 15	Evaluator and educator will meet to discuss and finalize mutually agreed upon goals.				
By November 30		At least one (1) informal observation completed	At least one (1) informal observation completed	At least one (1) informal observation completed	
By December 15					At least one (1) informal observation completed
By January 15		At least one (1) formal observation completed	At least one (1) formal observation completed	At least one (1) formal observation completed	
By January 31		Memo to non-tenured staff indicating concerns that may lead to non-renewal	Memo to non-tenured staff indicating concerns that may lead to non-renewal		
By February 15	Mid-Year Check-In Conference	The Mid-Year Check-In Conference. Review of Practice.	The Mid-Year Check-In Conference. Review of Practice.	The Mid-Year Check-In Conference. Review of Practice.	The Mid-Year Check-In Conference. Review of Practice.
By March 15					At least two (2) informal observations completed
By May 15		All formal observations are completed	All formal observations are completed	All formal observations are completed	All informal observations are completed
By May 30		Summative Evaluation Conference and Review of Practice, including Self-Evaluation			
Prior to 5 days before last day of school			Summative Evaluation Conference and Review of Practice, including Self-Evaluation	Summative Evaluation Conference and Review of Practice, including Self-Evaluation	Summative Evaluation Conference and Review of Practice, including Self-Evaluation

* F=Formal Observation I=Informal Observation

See Appendix C for suggested monthly evidence checklist for educators.

Four Level Rating System

The CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation require the use of the following definitions to describe educator performance: (state wording is in parenthesis)

Exceeding (Exemplary)	Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
Meeting (Proficient)	Meeting indicators of performance
Progressing (Developing)	Meeting some indicators of performance but not others: <i>Inconsistently or partially demonstrating development of skills</i>
Not Meeting (Below Standard)	Not meeting indicators of performance

In the Groton Public Schools Educator Evaluation, Development, and Support plan, aligned with the CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, the term 'performance' will mean 'progress as defined by specific indicators.' These indicators will be mutually agreed upon between evaluator and educator. Progress will be demonstrated by representative evidence.

How those indicators will be selected is outlined in another section of this plan.

YEARLY TIMELINES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

***Unless otherwise noted, educator refers to all certified staff below the position of Superintendent. Depending on the job description of the educator, he/ she may be both an evaluator and an evaluatee.**

Evaluator Orientation by August of each school year

A yearly orientation for evaluators will be conducted by the superintendent or designee and they will provide material outlining the evaluation process and other information as appropriate. Process information provided in orientation must include the rubric used for assessing administrator practice, the instruments to be used to gather feedback from staff, families, and/or students and their alignment to the rubric, the process and calculation by which all evaluation elements will be integrated into an overall rating.

Orientation by September 30

An orientation will be conducted for all staff members. An administrator will review the purpose, procedures, and forms used in the observation and evaluation process. For new staff hired prior to the first day of school, orientation will occur during the summer. For new staff hired after the first day of school, orientation will occur within fifteen days of start date. Discussion topic will also include any school or district priorities that should be reflected in the teacher practice focus areas and student learning objectives (SLOs).

Educator Reflections and Goal Setting (prior to goal setting conference)

The educator will examine student data, prior year evaluation and survey results, and the appropriate rubric for his/her role (CCT or CCL) to draft a proposed performance and practice focus area, a feedback goal, and at least one student learning objective with multiple supporting indicators of academic growth (IAGDs). The educator may collaborate in grade-level or subject-

matter teams to support the goal-setting process. The proposed draft of goals and objectives needs to be submitted two days prior to the scheduled Goal Setting Conference.

By November 15 Goal Setting Conference

The evaluator and educator will meet to discuss and finalize mutually agreed upon goals. Guidance is provided for this step in another portion of this document. While the evaluator may request revisions to the proposed focus area(s), goals and objectives if they do not meet approval criteria based on SMART goals (Appendix E), the final goals will be mutually agreed upon between the evaluator and educator. Discussion will also include actions that the educator can take and supports the evaluator can provide to promote educator growth in his/her focus area. During this conference, the evaluator will provide guidance on how best to develop a multi-year professional growth plan. See Appendix A (Talent Development and Growth (Professional Practice Goal)).

By February 15 Mid-year Check-in conference

Mid-Year Check-in Conferences will be conducted using some of the guiding questions found in Appendix E. All Educators will conduct a mid-year Review of Practice. It is suggested that this review occur by February 15th. If needed, educators and evaluators can mutually agree to revisions on the strategies or approaches used and/or mid-year adjustments of SLOs to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignments). Discussion will also include actions that the educator can take and supports the evaluator can provide to promote educator growth in his/ her focus area.

The following chart represents a guideline for educator observations.

OBSERVATIONS TIMELINE			
Year 1, 2 or teachers with Progressing or Not Meeting rating.	Year 3, 4 with Meeting or Exceeding ratings	Teachers in year 5 or beyond, with Meeting or Exceeding ratings	
		Cycle 1	Cycle 2, 3
By November 30 at least one informal observation completed.	By November 30 at least one informal observation completed	By November 30 at least one informal observation completed	By December 15 at least one informal observation completed
By January 15 at least one formal observation completed <i>By January 31 memo to non-tenured staff indicating concerns that may lead to non-renewal</i>	By January 15 at least one formal observation completed <i>By January 31 memo to non-tenured staff indicating concerns that may lead to non-renewal</i>	By January 15 at least one formal observation completed	By March 15 at least two informal observations completed

By February 15 the Mid-Year Check in Conference and Review of Practice will be completed by this date.	By February 15 the Mid-Year Check in Conference and Review of Practice will be completed by this date.	By February 15 the Mid-Year Check in Conference and Review of Practice will be completed by this date.	By February 15 the Mid-Year Check in Conference and Review of Practice will be completed by this date.
By May 15 all formal observations are completed	By May 15 all formal observations are completed	By May 15 all formal observations are completed	By May 15 all informal observations are completed
By May 30: Summative Evaluation Conference Review of Practice Self-Evaluation	By May 30: Summative Evaluation Conference Review of Practice Self-Evaluation	Prior to 5 days before the last day of school: Summative Evaluation Conference Review of Practice Self-Evaluation	Prior to 5 days before the last day of school: Summative Evaluation Conference Review of Practice Self-Evaluation

End of Year Summative Review (Within 5 days prior to the last day of school.)

Educator Self-Assessment - The educator reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the evaluator. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas of development established in the goal setting conference. Summative Self Reflections will be submitted two days prior to the scheduled Summative Review.

The educator will collect multiple pieces of evidence from a representative sample of students. This evidence should be collected over the period of time and correlate to the Student Learning Objectives, review of practice and/ or professional growth goal.

Scoring – The evaluator reviews submitted evidence, self-assessments and observation data and uses this information to generate component ratings. The component ratings are combined to calculate scores for Educator Practice Related Indicators and Student Outcomes Related Indicators. These scores generate the final, summative rating. After all data, including state test data, are available, the evaluator may adjust the summative rating if the state test data would significantly change the Student-Related Indicators final rating. Note: Such revisions should take place as soon as state test data are available and before September 15.

End-of-Year Conference – The evaluator and the educator meet to discuss all evidence collected to date and to discuss component ratings. Additionally, the evaluator and educator will review the alignment of the existing professional growth plan to the findings from this conference. During this conference, the evaluator and educator may modify the professional growth plan to address needs for the future. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a

summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year and before June 30.

DETERMINING AN EDUCATOR'S PRACTICE RATING (40% OF EVALUATION)

The Educator Performance and Practice component is a comprehensive review of teaching practice conducted through multiple observations, which are evaluated against a standards-based rubric. It comprises 40% of the summative rating. Following observations, evaluators provide teachers with specific feedback to identify strong practice, to identify teacher development needs and to tailor support to meet those needs. While evaluation rubrics and observation time in and of themselves are not useful to teachers – it is the feedback, based on observations, that helps teachers reach their full potential. All teachers deserve the opportunity to grow and develop through observations and timely feedback. Teachers will receive feedback as related to the four domains in the following chart as applicable to the type of observation performed.

EDUCATOR OBSERVATION CYCLES

In the Groton Evaluation, Development and Support Plan, observations will be based on two cycles:

It is understood that observations will take place in the appropriate setting according to the job description of the evaluated educator. At least 2 of the 3 formal in class observations will have a pre-conference and all will have a post-conference with timely verbal and written feedback. For example, classroom teachers will be observed in the classroom setting, special area teachers will be observed within their content area.

Teacher Cycle:

Teachers in year 5 or beyond, with Meeting or Exceeding ratings will be on a three year cycle beginning in the 2014-2015 school year. During one year of the cycle, an educator will have one formal observation. During each of the other two years, an educator will have three informal observations in the appropriate setting (e.g. classroom setting for classroom teachers, etc.). Educators and evaluators can mutually agree to an additional formal observation. All teachers will conduct a Review of Practice annually with his/ her evaluator.

Teacher Cycle (Years 1, 2):

Beginning teachers participating in TEAM will have three formal observations in the appropriate setting and two informal observations in the appropriate setting in addition to completing TEAM requirements.

Teacher Cycle (Progressing or Not Meeting):

Teachers who have a previous year rating of Progressing or Not Meeting will have three formal observations in the appropriate setting and two informal observations in the appropriate setting and one Review of Practice.

Educators (year 3 and 4 with previous rating of Meeting or Exceeding), as well as teachers who are new to Groton Public Schools will have a minimum of two formal and two informal observations in an appropriate setting and one Review of Practice, provided they

receive a summative rating of Meeting or Exceeding. Teachers in this category completing the 2 years will enter Cycle 1 on the observation timeline the following year as long as they receive a Meeting or Exceeding rating.

For any teacher:

If a teacher receives a Not Meeting rating on an observation, the teacher will remain in or be moved to Teacher Cycle (Progressing or Not Meeting). Any teachers classified as progressing or not meeting must have a minimum of three formal in-class observations.

The support and remediation portion of this plan will be implemented for teachers with a Not Meeting End of Year Summative rating.

An evaluator may request additional formal or informal observations (for any teacher) if rating (progressing or not meeting) or situation determines one is needed.

Number of Formal & Informal Observation's for Teacher Educator

New Teacher or Teachers not in good standing (Progressing or Not Meeting)

Year 1 & 2	3-Formal / 2-Informal	1 Review of Practice
Progressing or Not Meeting	3-Formal / 2-Informal	1 Review of Practice
Year 3 & 4	2-Formal / 2-Informal	1 Review of Practice

Teachers in years 5 and beyond with Meeting or Exceeding ratings

	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3
	1-Formal / 0-Informal	0-Formal / 3-Informal	0-Formal / 3-Informal
	1 Review of Practice	1 Review of Practice	1 Review of Practice
2014-2015	Group A	Group B	Group C
2015-2016	Group C	Group A	Group B
2016-2017	Group B	Group C	Group A
2017-2018	Group A	Group B	Group C
2018-2019	Group C	Group A	Group B
2019-2020	Group B	Group C	Group A

Teachers Summative Evaluation ratings:

All teachers will be evaluated in four components, grouped into two major categories: Teacher Performance and Practice and Student Outcomes.

1. Teacher Practice Related Indicators: An evaluation of the core teacher performance and practices and skills that positively affect student learning. This category is comprised of two components: (a) Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice (40%) as defined in the Common Core of Teaching (CCT): Common Core of Teaching Rubric: Common Core of Service Delivery Rubric; (b) Parent Feedback (10%).
2. Student Outcomes Related Indicators: An evaluation of a teacher's contribution to student academic progress, at the school and classroom level. This category is comprised of two components: (a) (45%) is comprised of a SLO with multiple IAGD's (b) (5%) is comprised of the whole school learning indicator must be represented by the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators (45%) established for the administrator's evaluation rating. This focus should be determined by the building data team at the beginning of each school year.

Teacher Practice: Observation of Teaching Practice 40%; Parent Feedback 10%

CCT RUBRIC FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING 2014 - AT A GLANCE			
Evidence generally collected through in-class observations	<u>DOMAIN 1: Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning</u> <i>Teachers promote student engagement, independence and interdependence in learning and facilitate a positive learning community by:</i> 1a. Creating a positive learning environment that is responsive to and respectful of the learning needs of all students. 1b. Promoting developmentally appropriate standards of behavior that support a productive learning environment for all students. 1c. Maximizing instructional time by effectively managing routines and transitions.	<u>DOMAIN 2: Planning for Active Learning</u> <i>Teachers plan instruction to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:</i> 2a. Planning of instructional content that is aligned with standards, builds on students' prior knowledge and provides for appropriate level of challenge for all students. 2b. Planning instruction to cognitively engage students in the content. 2c. Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to monitor student progress.	Evidence generally collected through non-classroom observations/reviews of practice
	<u>DOMAIN 3: Instruction for Active Learning</u> <i>Teachers implement instruction to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:</i> 3a. Implementing instructional content for learning. 3b. Leading students to construct meaning and apply new learning through the use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies. 3c. Assessing student learning, providing feedback to students and adjusting instruction.	<u>DOMAIN 4: Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership</u> <i>Teachers maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration and leadership by:</i> 4a. Engaging in continuous professional learning to impact instruction and student learning. 4b. Collaborating to develop and sustain a professional learning environment to support student learning. 4c. Working with colleagues, students and families to develop and sustain a positive school climate that supports student learning.	

All observations must be followed by a combination of feedback:

Verbal feedback (e.g., a post-conference) **and** written feedback should be entered into the data management system within a timely manner. It is recommended that feedback be provided within **five** to **ten** business days. Feedback should be specific. Its purpose is to help the teacher grow and develop as a professional.

In order to capture an authentic view of practice and to promote a culture of openness and comfort with frequent observations and feedback, it is recommended that evaluators use a combination of announced and unannounced informal observations. All formal observation are scheduled and therefore announced.

- **Formal:** Observations or reviews of practice that last at least 30 minutes and are followed by a post-observation conference, which includes timely written and verbal feedback. It is recommended that feedback be provided within five to ten business days.
- **Informal:** Observations or reviews of practice that last at least 15 minutes and are followed by written feedback. Informal observations will take place in an appropriate setting according to the educator's assignment (for example, classroom teachers in the classroom, special area teacher within their content).

Written feedback (e.g., online data management platform, comprehensive write-up) will be provided within five to ten days of the observation. Evaluators and/or educators may also request a conference to review any informal observation.

Formal and informal observations of support specialists will occur in settings appropriate to their role in the school, and may include the interaction between the teacher and students, staff and/or parents in those settings.

Evidence collected by the evaluator during any formal observation will become part of the educator's evaluation file. Evidence collected during informal observation will be used to determine that the educator is Meeting (Meeting) the indicators of performance. If the evidence indicates otherwise, the evaluator may request a formal observation to take place following the guidelines in this document.

All written feedback given after formal and informal observations will be entered into the educator's evaluation file.

DETERMING EVALUATION RATINGS FOR OBSERVATIONS

The CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching (revised 3/10/14) will be used for rating observations for teachers.

Review of Practice for Teachers

All teachers will also participate in a minimum of one review of practice (professional conversation about areas of practice not observable directly in the classroom) each year with their evaluators, and may mutually agree with their evaluators to participate in additional reviews. The focus of the review of practice should be discussed at the goal setting conference. Educators and evaluators will provide evidence of the educator's ability to plan instructional units, engage in continuous professional growth, collaborate and communicate with colleagues, and communicate with parents concerning the student's growth and any other professional behaviors. To assure that they receive the attention deserved, a review of practice may not take place on the last day of school before a holiday break, unless a teacher so desires, and may not take place within the last two weeks of the school year.

Reviews of practice for support specialists will focus on appropriate domains of the standards applicable to their field/role in the school, as mutually agreed on in the goal-setting conference. During the review of practice meeting, collected evidence will be reviewed in regards to the selected domains from the CCT Rubric found on page 21. This meeting may take place with the evaluator and educator or the evaluator and a grade level team.

Determining evaluation ratings for teacher performance and practice—40%

All formal and informal in-class observations will be 20% of the educator's summative evaluation (or one half of the 40% designated by guidelines). The primary domains used for observations are Domains 1 and 3.

Reviews of performance/ practice will collectively be 20% of the educator's summative evaluation (or one half of the 40% designated by guidelines). The primary domains used for RoP are Domains 2 and 4.

The ratings will be based on concrete evidence collected by the evaluator and educator analyzed synthesized, and reviewed together. During the conference, the evaluator and the educator will discuss how the evidence collected aligns with the indicators from the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching (revised 3/10/14).

At the end of the year, the evaluator will collectively view all of the evidence and any preliminary ratings given for any indicators or domain, noting changes, which will be considered when making the final rating for the domain. This will be discussed with the educator during the year end conference. The overall evaluation rating for reviews of practice will be based on the preponderance of evidence. The educator and evaluator will each be responsible for entering the evidence they collected for the review of practice into the educator's evaluation file via the district data management system.

Use of Stakeholder Feedback for All Educators – 10%

The Groton Educator Evaluation, Development, and Support plan will require that 10% of an educator's evaluation be based on stakeholder feedback. For teachers, this feedback will be in the form of parent feedback. (The evaluation rating from this category will be combined with the rating from observations of performance and practice 40% to help form 50% of the educator's total evaluation. In Groton Public Schools, educators will use a mutually agreed indicator between the evaluator and educator.)

Educator is defined as any certified staff below the position of Superintendent. Educators shall participate in a whole-school parent engagement effort, based on information obtained from a whole-school parent survey. Each school will determine what the parent engagement effort will be.

Surveys must be anonymous, fair, reliable, valid, and useful; School Governance Councils or School Data Teams must assist in the development of survey; age and grade-level appropriate. After survey results are analyzed by the school governance council or the school data team, the educators within the building (administrators and teachers) will determine several school-level parent goals based on the survey feedback. The educator and evaluator will identify one parent engagement goal and set improvement targets. *Note that educator is defined as anyone below the position of Superintendent.

Educators will collect evidence of their participation and bring that to the year-end conference with their evaluator for discussion. During the year end conference, they will complete the Parent Feedback Form (Appendix E) to document the educator's completion of the activities.

The educator will enter evidence used during the year end conference, and the evaluator will enter the Parent Feedback Form into the educator's evaluation file via the district data management system.

Below is a list of possible examples (certainly, there are other examples that over parent engagement):

Communications examples:

- Updating website frequently
- Newsletters
- Communication logs

Engagement examples:

- Leading or co-leading a parent workshop
- Curriculum night

The Parent Feedback/Engagement rating should reflect the degree to which an educator successfully reaches his/her parent goal and improvement targets. This is accomplished through a review of evidence provided by the teacher and application of the following scale:

Exceeding (4)	Meets (3)	Progressing (2)	Not Meeting (1)
Exceeds the goal	Met the goal	Partially met the goal	Did not meet the goal

Student Outcomes: Student Learning 45% (SLO/IAGDs); Whole school student learning indicator 5%

Using multiple indicators of student academic growth and development

General information

The CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation approved by the State Board of Education state that 45% of an educator's evaluation must be based on progress toward attaining or exceeding goals for student growth, using multiple indicators. There will be mutual agreement between Teacher Educators and their Evaluating Administrator. The following are specific parameters in this plan for this requirement:

For all classroom teachers

1. Educators will set at least one student learning objective (SLO) for student growth and development; educators with special circumstances, such as teaching only half-year courses, will mutually agree with their evaluators how many goals will be set over the course of the year. The SLO will include 2 or more Indication of Academic Growth Development (IAGD). One IAGD must be non-standardized.
2. At least one non-standardized indicator will be used to show student growth over time. The educator and evaluator will mutually agree on that indicator and the types of evidence that will be collected for the indicator(s).
3. For the second half (22.5%) of the indicators, the educator and evaluator may mutually agree to include one additional standardized indicator other than the state test.
4. All standardized assessments used must: include interim assessments that align/lead to the standardized assessment and be administered over time. Data from standardized assessments must be compared and analyzed collectively to determine student growth.
5. No standardized assessment can be used if the assessment creator has a specific policy that states the test was **not** designed for use in evaluating teachers.

For classroom teachers in state-tested grades and subjects

(ELA, Math, elementary, CMT science grades 5 & 8, CAPT science grade 10)

1. One-half (22.5%) of the indicators used shall compare data across assessments administered over time. The state test will be included only if there are interim assessments that align with and lead to that assessment.
2. If there is no state test and/or interim assessments available, the educator and evaluator will mutually agree to determine which measures to utilize subject to the local dispute-resolution procedure. A list of available measures in Groton will be maintained by the Office of Teaching & Learning. If a different standardized indicator is used, it must meet the same criteria as the state test must meet.
3. If a standardized indicator is used, teachers and evaluators will mutually agree on 1-2 non-standardized indicators to use in the second 22.5% of this evaluation component.
4. If no standardized indicator is used, educators and evaluators will mutually agree on 2-3 non-standardized indicators for use in the entire 45% of this evaluation component.

5. Teachers with special circumstances, such as teaching only half-year courses, will mutually agree with their evaluators how many different indicators will be used over the course of the year.

For classroom teachers in all other grades and subjects

1. A standardized indicator, if available, may be used in the first 22.5% of this evaluation component.
2. The Groton Teaching and Learning Collaborative Evaluation Subcommittee will mutually agree, prior to the beginning of each school year, whether or not recommended standardized indicators may be used in specific content areas.
3. After this determination by the GTLC Evaluation Subcommittee, the educator and evaluator will mutually agree whether or not the indicator will be used in connection with the student growth goal.
4. If a standardized indicator is used, educators and evaluators will mutually agree on 1 to 2 non-standardized indicators for use in the second 22.5% of this evaluation component.
5. If NO standardized indicator is used, educators and evaluators will mutually agree on 2 to 3 non-standardized indicators for use in the entire 45% of this evaluation component.
6. Educators with special circumstances, such as teaching only half-year courses, will mutually agree with their evaluators how many different indicators will be used over the course of a year.

In the Groton Educator Evaluation, Development and Support process, the educators and evaluators will work collaboratively to determine an appropriate mix of indicators to use in the evaluation process. Educators and evaluators will mutually agree on one student goal with multiple IAGDs for growth and development; all goals will be appropriate for the teacher's grade and subject area, or position and role within the school. Goals will be based on an analysis of data from multiple sources. The following definitions and uses of standardized and non-standardized indicators, and evidence, will guide the selection process:

Standardized indicator – periodic assessment tool, including interim assessments that align with and lead to the main assessment that is administered more than once per year, with cumulative results of all assessments used to show growth over time

Non-standardized indicator – type of task performed by students that is aligned to the curriculum and rated against a set of criteria that describes student growth, development and might include, but is not limited to the following: student written work, student oral work, demonstration &/or performance, constructed project, curriculum-based assessment

Evidence – each piece of work done; multiple pieces of evidence will be collected for each type of indicator.

All indicators selected must be fair, valid, reliable, and useful to the teacher, as described in the teacher evaluation guidelines.

DETERMINING AN EDUCATOR'S WHOLE-SCHOOL STUDENT LEARNING (5% OF EVALUATION)

For this rating, teachers will receive a rating based on whole-school measures of student learning. The administrator final summative rating for multiple student learning indicators will be correlated to the educator final summative rating (5%) for whole-school student learning indicator must be represented by the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators (45%) established for the administrator's evaluation rating.

Example:

Administrator Final Summative Rating (45%) Multiple Student Learning Indicators	Teacher Final Summative Rating (5%) Whole-School Student Learning Indicator
If the administrator receives a final summative rating of proficient (3) for Multiple Student Learning Indicators (45%) then...	Teachers evaluated by that administrator receive a final summative rating of proficient (3) for the Whole-School Student Learning Indicator (5%) rating.

DETERMINING SUMMATIVE EVALUATION RATINGS

The summative evaluation rating will use ratings from each major category. These ratings will be used to determine the final rating per the matrix that follows.

Matrix for Educators

Using the ratings determined for each major category: Student Outcomes Related Indicators and Teacher Practice-Related Indicators, follow the respective column and row to the center of the matrix. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. If the two major categories are highly discrepant, then the evaluator shall examine the current data and gather additional information in order to determine a summative rating.

		Teacher Practice Related Indicators Rating			
		4	3	2	1
Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating	4	Rate Exemplary	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	Gather further information
	3	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing
	2	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing	Rate Developing
	1	Gather further information	Rate Developing	Rate Developing	Rate Below Standard

Adjustment of Summative Rating

Summative ratings will be provided for all educators by June 30 of a given school year and reported to the CSDE per state guidelines. Should state standardized test data not yet be available at the time of calculating a summative rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. Ratings can be adjusted up until September 15th of the following school year if the test data is not available until the end of the year.

Training for all Educators

The educators in Groton Public Schools believe that any evaluation system is only as good as its implementation. The most important factor in sound implementation is the training that all those who use the system receive. Therefore, training will be provided to all educators as follows:

Training will be designed in modules that will developed by the GTCL the Groton Teaching and Learning Collaborative. Evaluators will participate in training through the RESC, SDE, or other appropriate means in components of the evaluation and support plan, as well as, observation and high quality feedback. Evaluators will be required to demonstrate proficiency in these tasks.

The intention is to develop a cadre of teachers and administrators who will conduct training within the district on an ongoing basis. The details of how this will come about will be decided as the committee begins to plan implementation.

Linking Educator Evaluation to Professional Learning and Growth

The foundation of the Groton Educator Evaluation, Development and Support process is a strong, collaboratively developed professional growth program. Results from collective teacher evaluations will be part of the data that will be used to develop professional growth opportunities to be offered on a school- or district-wide basis. All educators will also use information from their own evaluations to develop growth plans to impact instruction and student learning. Those growth plans will be used as one source of data in the educator's evaluation.

The Groton Public School district through the Groton Teaching and Learning Collaborative will provide opportunities for career development and professional growth based on performance identified through the evaluation process.

All educators will be encouraged to use their evaluations and professional growth opportunities for career enhancement. The Talent Development committee (a subcommittee of the GTLC) has begun to identify career enhancement options, which include but are not limited to:

- Mentoring
- Facilitate Professional Development Workshops
- Teacher in Residence
- Participation in School Wide Data Team
- Participation in district level committees
- Leading Professional Learning Communities
- Recalibration teacher evaluation training for administrators
- Training for administrators on school improvement initiatives
- Targeted training for administrators on feedback received from Connecticut School Leadership Standards Rubric and Performance Expectations.
- Administrator in Residence

Determining Effective and Ineffective Educators

Effectiveness and ineffectiveness shall be defined utilizing patterns of summative ratings derived from the Groton Public Schools evaluation system. One year's summative rating will not determine an educator's effectiveness or ineffectiveness. A clear pattern and concrete evidence need to inform the determination of effectiveness.

An educator will be determined effective if the educator has two consecutive years of a summative rating of Meets or Exceeds one of which needs to be obtained in the fourth year of being evaluated using this plan. Educators who are not deemed effective by this criterion will be deemed ineffective.

Any educator having a summative rating of Progressing or Not Meeting after one year of being evaluated with this plan may be placed on an individual improvement plan. The Groton Teacher Improvement and Remediation Plan is a 3 tiered approach to educator support. (See description of this support plan in the following section)

After one year of participating in the support and remediation plan, an educator receiving such support will be expected to have a summative rating of Meets or Exceeds. Educators who do not receive a summative rating of Meets or Exceeds after one year of participation in support and remediation shall be assigned a mentor will participate in Tier 3 of the support and remediation plan.

No educator will participate in support and remediation for more than two consecutive school years.

Educator Improvement and Remediation Plans

Groton Public Schools will offer three tiers of support to educators predicated on nature of support needed.

1. Structured Support: An educator would receive structured support when an area(s) of concern is identified during the school year. This support is intended to provide short-term assistance to address a concern in its early stage.
2. Supervisory Assistance: An educator would receive special assistance when he/she earns an overall performance rating of *Progressing* or *Not Meeting* and/or has received structured support. An educator may also receive special assistance if he/she does not meet the goal(s) of the structured support plan. This support is intended to assist an educator who is having difficulty consistently demonstrating proficiency.
3. Intensive Assistance: An educator would receive intensive assistance when he/she does not meet the goal(s) of the special assistance plan. This support is intended to build the staff member's competency.

Tier 1 - Structured Support

The first tier of supportive assistance is an initial attempt to provide an educator with support, supervision, and resources to improve his/her performance in one or more domains. **If a rating of Not Meeting is received, a staff member may be placed in Tier 2 with acknowledgment of the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent.*

Qualifier: If the evaluator has concerns about an educator's performance after informal and/ or formal observations and the evaluator deems greater support is needed for success, the evaluator will notify the educator that he / she is in need of Tier 1 structured support. Tier 1 structured support will consist of 45 school days.

Tier 1 Structured Support will include the following steps:

1. Notice - A meeting between the evaluator and educator will be held to discuss the area(s) of concern. After this meeting, the evaluator will provide formal written notice of need of support to the staff member. This notice must be specific as to the domains, the concerns and why support is needed. A copy of the written notice will be sent to the appropriate Association representative.
2. Support Plan - The educator, staff member and representative from the Association will collaborate to outline a support plan including specific goals and objectives related to the domains of concern.
3. Assistance- The evaluator will offer reasonable assistance so that the educator can improve his/her performance in the areas of concern. Assistance may include:
 - peer mentoring / peer coaching
 - informal observation as agreed in support plan
 - evaluator observation
 - peer observation
 - teacher observation of peers
 - release time
 - any other mutually agreed upon support
4. Conference - A schedule of conferences with the evaluator will be agreed upon at the initiation of the plan to review progress towards success of goals and objectives.
5. Resolution - There are three possible resolutions to Tier 1 Structured Support:
 - A. Successful - The staff member will receive written notification of successful completion of the Tier 1 support plan. The staff member will be returned to his/ her normal rotation in the Groton Public Schools Educator Development Plan.
 - B. Progressing - The staff member has made some progress towards successful completion; however, it is deemed additional time is needed to complete Tier 1 support. A collaborative meeting will be held to review the support plan and adjustments will be made if necessary. This phase may last up to 45 days.
 - C. Unsatisfactory - The staff member will receive written notification that the Tier 1 support was not successful; therefore, the staff member will be moved into the Supervisory Assistance Phase for Certified Staff.

Tier 2: Supervisory Assistance for Certified Staff

The Supervisory Assistance Tier is an attempt to provide a teacher/administrator with the support, supervision, and resources to improve his/her performance in one or more domains.

Procedures for Supervisory Assistance

If the evaluator has continued concerns about a teacher/administrator's performance and feels greater support is needed for success, the evaluator will notify the educator in writing that he/she is being placed in the Supervisory Assistance Tier. The Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent and Association president(s) will be notified immediately when an educator is placed in the Supervisory Assistance Tier (Appendix E).

The Supervisory Assistance Tier will include the following steps:

1. Notice - The evaluator will provide formal written notice of dissatisfaction with the educator's performance and assignment to the Supervisory Assistance Tier. This notice must be specific as to the concern(s) and why it is considered to be unsatisfactory.
2. Action Plan - The evaluator will collaborate with the teacher and a representative of the association to outline an action plan including specific goals and objectives for changes with timelines, resources, a schedule of appropriate observations, and evaluative criteria. Upon mutual agreement, other professionals with expertise in the area(s) of need may be consulted.
3. Assistance - The evaluator will offer reasonable assistance so that the staff member can improve his/her performance in the areas that were considered unsatisfactory. The assistance may include but is not limited to, positive suggestions, resource materials, professional development opportunities, referral to other individuals or peer coaching. This intervention will operate for forty-five consecutive school days or fewer if conditions warrant.
4. Observation/Conference - The evaluator will monitor the educator's progress according to the Action Plan.

Resolution - The evaluator will complete the Supervisory Assistance Form (Appendix E). If performance in the areas considered to be unsatisfactory has improved, the educator will continue to be monitored through Formal Observation Band. If performance remains unsatisfactory or the action plan has not been followed by the staff member, he/she will be placed on the Intensive Assistance Tier (Tier 3).

Intensive Assistance is the final attempt to provide the help necessary to assist the educator in meeting the requirements of his/her position. If the evaluator has serious concerns about a staff member's performance and in his/her opinion the staff member is not meeting performance standards as described in the Groton Public Schools Educator Development and Support Plan, then he/she will notify the staff member that he/she will be placed in the Intensive Assistance Tier.

The Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and Association president(s) will be notified immediately when an educator is placed in the Intensive Assistance Tier and will receive a copy of the Intensive Assistance Form (Appendix E).

Tier 3: Intensive Assistance Tier for Certified Staff

The Intensive Assistance Tier will include the following steps:

1. Notice -The evaluator will complete the Intensive Assistance Form to advise the educator that the evaluation assistance will continue and improvement in performance must be shown, or the result may lead to a Central Office review and possible termination.
2. Action Plan -The teacher, evaluator, another appropriate administrator, appointed by the Superintendent, a representative from the Association and at least one mutually agreed upon professional with expertise in the area(s) of need, will develop a plan that includes specific goals, objectives, timelines, resources, and evaluative criteria.
3. Assistance - The evaluator is to offer reasonable assistance so that the educator can improve his/her performance in the areas that were considered unsatisfactory. The assistance may include but is not limited to, positive suggestions, resource materials, professional development opportunities, referral to other individuals or peer coaching. A time frame which allows the educator adequate opportunity to improve his/her performance must be stated. This time frame should not exceed 30 school days or extend beyond the school year.
4. Observation/Conference - The evaluator will monitor the educator's progress in achieving the target(s) established for performance improvement. The plan will be in operation for thirty consecutive school days and shall include both formal and informal observations. The evaluator will observe in the classroom at least once a week followed by a conference with the teacher. The other administrator will make observations and provide feedback to the teacher and the evaluator.
5. Resolution - The evaluator will complete the Intensive Assistance Form (Appendix E). If performance in the area(s) considered to be unsatisfactory has improved, the educator will continue to be monitored in the Formal Observation Band. If performance remains unsatisfactory, or the action plan has not been followed by the educator, there will be a Central Office review which may lead to termination.

Dispute Resolution Procedures

In case of conflict concerning mutual agreement on performance objectives, implementation of the process, the evaluation period, the redirection to the Formal Observation Band, feedback on performance and practice, or final summative rating below Meeting, the staff member has the right to conflict resolution. An educator maintains the right of written rebuttal to be attached to the relevant document for any rating.

An appeal procedure may be instituted to resolve the conflict as described below:

1. Evaluator and staff member meet to attempt to resolve the conflict.
2. If unable to reach a satisfactory resolution, the evaluator and staff member meet within five days with a mutually agreed upon impartial third party (e.g., but not limited to certified

3. Professional in the same area of expertise as the educator) who will attempt to help resolve differences by facilitating discussion. Satisfactory resolution may result from this step. Inability to agree on an impartial third party will automatically move this matter to the next step.
4. If conflict has not been resolved, a Request for Conflict Resolution Form (Appendix E) should be completed by either party no later than three days after step two and submitted to the Superintendent.
5. A Conflict Resolution Panel will be established. The panel will be composed of the superintendent or designee, human resources representative, Association designee (as determined by Association president(s)) and a mutually agreed upon neutral third person. The committee will meet within five (5) working days with the parties and attempt to resolve the conflict. A report of the results of the Conflict Resolution Panel will be submitted to educator, evaluator, and appropriate Association president. Dissenting opinions of committee members will be included in the committee report and will be filed with the appropriate documents. A copy of the report will be included in the educators evaluation file.

If there is **not** unanimous agreement to the resolution of conflict, the decision of the Superintendent will be considered final. In this situation, a written report of conflict resolution will be completed by the Superintendent and submitted to the educator, evaluator, and appropriate Association president. A copy of the Superintendent's final decision will be included in the educator's evaluation file.

Request for Change of Evaluator

The relationship between the evaluator and the educator is critical to the success of the educator. A good working relationship is in the best interest of individuals and the district. If a relationship is not successful, either person can request a change of assignment at any time by submitting a written request to the Assistant Superintendent or Superintendent where appropriate.

Evaluator Ratings Audit & Validation

All evaluators are required to complete extensive training on the evaluation model. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) will provide Groton Public Schools with training opportunities and tools throughout the year to support district administrators, evaluators and teachers in implementing the model across their schools. Groton Public Schools will adapt and build on these tools to provide comprehensive training and support to their schools and to ensure that evaluators are Meeting in conducting and consistent in scoring teacher evaluations.

At the request of a district or employee, the CSDE or a third-party entity approved by the CSDE will audit the evaluation components that are combined to determine an individual's summative rating in the event that such components are significantly dissimilar (i.e., include both Exceeding and Not Meeting ratings) ratings in different components. In these cases, the CSDE or a third-party entity will determine a final summative rating.

Groton Public Schools will have the option of conducting inter-scorer reliability checks with its trained and calibrated evaluators. This check may consist of review of data from previous observations and ratings or a review of calibration with materials from LEARN. Additionally, we may assign evaluators peer partners as a means by which to calibrate scoring.

Groton Public School evaluators will attend training conducted by the CSDE regarding conducting observations and providing quality feedback. As part of attending this state approved training, evaluators will be expected to demonstrate proficiency in the evaluation process. Continued calibration of evaluators is essential to a fair and balanced evaluation system; therefore, evaluators in Groton Public School will participate in on-going calibration throughout the school year. Calibration will be a consistent agenda item on the district level administrators' meeting agenda at least once a term (based on a trimester system).

ADMINISTRATOR EDUCATOR

ADMINISTRATOR EDUCATOR


In order to determine an educator's summative evaluation ratings, the district will use the following:

A 'Student Outcomes Rating', based on multiple indicators of student learning (45%) and teacher effectiveness (5%).

An 'Educator Practice Rating', based on observations of practice (40%) and stakeholder feedback (10%);

Evidence will be examined to determine summative ratings.

Scores from each of the four components will be combined to produce a summative performance rating designation of Exceeding, Meeting, Progressing, and Not Meeting.



YEARLY TIMELINES IN THE GROTON ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION, DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT PLAN

Month	Task	New to District/Administration or Progressing/Not Meeting Observation = 4	Administration Meeting/Exceeding Observation = 2
August	Evaluator Orientation by Superintendent or Designee		
By October ~ November	Educator reflections and goal setting prior to Goal Setting Conference. Proposed draft of goals and objectives to be submitted two (2) days prior to the Goal Setting Conference		
By November 15	Evaluator and educator will meet to discuss and finalize mutually agreed upon goals.		
By December 15		At least one (1) observation completed	At least one (1) observation completed
By January 31		Memo to new or Progressing/Not Meeting indicating concerns that may lead to non-renewal	
By March 1	Mid-Year Check-In Conference & Formative Review for Administrators	Mid-Year Conference Review of Practice	Mid-Year Conference Review of Practice
By May 30		All four (4) observations are completed	
Prior to 5 days before last day of school	For New and Progressing/Below Administrators	Summative Evaluation Conference and Review of Practice, including Self-Evaluation	All two (2) observations are completed
By June 30	For Administrators: End year conferences		Summative Evaluation Conference and Review of Practice, including Self-Evaluation

Four Level Rating System

The CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation require the use of the following definitions to describe educator performance: (state wording is in parenthesis)

Exceeding (Exemplary)	Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
Meeting (Proficient)	Meeting indicators of performance
Progressing (Developing)	Meeting some indicators of performance but not others: <i>Inconsistently or partially demonstrating development of skills</i>
Not Meeting (Below Standard)	Not meeting indicators of performance

In the Groton Public Schools Educator Evaluation, Development, and Support plan, aligned with the CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, the term 'performance' will mean 'progress as defined by specific indicators.' These indicators will be mutually agreed upon between evaluator and educator. Progress will be demonstrated by representative evidence. How those indicators will be selected is outlined in another section of this plan.

YEARLY TIMELINES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

***Unless otherwise noted, educator refers to all certified staff below the position of Superintendent. Depending on the job description of the educator, he/ she may be both an evaluator and an evaluatee.**

Evaluator Orientation by August of each school year

A yearly orientation for evaluators will be conducted by the superintendent or designee and they will provide material outlining the evaluation process and other information as appropriate. Process information provided in orientation must include the rubric used for assessing administrator practice, the instruments to be used to gather feedback from staff, families, and/or students and their alignment to the rubric, the process and calculation by which all evaluation elements will be integrated into an overall rating.

To begin the process, the administrator needs five things to be in place:

1. Student learning data are available for review by the administrator and the state has assigned the school a School Performance Index (SPI) rating. (Smarter Balanced Assessments will be administered for the first time in the 2014-15 academic year. These assessments are administered in Grades 3-8 and Grade 11. Pending approval of the waiver submitted to the United States Department of Education (USED) the CSDE has requested continued flexibility, through at least the 2015-16 school year, regarding the requirement to incorporate the state test as a measure of student growth in educator evaluation.)
2. Stakeholder survey data are available for review by the administrator.
3. The superintendent has communicated his/her student learning priorities for the year.
4. The administrator has developed a school improvement plan that includes student learning goals.
5. The evaluator has provided the administrator with this document in order to orient her/ him to the evaluation process.

Educator Goal Setting and Plan Development (prior to goal setting conference)

The educator will examine student data, prior year evaluation and survey results, and the appropriate rubric for his/her role (CCL) to draft a proposed goal and plan. Before a school year starts, administrators identify three Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and one survey target, drawing on available data, the superintendent's priorities, their school improvement plan and prior evaluation results (where applicable). They also determine two areas of focus for their practice. This is referred to as "3-2-1 goal-setting."



Administrators should start with the outcomes they want to achieve. This includes setting three SLOs and one target related to stakeholder feedback.

The proposed draft of goals and objectives needs to be submitted two days prior to the scheduled Goal Setting Conference.

By November 15 Goal Setting Conference

The evaluator and educator will meet to discuss and finalize mutually agreed upon goals. While the evaluator may request revisions to the proposed focus area(s), goals and objectives if they do not meet approval criteria based on the "3-2-1-goal-setting" model (see above). The final goals will be mutually agreed upon between the evaluator and educator. Discussion will also include actions that the educator can take and supports the evaluator can provide to promote educator growth in his/her Leadership Practice focus area. During this conference, the evaluator will provide guidance on how best to develop a plan. See Appendix G Sample Evaluation Support plan.

By March 1 Mid-year Formative review for administrators

Mid-Year formative review will be conducted using some of the guiding questions found in Appendix E. The administrator and evaluator hold a mid-year formative review, with explicit discussion of progress toward student learning targets, as well as any areas of performance related to standards of performance and practice. The meeting is also an opportunity to surface any changes in the context (e.g., a large influx of new students) that could influence accomplishment of outcome goals; goals may be changed at this point.

Discussion will also include actions that the educator can take and supports the evaluator can provide to promote educator growth in his/ her focus area.

The following chart represents a guideline for educator observations.

OBSERVATIONS TIMELINE	
New Administrators & Administrators not in good standing	Administrators Exceeding or Meeting (Meeting/Exceeding)
By December 15 at least one (1) observation completed	By December 15 at least one (1) observation completed
<i>By January 31 memo to new or Progressing/Not Meeting indication concerns that may lead to non-renewal.</i>	
By March 1 the Mid-Year Check in Review will be completed, including Review of Practice.	By March 1 the Mid-Year Check in Review will be completed.
By May 30 all four (4) observations are completed	Prior to 5 days before the last day all two (2) observations are completed
Prior to 5 days before the last day of school Summative Evaluation Conference and Review of Practice including Self Evaluation	By June 30 Summative Evaluation Conference and Review of Practice including Self Evaluation

End of Year Summative Review (Within 5 days prior to the last day of school for new Administrators and Administrators not in good standing. By June 30 for Administrators)

Educator Self-Assessment - The educator reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the evaluator. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas of development established in the goal setting conference.

Summative Self Reflections will be submitted two days prior to the scheduled Summative Review.

The educator takes an opportunity to assess his/her practice on all 18 elements of the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The administrator should also review his/her focus areas and determine if he/she considers him/herself on track or not.

The self-assessment can occur later in the process after summative ratings but before goal setting for the subsequent year. In this model the educator submits a self-assessment prior to the end-of-year summative review as an opportunity for the self-reflection to inform the summative rating.

End-of-Year Conference – Summative Review and Rating

The educator and evaluator meet to discuss the administrator's self- assessment and all evidence collected over the course of the year. While a formal rating follows this meeting, it is recommended that evaluators use the meeting as an opportunity to convey strengths, growth areas and their probable rating. After the meeting, the evaluator assigns a rating based on all available evidence.

See Appendix C for suggested monthly evidence checklist for educators.

Administrators Summative Evaluation Rating

All administrators will be evaluated in four components, grouped into two major categories: Leadership Practice and Student Outcomes.

1. Leadership Practice Related Indicators: An evaluation of the core leadership practices and skills that positively affect student learning. This category is comprised of two components: (a) Observation of Leadership Performance and Practice (40%) as defined in the Common Core of Leading (CCL): Connecticut School Leadership Standards and the Common Core of Leading (CCL) Leader Evaluation Rubric (b) Stakeholder Feedback (10%) on leadership practice through surveys.

*As of Spring 2015, the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric is undergoing a validation study. Substantive revisions are expected to be made to the rubric prior to its expected release in June 20

2. Student Outcomes Related Indicators: An evaluation of an administrator's contribution to student academic progress, at the school and classroom level. This category is comprised of two components: (a) Student Learning (45%) assessed in equal weight by: (a) progress on the academic learning measures in the state's accountability system for schools and (b) performance and growth on locally-determined measures. (b) Pending federal approval for 2015-2016 to decouple state testing from evaluation, administrators' 45% will be determined entirely on local measures. Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%) as determined by an aggregation of teachers' success with respect to Student Learning Objectives (SLOs). Please see chart below to determine an administrator's rating for Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes.

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
> 80% of teachers are rated proficient or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	> 60% of teachers are rated proficient or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	> 40% of teachers are rated proficient or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	< 40% of teachers are rated proficient or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation

- Central Office Administrators will be responsible for the teachers under their assigned role.
- All other administrators will be responsible for the teachers they directly evaluate.

OBSERVATION OF PRACTICE (40%) AND STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK (10%)

The Common Core of Leading (CCL) Leadership Rubric will be used for rating observations for administrators.

Observations of Practice - 40%

This rating will be based on concrete evidence collected by the evaluator and educator, analyzed, synthesized, and reviewed together. During the review, the evaluator and educator will discuss how the evidence collected aligns with the indicators from the rubric that are the focus of the review. There should be at least 2 site observations for any administrator; and at least 4 school site observations for any administrators who are new to the district, school, the profession, or who have received ratings of progressing or not meeting (Progressing or below) standard. All of the observations, site visits and reviews of artifacts for this component should result in evidence that is measured by the CCL.

At the end of the year, the evaluator will collectively view all of the evidence given for any indicators or domain which will be considered when making the final rating for each domain. This will be discussed with the educator during the year end conference. The overall evaluation rating for reviews of practice will be based on the preponderance of evidence. The educator and evaluator will each be responsible for entering the evidence they collected for the review of practice into the educator's evaluation file via the district data management system.

*Note: for Principals, the district weights the teaching and learning standard at least twice as much as any other standard. The plan requires weights to be determined at the goal setting conference. An Assistant Principals rating must be based on evidence collected about leadership practice based on the CCL and must include all 6 standards and must weight each of them at least 5% of the overall evaluation of practice. Evaluators must limit the rating to those elements relevant to the Assistant Principals job duties.

Formative Review for Administrators

All administrators will also participate in a Formative Review each year with their evaluators, and may mutually agree with their evaluators to participate in additional reviews. To be practical, a formative review of practice may not take place on the last day of school before a holiday break, unless the educator so desires, and may not take place within the last two weeks of the school year.

Administrator Formative Review will use six performance expectations:

- Vision, Mission, and Goals
- Teaching and Learning
- Organizational Systems and Learning
- Families and Stakeholders
- Ethics and Integrity
- The Education System

The weighting of these six performance expectations shall be the same for building and central office administrators. Domain 2 shall be rated at least twice as much than the other domains for principals.

Stakeholder Feedback—10%

The Groton Educator Evaluation, Development, and Support plan will require that 10% of an educator's evaluation be based on stakeholder feedback. For building based administrators, this feedback will be in the form of stakeholder feedback including teachers and parents. For non-building based administrators, this feedback will include appropriate stakeholders. Stakeholder feedback is a system or plan for gathering feedback from parents and staff. This is accomplished through surveys.

Surveys must be anonymous, fair, reliable, valid, and useful; School Governance Councils or School Data Teams must assist in the development of survey. More than half of the rating of a Principal on stakeholder feedback must be based on an assessment of improvement over time. If districts elect to use surveys to gather feedback, they may include the survey response rate as an input to the rating on feedback (as a way to increase the accuracy of survey results).

The Stakeholder Feedback rating should reflect the degree to which an educator successfully implemented improvement strategies and application of the following scale:

Exceeding (4)	Meets (3)	Progressing (2)	Not Meeting (1)
Exceeds the goal	Met the goal	Partially met the goal	Did not meet the goal

It should be noted that central office administrators must be rated based on feedback from the stakeholders whom the administrator directly serves.

STUDENT LEARNING INDICATORS (45%) AND TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS (5%)

General information

The CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation approved by the State Board of Education state that 45% of an educator's evaluation must be based on progress toward attaining or

exceeding goals for student growth, using multiple indicators. The following are specific parameters in this plan for this requirement:

In the Groton Educator Evaluation, Development and Support process, the educators and evaluators will work collaboratively to determine an appropriate mix of indicators to use in the evaluation process. Goals will be based on an analysis of data from multiple sources. The following definitions and uses of standardized and non-standardized indicators, and evidence, will guide the selection process:

Standardized indicator – periodic assessment tool, including interim assessments that align with and lead to the main assessment that is administered more than once per year, with cumulative results of all assessments used to show growth over time

Non-standardized indicator – type of task performed by students that is aligned to the curriculum and rated against a set of criteria that describes student growth and development; might include, but is not limited to, student written work; student oral work; demonstration &/or performance; constructed project; curriculum-based assessment

All indicators selected must be fair, valid, and reliable.

Administrator Student Learning Objectives (SLO) - 45%

Student learning is assessed in equal weight by: (a) performance and progress on the academic learning measures in the state's accountability system for schools and (b) performance and growth on locally-determined measures. Each of these measures will have a weight of 22.5% and together they will account for 45% of the administrator's evaluation.

State Measures of Academic Learning

With the state's new school accountability system, a school's SPI—an average of student performance in all tested grades and subjects for a given school—allows for the evaluation of school performance across all tested grades, subjects and performance levels on state tests. The goal for all Connecticut schools is to achieve an SPI rating of 88, which indicates that on average all students are at the 'target' level.

Currently, the state's accountability system⁹ includes two measures of student academic learning:

1. School Performance Index (SPI) progress – changes from baseline in student achievement on Connecticut's standardized assessments.

***PLEASE NOTE:** SPI calculations may not be available for the 2015-16 school year due to the transition from state legacy tests to the Smarter Balanced Assessment. Therefore, 45% of an administrator's rating for Student Learning will be based on student growth and performance on locally-determined measures.*

2. SPI progress for student subgroups – changes from baseline in student achievement for subgroups on Connecticut's standardized assessments.

Yearly goals for student achievement should be based on approximately 1/12 of the growth needed to reach 88, capped at 3 points per year. See below for a sample calculation to determine the SPI

Evaluation ratings for administrators on these state test measures are generated as follows:

Step 1: Ratings of SPI Progress are applied to give the administrator a score between 1 and 4, using the table below:

SPI Progress (all students and subgroups)				
SPI ≥ 88	Did not Maintain	Maintain		
	1	4		
SPI < 88	< 50% target progress	50-99% target progress	100-125% target progress	> 125% target progress
	1	2	3	4

PLEASE NOTE: Administrators who work in schools with two SPIs will use the average of the two SPI ratings to apply for their score.

Step 2: Scores are weighted to emphasize improvement in schools below the State's SPI target of 88 and to emphasize subgroup progress and performance in schools above the target. While districts may weigh the two measures according to local priorities for administrator evaluation, the following weights are recommended:

SPI Progress	100% minus subgroup %
SPI Subgroup Progress*	10% per subgroup; up to 50%

*Subgroup(s) must exist in year prior and in year of evaluation

Below is a sample calculation for a school with two subgroups:

Measure	Score	Weight	Summary Score
SPI Progress	3	.8	2.4
SPI Subgroup 1 Progress	2	.1	.2
SPI Subgroup 2 Progress	2	.1	.2
TOTAL			2.8

Step 3: The weighted scores in each category are summed, resulting in an overall state test rating that is scored on the following scale:

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
At or above 3.5	2.5 to 3.4	1.5 to 2.4	Less than 1.5

All protections related to the assignment of school accountability ratings (e.g., the minimum number of days a student must be enrolled in order for that student's scores to be included in an accountability measure) shall apply to the use of state test data for administrator evaluation. For any school that does not have tested grades (such as a K-2 school), the entire 45% of an administrator's rating on student learning indicators is based on the locally-determined indicators described below.

Locally-Determined Measures (Student Learning Objectives)

Administrators establish three Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) on measures they select. In selecting measures, certain parameters apply:

- All measures must align to Connecticut Core Standards and other Connecticut content standards. In instances where there are no such standards that apply to a subject/grade level, districts must provide evidence of alignment to research-based learning standards.
- At least one of the measures must focus on student outcomes from subjects and/or grades not assessed on state-administered assessments.
- For administrators in high school, one measure must include the cohort graduation rate and the extended graduation rate, as defined in the State's approved application for flexibility under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. All protections related to the assignment of school accountability ratings for cohort graduation rate and extended graduation rate shall apply to the use of graduation data for principal evaluation.
- For administrators assigned to a school in "review" or "turnaround" status, indicators will align with the performance targets set in the school's mandated improvement plan.

	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3
Elementary or Middle School Principal	Non-tested subjects or grades	Broad discretion	
High School Principal	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement)	Broad discretion	
Elementary or Middle School AP	Non-tested subjects or grades	Broad discretion: Indicators may focus on student results from a subset of teachers, grade levels or subjects, consistent with the job responsibilities of the assistant principal being evaluated.	
High School AP	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement)	Broad discretion: Indicators may focus on student results from a subset of teachers, grade levels or subjects, consistent with the job responsibilities of the assistant principal being evaluated.	
Central Office Administrator	(meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement) Indicators may be based on results in the group of schools, group of students or subject area most relevant to the administrator's job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.		

Beyond these parameters, administrators have broad discretion in selecting indicators, including, but not limited to:

- Student performance or growth on state-administered assessments and/or district-adopted assessments not included in the state accountability measures (e.g., commercial content area assessments, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations).
 - Students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation.
 - Students' performance or growth on school-or classroom-developed assessments in subjects and grade levels for which there are not available state assessments.
- Below are a few examples of SLOs for administrators:

Grade Level/Role	SLO
2nd Grade	Among second graders who remain enrolled in school and in good attendance from September to May, 80% will make at least one year's growth in reading as measured by MAP/NWEA assessments.
Middle School Science	78% of students will attain <i>proficient</i> or higher on the science inquiry strand of the CMT in May.
High School	9th grade students will accumulate sufficient credits to be in good standing as sophomores by June.
Central Office Administrator	By June 1, 2016, the percentage of grade 3 students across the district (in all 5 elementary schools) reading at or above grade level will improve from 78% to 85%. (Curriculum Coordinator)

The process for selecting measures and creating SLOs should strike a balance between alignment to district student learning priorities and a focus on the most significant school-level student learning needs. To do so, it is critical that the process follow a pre-determined timeline.

- First, the district establishes student learning priorities for a given school year based on available data. These may be a continuation for multi-year improvement strategies or a new priority that emerges from achievement data.
- The administrator uses available data to craft an improvement plan for the school/area. This is done in collaboration with other stakeholders and includes a manageable set of clear student learning targets.
- The administrator chooses student learning priorities for her/his own evaluation that are
 - (a) aligned to district priorities (unless the school is already doing well against those priorities) and
 - (b) aligned with the school improvement plan.
- The administrator chooses measures that best assess the priorities and develops clear and measurable SLOs for the chosen assessments/indicators (see the Administrator's SLO Handbook, SLO Form and SLO Quality Test).

- The administrator shares the SLOs with her/his evaluator, informing a conversation designed to ensure that:
 - The objectives are adequately ambitious.
 - There is adequate data that can be collected to make a fair judgment about whether the administrator met the established objectives.
 - The objectives are based on a review of student characteristics (e.g., mobility, attendance, demographic and learning characteristics) relevant to the assessment of the administrator against the objective.
 - The professional resources are appropriate to supporting the administrator in meeting the performance targets.
- The administrator and evaluator collect interim data on the SLOs to inform a mid-year conversation (which is an opportunity to assess progress and, as needed, adjust targets) and summative data to inform summative ratings.

Based on this process, administrators receive a rating for this portion, as follows

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Met all 3 objectives and substantially exceeded at least 2 targets	Met 2 objectives and made at least substantial progress on the 3rd	Met 1 objective and made substantial progress on at least 1 other	Met 0 objectives OR Met 1 objective and did not make substantial progress on either of the other 2

Arriving at a Student Learning Summative Rating

To arrive at an overall student learning rating, the ratings for the state assessment and the locally-determined ratings in the two components are plotted on this matrix:

		State Measures of Academic Learning			
		4	3	2	1
Locally Determined Measures of Academic Learning	4	Rate Exemplary	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	Gather further information
	3	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing
	2	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing	Rate Developing
	1	Gather further information	Rate Developing	Rate Developing	Rate Below Standard

DETERMINING TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS (5% OF EVALUATION)

Teacher effectiveness outcomes – as measured by an aggregation of teachers’ student learning objectives (SLOs) – make up 5% of an administrator’s evaluation.

Improving teacher effectiveness outcomes is central to an administrator’s role in driving improved student learning. That is why, in addition to measuring the actions that administrators take to increase teacher effectiveness – from hiring and placement to ongoing professional learning to feedback on performance – the administrator evaluation and support model also assesses the outcomes of all of that work.

As part of Connecticut’s teacher evaluation state model, teachers are assessed in part on their accomplishment of SLOs. This is the basis for assessing administrators’ contribution to teacher effectiveness outcomes. In order to maintain a strong focus on teachers setting ambitious SLOs for their evaluation, it is imperative that evaluators of administrators discuss with the administrator their strategies in working with teachers to set SLOs. Without attention to this issue, there is a substantial risk of administrators not encouraging teachers to set ambitious SLOs.

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
> 80% of teachers are rated <i>proficient</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	> 60% of teachers are rated <i>proficient</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	> 40% of teachers are rated <i>proficient</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	< 40% of teachers are rated <i>proficient</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation

- Central Office Administrators will be responsible for the teachers under their assigned role.
- All other administrators will be responsible for the teachers they directly evaluate.

Administrator’s Leader Practice and Student Outcomes Rating:

The summative rating for administrators will follow three steps.

1. Determining a Leader Practice Rating;
2. Determining an Student Outcomes Rating; and
3. Combining the two into an overall rating using the Summative Matrix.

1. PRACTICE: Leadership Practice (40%) + Stakeholder Feedback (10%) = 50%

The practice rating derives from an administrator’s performance on the performance expectations of the Common Core of Leading Evaluation Rubric (CCL) and the one stakeholder feedback target. The observation of administrator performance and practice counts for 40% of the total rating and stakeholder feedback counts for 10% of the total rating. Simply multiply these weights by the component scores to get the category points. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

Component	Score (1-4)	Weight	Summary Score
Observation of Leadership Practice	2	40	80
Stakeholder Feedback	3	10	30
TOTAL LEADER PRACTICE-RELATED POINTS			110

Leader Practice-Related Points	Leader Practice-Related Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-126	Developing
127-174	Proficient
175-200	Exemplary

2. **OUTCOMES: Student Learning (45%) + Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%) = 50%**

The outcomes rating is derived from student learning – student performance and progress on academic learning measures in the state’s accountability system (SPI) and student learning objectives – and teacher effectiveness outcomes. As shown in the **Summative Rating Form**, state reports provide an assessment rating and evaluators record a rating for the student learning objectives agreed to in the beginning of the year. Simply multiply these weights by the component scores to get the category points. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

Component	Score (1-4)	Weight	Points (score x weight)
Student Learning (SPI Progress and SLOs)	3	45	135
Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes	2	5	10
TOTAL STUDENT OUTCOMES-RELATED POINTS			145

Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points	Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-126	Developing
127-174	Proficient
175-200	Exemplary

C. OVERALL: Leader Practice + Student Outcomes

The overall rating combines the practice and outcomes ratings using the matrix below. Using the ratings determined for each major category: Student Outcomes-Related Indicators and Leader Practice-Related Indicators, follow the respective column and row to the center of the matrix. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. For the example provided, the Leader Practice-Related rating is *Progressing* and the Student Outcomes-Related rating is *Meeting*. The summative rating is therefore *Meeting*.

If the two major categories are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of *Exceeding* for Leader Practice and a rating of *Not Meeting* for Student Outcomes), then the evaluator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to determine a summative rating.

The overall rating combines the practice and outcomes ratings using the matrix below. Using the ratings determined for each major category: Student Outcomes-Related Indicators and Leader Practice-Related Indicators, follow the respective column and row to the center of the matrix. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. If the two major categories are highly discrepant, then the evaluator shall examine the current data and gather additional information in order to determine a summative rating.

		<i>Overall Leader Practice Rating</i>			
		4	3	2	1
<i>Overall Student Outcomes Rating</i>	4	Rate Exemplary	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	<i>Gather further information</i>
	3	Rate Exemplary	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing
	2	Rate Proficient	Rate Proficient	Rate Developing	Rate Developing
	1	<i>Gather further information</i>	Rate Developing	Rate Developing	Rate Below Standard

Adjustment of Summative Rating

Summative ratings will be provided for all educators by June 30 of a given school year and reported to the CSDE per state guidelines. Should state standardized test data not yet be available at the time of calculating a summative rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. Ratings can be adjusted up until September 15th of the following school year if the test data is not available until the end of the year.

Linking Educator Evaluation to Professional Learning and Growth

Student success depends on effective teaching, learning and leadership. The CSDE vision for professional learning is that each and every Connecticut educator engages in continuous learning every day to increase professional effectiveness, resulting in positive outcomes for all students. For Connecticut's students to graduate college and career ready, educators must engage in strategically planned, well supported, standards-based, continuous professional learning focused on improving student outcomes.

In mutual agreement with their evaluators, all administrators will identify professional learning needs that support their goals and objectives. The professional learning opportunities identified for each administrator should be based on the individual strengths and needs that are identified through the evaluation process. The process may also reveal areas of common need among administrators, which can then be targeted with school-wide or district-wide professional learning opportunities.

Determining Effective and Ineffective Educators

Effectiveness and ineffectiveness shall be defined utilizing patterns of summative ratings derived from the Groton Public Schools evaluation system. One year's summative rating will not determine an educator's effectiveness or ineffectiveness. A clear pattern and concrete evidence need to inform the determination of effectiveness.

An educator will be determined effective if the educator has two consecutive years of a summative rating of Meets or Exceeds one of which needs to be obtained in the fourth year of being evaluated using this plan. Educators who are not deemed effective by this criterion will be deemed ineffective.

Any educator having a summative rating of Progressing or Not Meeting after one year of being evaluated with this plan may be placed on an individual improvement plan. The Groton Teacher Improvement and Remediation Plan is a 3 tiered approach to educator support. (See description of this support plan in the following section)

After one year of participating in the support and remediation plan, an educator receiving such support will be expected to have a summative rating of Meets or Exceeds. Educators who do not receive a summative rating of Meets or Exceeds after one year of participation in support and remediation shall be assigned a mentor will participate in Tier 3 of the support and remediation plan.

No educator will participate in support and remediation for more than two consecutive school years.

Educator Improvement and Remediation Plans

Groton Public Schools will offer three tiers of support to educators predicated on nature of support needed.

1. **Structured Support:** An educator would receive structured support when an area(s) of concern is identified during the school year. This support is intended to provide short-term assistance to address a concern in its early stage.
2. **Special Assistance:** An educator would receive special assistance when he/she earns an overall performance rating of *Progressing* or *Not Meeting* and/or has received structured support. An educator may also receive special assistance if he/she does not meet the goal(s) of the structured support plan. This support is intended to assist an educator who is having difficulty consistently demonstrating proficiency.
3. **Intensive Assistance:** An educator would receive intensive assistance when he/she does not meet the goal(s) of the special assistance plan. This support is intended to build the staff member's competency.

Tier 1 - Structured Support

The first tier of supportive assistance is an initial attempt to provide an educator with support, supervision, and resources to improve his/her performance in one or more domains. **If a rating of Not Meeting is received, a staff member may be placed in Tier 2 with acknowledgment of the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent.*

Qualifier: If the evaluator has concerns about an educator's performance after informal and/ or formal observations and the evaluator deems greater support is needed for success, the evaluator will notify the educator that he / she is in need of Tier 1 structured support. Tier 1 structured support will consist of 45 school days.

Tier 1 Structured Support will include the following steps:

1. Notice - A meeting between the evaluator and educator will be held to discuss the areas of concern. After this meeting, the evaluator will provide formal written notice of need of support to the staff member. This notice must be specific as to what the domains and concerns are and why support is needed. A copy of the written notice will be sent to the appropriate Association representative.
2. Support Plan - The educator, staff member and representative from the Association will collaborate to outline a support plan including specific goals and objectives related to the domains of concern.
3. Assistance- The evaluator will offer reasonable assistance so that the educator can improve his/her performance in the areas of concern. Assistance may include:
 - peer mentoring / peer coaching
 - informal observation as agreed in support plan
 - evaluator observation
 - peer observation
 - teacher observation of peers
 - release time
 - any other mutually agreed upon support
4. Conference - A schedule of conferences with the evaluator will be agreed upon at the initiation of the plan to review progress towards success of goals and objectives.
5. Resolution - There are three possible resolutions to Tier 1 Structured Support:
 - a. Successful - The staff member will receive written notification of successful completion of the Tier 1 support plan. The staff member will be returned to his/ her normal rotation in the Groton Public Schools Educator Development Plan.
 - b. Progressing - The staff member has made some progress towards successful completion; however, it is deemed additional time is needed to complete Tier 1 support. A collaborative meeting will be held to review the support plan and adjustments will be made if necessary. This phase may last up to an additional 45 days.
 - c. Unsatisfactory - The staff member will receive written notification that the Tier 1 support

was not successful; therefore, the staff member will be moved into the Supervisory Assistance Phase for Certified Staff.

Tier 2: Supervisory Assistance for Certified Staff

The Supervisory Assistance Tier is an attempt to provide a teacher/administrator with the support, supervision, and resources to improve his/her performance in one or more domains.

Procedures for Supervisory Assistance

If the evaluator has continued concerns about a teacher/administrator's performance and feels greater support is needed for success, the evaluator will notify the educator in writing that he/she is being placed in the Supervisory Assistance Tier. The Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent and Association president(s) will be notified immediately when an educator is placed in the Supervisory Assistance Tier (Appendix E).

The Supervisory Assistance Tier will include the following steps:

1. Notice - The evaluator will provide formal written notice of dissatisfaction with the educator's performance and assignment to the Supervisory Assistance Tier. This notice must be specific as to what the concern(s) is and why it is considered to be unsatisfactory.
2. Action Plan - The evaluator will collaborate with the teacher and a representative of the association to outline an action plan including specific goals and objectives for changes with timelines, resources, a schedule of appropriate observations, and evaluative criteria. Upon mutual agreement, other professionals with expertise in the area(s) of need may be consulted.
3. Assistance - The evaluator will offer reasonable assistance so that the staff member can improve his/her performance in the areas that were considered unsatisfactory. The assistance may include but is not limited to, positive suggestions, resource materials, professional development opportunities, referral to other individuals or peer coaching. This intervention will operate for forty-five consecutive school days or fewer if conditions warrant.
4. Observation/Conference - The evaluator will monitor the staff member's progress according to the Action Plan.

Resolution - The evaluator will complete the Supervisory Assistance Form (Appendix E). If performance in the areas considered to be unsatisfactory has improved, the staff member will continue to be monitored through Formal Observation Band. If performance remains unsatisfactory or the action plan has not been followed by the staff member, he/she will be placed on the Intensive Assistance Tier (Tier 3).

Intensive Assistance is the final attempt to provide the help necessary to assist the staff member in meeting the requirements of his/her position. If the evaluator has serious concerns about a staff member's performance and in his/her opinion the staff member is not meeting performance standards as described in the Groton Public Schools Educator Development and Support Plan, then he/she will notify the staff member that he/she will be placed in the Intensive Assistance Tier.

The Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and Association president(s) will be notified

immediately when a staff member is placed in the Intensive Assistance Tier and will receive a copy of the Intensive Assistance Form (Appendix E).

Tier 3: Intensive Assistance Tier for Certified Staff

The Intensive Assistance Tier will include the following steps:

1. Notice -The evaluator will complete the Intensive Assistance Form to advise the staff member that the evaluation assistance will continue and improvement in performance must be shown, or the result may lead to a Central Office review and possible termination.
2. Action Plan -The teacher, evaluator, another appropriate administrator, appointed by the Superintendent, a representative from the Association and at least one mutually agreed upon professional with expertise in the area(s) of need, will develop a plan that includes specific goals, objectives, timelines, resources, and evaluative criteria.
3. Assistance - The evaluator is to offer reasonable assistance so that the staff member can improve his/her performance in the areas that were considered unsatisfactory. The assistance may include but is not limited to, positive suggestions, resource materials, professional development opportunities, referral to other individuals or peer coaching. A time frame which allows the staff member adequate opportunity to improve his/her performance must be stated. This time frame should not exceed 30 school days or extend beyond the school year.
4. Observation/Conference - The evaluator will monitor the staff member's progress in achieving the target(s) established for performance improvement. The plan will be in operation for thirty consecutive school days and shall include both formal and informal observations. The evaluator will observe in the classroom at least once a week followed by a conference with the teacher. The other administrator will make observations and provide feedback to the teacher and the evaluator.
5. Resolution - The evaluator will complete the Intensive Assistance Form (Appendix E). If performance in the area(s) considered to be unsatisfactory has improved, the staff member will continue to be monitored in the Formal Observation Band. If performance remains unsatisfactory, or the action plan has not been followed by the educator, there will be a Central Office review which may lead to termination.

Dispute Resolution Procedures

In case of conflict concerning mutual agreement on performance objectives, implementation of the process, the evaluation period, the redirection to the Formal Observation Band, feedback on performance and practice, or final summative rating below Meeting, the staff member has the right to conflict resolution. A staff member maintains the right of written rebuttal to be attached to the relevant document for any rating.

An appeal procedure may be instituted to resolve the conflict as described below:

1. Evaluator and staff member meet to attempt to resolve the conflict.
2. If unable to reach a satisfactory resolution, the evaluator and staff member meet within five days with a mutually agreed upon impartial third party (e.g., but not limited to certified professional in the same area of expertise as the educator) who will attempt to help resolve differences by facilitating discussion. Satisfactory resolution may result from this step. Inability to agree on an impartial third party will automatically move this matter to the next step.
3. If conflict has not been resolved, a Request for Conflict Resolution Form (Appendix E) should be completed by either party no later than three days after step two and submitted to the Superintendent.
4. A Conflict Resolution Panel will be established. The panel will be composed of the superintendent or designee, human resources representative, Association designee (as determined by Association president(s)) and a mutually agreed upon neutral third person. The committee will meet within five (5) working days with the parties and attempt to resolve the conflict. A report of the results of the Conflict Resolution Panel will be submitted to educator, evaluator, and appropriate Association president. Dissenting opinions of committee members will be included in the committee report and will be filed with the appropriate documents. A copy of the report will be included in the educators evaluation file.

If there is **not** a unanimous agreement to the resolution of conflict, the decision of the Superintendent will be considered final. In this situation, a written report of conflict resolution will be completed by the Superintendent and submitted to the educator, evaluator, and appropriate Association president. A copy of the Superintendent's final decision will be included in the educator's evaluation file.

Request for Change of Evaluator

The relationship between the evaluator and the certified staff member is critical to the success of the certified staff member. A good working relationship is in the best interest of individuals and the district. If a relationship is not successful, either person can request a change of assignment at any time by submitting a written request to the Assistant Superintendent or Superintendent where appropriate.

Evaluator Ratings Audit & Validation

All evaluators are required to complete extensive training on the evaluation model. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) will provide Groton Public Schools with training opportunities and tools throughout the year to support district administrators, evaluators and teachers in implementing the model across their schools. Groton Public Schools will adapt and build on these tools to provide comprehensive training and support to their schools and to ensure that evaluators are Meeting in conducting and consistent in scoring Teacher and/or Administrator evaluations.

At the request of a district or employee, the CSDE or a third-party entity approved by the CSDE will audit the evaluation components that are combined to determine an individual's summative rating in the event that such components are significantly dissimilar (i.e., include both Exceeding and Not Meeting ratings) ratings in different components. In these cases, the CSDE or a third-party entity will determine a final summative rating.

Groton Public Schools will have the option of conducting inter-scorer reliability checks with its trained and calibrated evaluators. This check may consist of review of data from previous observations and ratings or a review of calibration with materials from LEARN. Additionally, we may assign evaluators peer partners as a means by which to calibrate scoring.

Groton Public School evaluators will attend training conducted by the CSDE regarding conducting observations and providing quality feedback. As part of attending this state approved training, evaluators will be expected to demonstrate proficiency in the evaluation process. Continued calibration of evaluators is essential to a fair and balanced evaluation system; therefore, evaluators in Groton Public School will participate in on-going calibration throughout the school year. Calibration will be a consistent agenda item on the district level administrators' meeting agenda at least once a term (based on a trimester system).

APPENDIX Table of Contents:

- A. Career Development and Growth
- B. Job Descriptions
- C. Suggested Monthly Checklists for Educators
- D. Mid-Year Conference: Guidance
 - 1. Teachers
 - 2. Administrators
- E. Forms
 - 1. SLO
 - 2. Pre-Observation Plan
 - 3. Pre-Observation Conference Protocol
 - 4. Post Observation Reflection
 - 5. Informal Observation
 - 6. Administrators Mid-Year Form and Artifact Review
 - 7. Teachers Mid-Year Form and Artifact Review
 - 8. Conference Summary
 - 9. Professional Growth
 - 10. Self-Evaluation
 - 11. Summative Evaluation
 - 12. Request for Conflict Resolution
 - 13. Supervisory Assistance for Certified Staff
 - Tier 1 Support
 - Tier 2 Support
 - Tier 3 Support
 - 14. Request for Change of Evaluator
 - 15. Parent Engagement
- F. Supporting Documents
 - 1. [Common Core of Teaching: Rubric for Effective Teaching](#)
 - 2. [Connecticut Common Core of Teaching: Rubric for Effective Service Delivery](#)
 - 3. [Common Core of Leading](#)
 - 4. [Connecticut School Leadership Standards](#)
 - 5. [Common Core of Leadership Rubric](#)
- G. SEED Sample Evaluation Support Plan

Appendix A: Career Development and Growth (Professional Practice Goal)

The Groton Public Schools recognize the diversity in experience and expertise that exists among professional staff in the district. For that reason, educators are encouraged to develop their own professional development plans, linked to district goals but designed to meet the individual needs of the teacher to advance student learning and professional growth. Every effort will be made to provide time for individual or group professional development alternatives during Professional Development Days and/or faculty meetings.

Peer Coaching or Consultative Support

Peers agree to observe each other's classes a minimum of two times during the school year. The purpose is to provide and receive feedback pertaining to their goal. The peer should be someone who is helpful, supportive, and knowledgeable. The educator may choose to have more than one peer observe at the same time or a series of peer observers over a period of time. With peer observation, two teachers may be working on similar growth plans or be working on very different plans. Alternatively, educators may request support from district/school consultants to provide professional feedback and support.

Staff Development Program

An educator develops a topic and presents a program to other staff. The presentation includes what participants will know or be able to do as a result of participating in the program, why it is important to learn it, and how it relates to student learning.

Co-Teaching

An educator plans, instructs, and evaluates a unit with a colleague, an administrator or department head. Both share the responsibility for Progressing, presenting and assessing the unit and identifying difficulties and successes.

Submission of Articles for Publication

An educator prepares and presents an article on instruction or curriculum for publication in a professional journal.

Reflective Practice

An educator records a selection of lessons during the school year, analyzes the lessons, and writes an assessment/reflection on the effectiveness of each lesson.

Coursework/Conferences

An educator completes a graduate course, summer seminar or series of workshops related to a district, school, or individual goal.

Curriculum Work

An educator works on the development of a curriculum based on local, state, and national standards.

Mentor/Cooperating Teacher

An educator serves as a mentor and/or cooperating teacher. Participants agree to observe and provide feedback to the beginning and student teacher, and to write a written reflection at the end of each year for review with another colleague and with their supervisor.

Study Group

Participants meet with a group of 4-6 colleagues to learn new strategies, experiment with teaching strategies, analyze the resulting student work from these strategies, and to problem solve. Study groups can be formed to focus on content that supports a teacher's goal or to support the implementation of a district goal.

Action Research

The educator (or group of educators) develops a hypothesis and a research project to test that hypothesis. An educator might propose the hypothesis that the use of cooperative learning strategies will improve student achievement in U.S. History. The educator could then identify lessons or a unit in which to use the strategy and measure student achievement. Findings could be briefly presented in a paper and discussed with other faculty.

Analysis of Classroom Artifacts

The educator would maintain a file which includes each lesson plan, handout, quiz, test and exam in a given semester. The analysis might include the congruency between what is taught and how it is tested, the relationship between the instructional strategies used and student achievement, an analysis of the students' thinking and the depth of their learning, and/or evidence of growth over time.

Professional Readings

Educators review books, articles, and journals related to goal attainment.

Best Practice Study

Based on an examination of state or national standards for educators or students, an educator or group of educators may examine classroom practices to identify best practices related to those standards. The group may wish to compile case studies, a compilation of best practices, or a professional development activity to share their findings.

Peer Coaching or Support

Peers work together to meet a common goal. Peers observe each other, review video recordings, meet to advise and offer support. Peers may also plan time to examine current literature and best practices related to the goal.

Individual Plans

Individuals should tailor professional growth plans to meet their professional needs as they relate to student learning. An educator's goals will be mutually agreed upon by the educator and his/her evaluator. The plans will meet the requirements of the professional growth goal of the Groton Public Schools Educator Development Plan, and outline the professional development needed to successfully meet the individual's goal. These plans will define the goal, and also define the professional development activities, which could be accomplished using district professional development days, in addition to time outside of the scheduled school day and year. These plans may include activities such as case studies, professional writing, classroom research, action research, conference attendance, or the development of innovative instructional practices. Final plans must be submitted to the evaluator for approval.

Group Plans

Groups may tailor their professional growth plans to meet individual, group, or building needs based on district goals. These plans may include activities such as study groups, case studies, action research, collaborative inquiry groups, professional writing, classroom research, conference attendance, off-site visits, or the development of innovative instructional practices. Professional development activities may be carried out using district professional development days and/or time outside of the scheduled school day and year. Groups will specify how their plan meets individual, building, and district level goals, and ultimately how it impacts student learning. Final plans must be submitted to the evaluator for review and approval.

National Board Certification

National Board Certification is a benefit to the individual teacher, the district, and the profession. Candidates are most likely to be attracted to the process and successful in pursuing certification when they have familiarity with National Standards for Board Certification in the specific field of interest. In addition, success in achieving National Board Certification is enhanced when supports and incentives are in place at the school and district levels. To this end, the Groton School System will provide the necessary supports and incentives as time and resources may allow.

1. Strand One — Pre-Candidacy

A professional development activity as noted below based on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards will be offered to teachers considering candidacy. Since the NBPT has developed standards in almost all areas of certification, teachers will be invited to voluntarily form groups to examine the standards as they apply to their own teaching. Activities may include case studies, action research, investigations within the classroom, or peer collaboration. For instance, teachers in the group might decide to bring evidence of their own work on a particular standard to discuss and critique at subsequent meetings.

Release time may be provided throughout the school year. This time may include district Professional Development Days and building faculty meetings. CEUs will be provided for all appropriate activities.

2. Strand Two: Candidacy

Candidacy for National Board Certification is a one to three year professional development commitment. During this time, teachers will undertake the assessments necessary for national certification. Teachers will meet periodically in support groups for review and assistance in fulfilling the requirements of the assessment.

Candidates have one school year to complete an assessment. As candidates pass each segment of the assessment, the segments can be banked. Overall, three years will be allotted. Any candidate who passes in the first year can act as a facilitator for the other candidates for the next two years.

The Groton Board of Education will support candidates as per contract, as well as awarding CEUs for all appropriate activities.

Release time may be provided throughout the school year. This time may include district Professional Development Days and building faculty meetings. CEUs will be provided for all appropriate activities.

3. Strand Three: Post-Candidacy

Teachers who achieve the National Board Certification will be recognized by the district. They may be released from teaching duties to engage in activities such as presentations, mentoring, group facilitation, etc.

Appendix B: Job Descriptions

Appendix C: Suggested Monthly Checklists for Educators

JULY- AUGUST

- Administrators will orientate themselves to new updates, and will determine goal setting and plan development and implementation.

SEPTEMBER

- Set up email folders:
 - Parent/guardian emails
 - Evaluators/complementary evaluators
 - PLC/Instructional Data Team
- Gather other data about student performance and needs
 - Review current students' previous year's assessment results
 - Give students pre-assessments
 - Look at early samples of student work
 - Review students' cumulative files
 - If appropriate speak with other teachers and support staff
 - If appropriate, give student interest inventory
- Begin parent/guardian home communication log (especially useful for the 10% parent feedback indicator and 5% student feedback, if school is using surveys or focus groups).
- Take a look at last year's summative evaluation and where it might place you on the continuum for this year.

OCTOBER

- **Orientation process--must be completed by 11/15. (Most likely, this would have taken place at a faculty meeting at the beginning of the year).**
 - **Orientation should have included**
 - General discussion of evaluation process, teacher's role, observations and review of practice?
 - School or district priorities to be reflected in teacher practice focus areas and SLOs?
 - How are parent feedback (10%) to be collected (surveys? school-wide parent engagement goals?)
 - How student outcomes related indicators (5%) will be captured (Student feedback? Whole-school learning indicators? Combination of both?)?
 - What your district's dispute resolution plan is?

- **Educator reflection and goal setting: check your district's evaluation plan for completion date; must be completed by 11/15.**
 - Examine all student data
 - Review prior year's evaluation and survey results--if applicable.
 - Review district's observation rubric to help set performance practice focus areas, parent feedback goal--if required.
 - Discuss collaboration with grade-level or subject matter teams
 - Write draft of practice goals, SLOs, IAGDs
- **Goal-setting conference: check district plan for target date; must be completed by 11/15**
 - Teacher and evaluator meet to discuss teacher's proposed focus area; goals and objectives; MUTUAL AGREEMENT is ESSENTIAL to procedure.
 - Evaluator may request revisions to proposed focus area(s), goals and objectives if they do not meet approval criteria.
 - Review with evaluator whether you will have formal, in-class observations and other reviews of practice (such as data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring sessions or reviews of lesson plans/other teaching).
 - Review control factors and discuss with evaluator any factors you feel may impact student performance and your evaluation.

NOVEMBER

- ***Orientation on process:*** *Check your district's evaluation plan for completion date; must be completed by 11/15. (look to October for criteria)*
- ***Develop professional development growth plan to support practice goals and instruction to impact student learning:***
 - Identify clear learning objectives for yourself
 - Review and identify learning activities offered by district, professional organizations, online resources, etc.
 - Determine indicators of progress/reaching objectives
- ***Teacher reflection and goal setting conference:*** *check your district's evaluation plan for completion date; must be completed by 11/15 (see October)*
- ***Collect evidence to support focus area(s), goals and objectives and upload to data management system, such as:***
 - PD activities in which you have participated
 - Student work
 - Notes re: your observation of student progress or challenges
- *Have you had any in-class observations? Make note of the following:*

- Was the observation formal or informal?
- Was there any feedback--written or verbal?
- If formal, was there a pre-conference and post-conference?
- Check phone communication log: is it up to date?
- Make sure you're saving and sorting email communications that can be artifacts and/or provide evidence

DECEMBER

- Revisit SLOs--talk to evaluator if adjustments are needed. Make sure your IAGDs are appropriate
- Review control factors and let your evaluator know of any excessive student absences, changes in student population (as they relate to your SLOs), etc.
- Collect evidence to support focus area(s), goals, and objectives and upload to data management system, such as:
 - PD activities in which you have participated
 - Student work
 - Notes regarding your observations of student progress or challenges
- Make sure you're getting adequate professional development in any identified goal or areas targeted for growth. Advocate for your needs.

JANUARY

- Mid-year check in; timeframe is January – February (check district plan for specified timeframe):
 - Review goals, SLOs and performance
 - Review evidence (yours and evaluator's)
 - Review control factors
 - Revises SLOs if necessary
 - Discuss end-of-year self-assessment
- Collect evidence to support focus area(s), goals, and objectives and upload to data management systems, such as:
 - PD activities in which you have participated
 - Student work
 - Notes re: your observations of student progress and challenges

FEBRUARY

- Mid-year check in; timeframe is Jan.-Feb. (see district evaluation for specific timeframe; look to January for criteria).
- Check communication log; is it up to date?
- Make sure you're saving and sorting email communications.

- Revisit SLOs—talk to evaluation if adjustments are needed. Make sure your IAGDs are appropriate.
- Collect evidence to support focus areas, goals, and objectives and upload to data management system, such as:
 - PD activities in which you have participated
 - Student work
 - Notes re: your observations of student progress or challenges
- Have you had any in-class observations? Make note of the following:
 - If informal:
 - How long was the observation?
 - Did you get written or verbal feedback?
 - How long after the observation did you get the feedback?
 - If formal:
 - How long was the observation?
 - Did you get written or verbal feedback?
 - How long after the observation did you get the feedback?
 - Was there a pre-conference?
 - If you had a face-to-face post conference, how long did it last?

MARCH

- Review control factors: have you had many students move in and/or out, especially right before state testing? Inform your evaluator.
- Collect evidence to support focus areas, goals and objectives and upload data to data management system, such as:
 - PD activities in which you have participated
 - Student work
 - Notes re: your observations of student progress or challenges
- Have you had any in-class observations? (Make note of the following)
 - If informal:
 - How long was the observation?
 - Did you get written or verbal feedback?
 - How long after the observation did you get the feedback?
 - If formal:
 - How long was the observation?
 - Did you get written or verbal feedback?
 - How long after the observation did you get the feedback?
 - Was there a pre-conference?
 - If you had a face-to-face post conference, how long did it last?

APRIL

- Check phone communications log: is it up to date?
- Make sure you're saving and sorting email communications.
- Revisit SLOs—talk to evaluator if adjustments are needed. Are your IAGDs appropriate?
- Have you had any in-class observations? Make note of the following:
 - If informal:
 - How long was the observation?
 - Did you get written or verbal feedback?
 - How long after the observation did you get the feedback?
 - If formal:
 - How long was the observation?
 - Did you get written or verbal feedback?
 - How long after the observation did you get the feedback?
 - Was there a pre-conference?
 - If you had a face-to-face post conference, how long did it last?
- Begin working on end-of-year self-assessment.

MAY

- Review your professional development in identified goal areas or areas targeted for growth. Determine your progress in reaching objectives.
- Review Control factors and let your evaluator know of any excessive student absences, changes in student absences, changes in student populations (esp. as they relate to your SLOs), etc.
- Collect evidence to support focus areas, goals, and objectives and upload to data management system, such:
 - PD activities in which you have participated
 - Student work
 - Notes re: your observations of student progress or challenges
- Administer students' post-assessment (if pre-assessment was given in September).
- Put the finishing touches on your end-of-year self-assessment.

JUNE

End-of-year conference and review; check your plan for specific date, but must be completed by June 30th.

- You and evaluator should discuss:
 - Student Outcomes:
 - What evidence of student growth over time will you bring to discuss?
 - How did control factors impact student progress (if at all)?
 - Overall, were you IAGDs appropriate and attainable?

REMINDER: If student test data is not achievable, the student outcome rating based on other non-standardized indicators.

- Teacher Performance Outcomes:
 - What feedback from observations and reviews of practice will you bring to discuss?
 - What other evidence will you bring that supports your performance in domains not directly observable in the classroom?
 - How does your evidence support your self-assessment?
- What evidence will you bring to show?
 - Parent engagement?
 - Planning of lessons?
 - Professional responsibility?

REMINDER: a summative rating can be disputed or audited for accuracy. Check your plan for specific disputed resolution procedure.

Appendix D: Mid-Year Conference January/February: Guidance for Evaluators of Teacher

Outcomes

The goal of the Mid-Year Conference is to engage the teacher and the evaluator in examining progress toward established yearlong goals, especially the student learning objectives (SLOs) and performance and practice goals. Additionally, the Mid-Year Conference is an opportunity for the teacher to share artifacts, experiences, data and anecdotal information about student performance and professional practice that might provide evidence for Domains 1 and 4 of the CT Framework for Evaluation and Support. Examining progress toward SLOs is an important discussion. ***Determining supports for teachers, necessary to ensure success, are a priority.*** If it becomes clear that SLOs can be improved or are no longer appropriate, adjustments may be considered if:

- Based on new information gathered since the SLOs were set, the objectives fail to address the most important learning challenges in the classroom and/or school.
- New, more reliable sources of evidence are available.
- Class composition has significantly changed.
- Teaching schedule, assignment or personal circumstance has significantly changed.

Tips to Ensure a Productive Conference

- **Establish a specific timeframe (15-30 minutes).**
- **Communicate expected outcomes for the Mid-Year Conference to teachers.** Suggest that teachers use the Mid-Year Conference Form to guide their own preparation. Teachers should be prepared to share interim results and predictions, using multiple measures related to student performance, as established within their Initial Goal Setting Conference. The following list describes possible sources of evidence to assist teachers in their preparation:

*Analysis of classroom assessments
colleagues
*Evidence of communication with families
*Reflective teacher and/or student journals
*Differentiated lesson plan samples
student results
*Student intervention plans

*Examples of collaborative work with
*Record of PD activities
*Student Work Samples
*Graphs, tables or rubrics describing
*Video/audio samples of instruction

Plan the conference around progress toward SLOs within the 45%. Post observation conferences and feedback have likely provided opportunities for discussion and evidence collection within the 40%. Discussions around progress for the Parent/Peer Feedback (10%) and the Whole School Student Learning Indicator/Student Feedback (5%) can occur as a part of team/faculty meetings.

- **Provide a “general impression” of the teacher’s evaluation rating.** Teachers may want to know where you see them within the continuum of performance at this point in the year. This is your opportunity to further discuss a specific professional learning plan to move the teacher along the performance continuum.

- **Complete the Mid-Year Summary Form** and share it with the teacher.

Suggested Conference Discussion Prompts 45% Student Learning Objectives

- Tell me about your students' progress relative to the goals you've set for their learning this year.
- What evidence/data do you have to support your thinking about student progress?
- Tell me what we have to celebrate. What might explain the successes you've documented?
- Tell me about your challenges. What might explain slower progress than you expected?
- Based on your current review of student progress, what short-term objectives are you considering to assist you in reaching your end of year targets?
- Are there additional supports or professional development that I can provide?

Note: If revisions are mutually agreed upon, consider determining an additional check in to determine progress. Additionally, refer to the criteria used to approve SLOs at the initial goal setting conference.

Mid-Year Conference—Guidance for Evaluators of Administrators

Conference Discussion Prompts

45% Student Learning Objectives • Tell me about your students' progress relative to the goals you've set this year. (i.e. graduation rate, non-tested areas/grades) • What evidence/data do you have to support your thinking about student progress? • Tell me what we have to celebrate. What might explain the success you've documented? • Tell me about your challenges. What might explain slower progress than you expected? • Based on your current review of student progress, what short term objectives are you considering to assist you in reaching your end of year targets? Are there additional resources or supports that I can provide? <i>Note:</i> If revisions are mutually agreed upon, consider determining an additional check in to determine progress
40% Observation of Practice • Tell me about your learning relative to your professional practice goal. • Are you working with a colleague(s) to develop and/or expand leadership practice? Can I connect you with someone who may be able to offer additional guidance? • What are you learning about your practice that is helping you to grow as a school leader? • Let me share some of my observations with you. Let's talk about how I can assist your moving forward.
10% Stakeholder Feedback • Tell me about your ongoing communication with families or faculty as it relates to your school wide goal. • Describe your faculty involvement in the goal activities to date. • What level of response have you observed from families? (Attendance at school sponsored events, greater number of view on classroom webpage, willingness to volunteer in class, homework completion, etc.) • What is your contribution to the partnership/team and what have you gained through the collaborative process?
5% Teacher Effectiveness • What have you learned from your collection/analysis of any interim data from teachers as it relates to student progress on their SLOs? • What strategies/actions have you put into place that you expect to positively influence teacher performance?

Mid-Year Conference—Guidance for Evaluators of Administrators

Outcomes

- The goal of the Mid-Year Conference is to engage the administrator and the evaluator in examining progress toward established year-long goals, especially the student learning objectives (SLOs) and professional practice goals. Additionally, the mid-year conference is an opportunity for the administrator to share artifacts, experiences, data and anecdotal information about student performance and professional practice. This presents an opportunity to revise SLOs if it becomes clear that they can be improved or are no longer appropriate and/or request additional resources to ensure success. Adjustments may be considered if:
- Based on new information gathered since the SLOs were set, the objectives fail to address the most important learning challenges in the school.
- New, more reliable sources of evidence are available.
- Composition of faculty or student body has significantly changed.

Evaluator Preparation

Establish a specific time frame (30-45 minutes)

Frame the conference around progress toward SLOs within the 45% initially.

- Observation feedback has likely provided opportunities for discussion and evidence collection within the 40%, yet progress toward SLOs can and should connect to observations of practice.
- Provide a “general impression” of the administrator’s rating to date.
- Administrators may want to know where you see them within the continuum of performance at this point in the year.
- This is your opportunity to further discuss a specific professional learning plan to move the teacher along the performance continuum.
- Provide a written summary of the conference and share with administrator.
- The following list can be suggested as possible sources of evidence to assist administrators in their preparation.

- ***Analysis of school/specific grade or subject formative assessment data***
- ***Examples of collaborative work with colleagues and teachers***
- ***Evidence of communication with families -Evidence of communication with families and teachers***
- ***Reflective journals***
- ***Student/Teacher work samples***
- ***Annotated photographs of school activities -Graphs, tables or rubrics describing student results***
- ***Record of PD activities and implementation data***
- ***Video/audio samples of work (i.e. SWDT/faculty meeting)***
- ***Samples of feedback to teachers -Documentation of work on professional standard***

APPENDIX E: Evaluation Forms

1. SLO
2. Pre-Observation Plan
3. Pre-Observation Conference Protocol
4. Post Observation Reflection
5. Informal Observation
6. Administrators Mid-Year Form and Artifact Review
7. Teachers Mid-Year Form and Artifact Review
8. Conference Summary
9. Professional Growth
10. Self-Evaluation
11. Summative Evaluation
12. Request for Conflict Resolution
13. Supervisory Assistance Phase for Certified Staff
 - Tier 1 Support
 - Tier 2 Support
 - Tier 3 Support
14. Request for Change of Evaluator
15. Parent Feedback
16. Administrator Student Learning Indicator

** Forms will be correlated with the data management system.

Groton Public Schools currently subscribed to BloomBoard as a data management system.

Form 1

GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SLO Form

Teacher:	Date:	Grade:
School:	Content area:	

SLO Focus Statement

What will you teach in the SLO? What is the expectation for student improvement related to school improvement goals?

Baseline – Trend Data

What data were reviewed for this SLO? How does the data support the SLO?

Student Population

Who are you going to include in this objective? Why is this target group/student selected?

Standards and Learning Content

What are the standards connected to the learning content?

Interval of Instruction <i>What is the time period that instruction for the learning content will occur?</i>
Assessments <i>How will you measure the outcome of your SLO?</i>
Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs)/Growth Targets <i>What are the quantitative targets that will demonstrate achievement of the SLO?</i>
Instructional Strategies <i>What methods will you use to accomplish this SLO? How will progress be monitored? What professional learning/supports do you need to achieve this SLO?</i>

Form 2:

GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Common Core of Teaching (CCT) Rubric for Effective Teaching

Pre-Observation Plan for Classroom Teachers

Teacher _____ Grade Level _____ Date of lesson _____

Directions: This plan should be completed by the teacher and provided to the evaluator at least 24 hours prior to the Pre-Observation Conference and the formal observation. The CSDE does not recommend use of this form for everyday planning purposes.

Content Standards: Identify one or two **primary** content standards, (including CSS as applicable) that this lesson is designed to help students attain.

Placement of Lesson within Broader Curriculum/Context: Where does this lesson fall within the sequence of the larger content standards, curriculum or unit? Is it at the beginning, middle or end of a sequence of lessons/or a unit leading to attainment of the content standards? How will the outcomes of this lesson and student learning affect subsequent instruction?

Learner Background: Describe the students' prior knowledge or skill, and/or their present level related to the learning objective(s) and the content of this lesson (using data from pre-assessment as appropriate).

Objective(s) for Lesson: Identify specific and measurable learning objectives/purpose for this lesson.

Formative Assessment: How will you check for student understanding to demonstrate mastery? *Attach a copy of any assessment materials you will use, along with assessment criteria.* What data or evidence of student learning will be collected through the assessment?

In the table below create a bulleted list, which includes

- The instructional grouping/s (whole class, small groups, pairs, individuals) you will use in each lesson segment and approximate time frames for each.
- The instructional strategies you will use and the learning activities in which students will be engaged in order to gain the key knowledge and skills identified in the learning objective(s). This may also include a description of how you will *initiate* (set expectations for learning and purpose) and *close* (understanding the purpose) the lesson.
- The materials you will use in each learning activity including any technological resources.

Instructional Strategies	Groupings	Materials/Resources:

Students Needing Differentiated Instruction:

Note: Differentiated instruction may not be necessary in every lesson. However, over the course of the year, it is expected that each teacher will demonstrate the ability to differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of students with learning differences.

Identify several students with learning differences. Students should represent a range of ability and/or achievement levels, including students with IEPs, gifted and talented students, struggling learners and English language learners.

Which students do you anticipate may struggle with the content/learning objectives of this lesson?		
Student initials or group	Evidence that the student needs differentiated instruction	How will you differentiate instruction in this lesson to support student learning?
Which students will need opportunities for enrichment/a higher level of challenge?		
Student initials or group	Evidence that the student needs differentiated instruction	How will you differentiate instruction in this lesson to support student learning?

Form 3

GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Common Core of Teaching (CCT) Rubric for Effective Teaching

Pre-Observation Conference Protocol

Teacher _____ School _____ Date _____

Directions: These questions can be used by the evaluator and should be asked of the teacher before the observation and based on the submitted plan (see Pre-Observation Plan for Classroom Teachers).

1. Will you still be implementing the plan you submitted or has it changed?
2. Do you have any data, artifacts or information about the lesson or the students' learning or behavior you wish to share?
3. How have you used data to inform your instruction? (On what assessment data/evidence did you base your determination of prior or present level of student knowledge and skills for the class versus those needing differentiation?)
4. How do plan to address student misconceptions, misunderstandings or challenges do you anticipate and these?
5. How will students be engaged in problem-solving or critical thinking? How have you determined the strategies/tasks/questions are at an appropriate level of rigor for students?
6. How did you decide upon the lesson-based assessment strategies you will use?

Form 4

GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Common Core of Teaching (CCT) Rubric for Effective Teaching

Post-Observation Reflection

Teacher_____ School _____ Date_____

Directions: This reflection may be completed by the teacher and provided to the evaluator prior or recorded with the evaluator during the Post-Observation Conference.

1. As you think about your lesson and how it progressed, which of your instructional strategies were most effective in helping students learn? What evidence supports your conclusions?

2. If you made changes or adjustments during your lesson, what were they, and what led you to make them?

3. To what extent did students achieve the learning outcomes you intended? What evidence from student work or assessment do you have that provides you with sufficient information about student learning/progress towards the learning outcome? (Upload a representative sample of student work or assessments from the lesson to the Post-Observation Conference.)

4. What have you learned from this lesson or others that will affect your planning for future lessons, either in terms of your own instructional skills or in addressing students' instructional needs? If you were to teach this lesson again, would you do anything differently? If yes, why?

Form 5

GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Informal Observation & Feedback Form

Teacher Name: _____

Time/Date Observed: _____

Observer's Name: _____

Date feedback provided: _____

This form serves as a record of an informal walkthrough by the teacher's evaluator. Any information also needs to be entered in BloomBoard or this form should be uploaded to the informal observation record in BloomBoard. The evaluator will likely NOT observe all of the teaching elements listed below in any one informal observation. Evidence gathered along with evidence from additional observations will be used to inform the summative evaluation of the teacher. A copy of this form can be given to teachers as feedback.

What were the Students doing/saying?	What was the teacher doing/saying?
Feedback	Next Steps

Domain 1: Classroom environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning	Domain 3: Instruction for Active Learning
1a. Creating a positive learning environment that is responsive to and respectful of the learning needs of all students. 1b. Promoting developmentally appropriate standards of behavior that support a productive learning environment for all students. 1c. Maximizing instructional time by effectively managing routines and transitions.	3a. Implementing instructional content for learning. 3b. Leading students to construct meaning and apply new learning through the use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies. 3c. Assessing student learning, providing feedback to students and adjusting instruction.

Form 6

GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

ADMINISTRATOR MID YEAR FORM AND ARTIFACT REVIEW

Administrator's name: _____

Date/Time: _____

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 1: Vision, Mission, and Goals

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, a strong organizational mission, and high expectations for student performance.

- ☐ **Element A. High Expectations for All:** Leaders ensure that the creation of the vision, mission and goals establish high expectations for all students and staff.
- ☐ **Element B. Shared Commitments to Implement the Vision, Mission, and Goals:** Leaders ensure that the process of implementing and sustaining the vision, mission, and goals is inclusive, building common understandings and commitment among all stakeholders.
- ☐ **Element C. Continuous Improvement toward the Vision, Mission, and Goals:** Leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by consistently monitoring and refining the implementation of the vision, mission and goals.

ARTIFACTS TO TAG:

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 2: Teaching and Learning

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by monitoring and continuously improving teaching and learning.

- ☐ **Element A. Strong Professional Culture:** Leaders develop a strong professional culture which leads to quality instruction focused on student learning and the strengthening of professional competencies.
- ☐ **Element B. Curriculum and Instruction:** Leaders understand and expect faculty to plan, implement, and evaluate standards-based curriculum and challenging instruction aligned with Connecticut and national standards.
- ☐ **Element C. Assessment and Accountability:**
Leaders use assessments, data systems, and accountability strategies to improve achievement, monitor and evaluate progress, and close achievement gaps.

ARTIFACTS TO TAG:

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 3: Organizational Systems and Safety

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by managing organizational systems and resources for a safe, high-performing learning environment.

- ☐ **Element A. Welfare and Safety of Students, Faculty and Staff:** Leaders ensure a safe environment by addressing real and potential challenges to the physical and emotional safety and security of students, faculty and staff.
- ☐ **Element B. Operational Systems:** Leaders distribute responsibilities and supervise management structures and practices to improve teaching and learning.
- ☐ **Element C. Fiscal and Human Resources:** Leaders establish an infrastructure for finance and personnel that operates in support of teaching and learning.

ARTIFACTS TO TAG:

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 4: Families and Stakeholders

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by collaborating with families and other stakeholders to respond to diverse community interests and needs and to mobilize community resources.

- ☐ **Element A. Collaboration with Families and Community Members:** Leaders ensure the success of all students by collaborating with families and other stakeholders.
- ☐ **Element B. Community Interests and Needs:** Leaders respond and contribute to community interests and needs to provide high quality education for students and their families.
- ☐ **Element C. Community Resources:** Leaders access resources shared among schools, districts, and communities in conjunction with other organizations and agencies that provide critical resources for children and families.

ARTIFACTS TO TAG:

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 5: Ethics and Integrity

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students and staff by modeling ethical behavior and integrity.

- ☐ **Element A. Ethical and Legal Standards of the Profession:** Leaders demonstrate ethical and legal behavior.
- ☐ **Element B. Personal Values and Beliefs:** Leaders demonstrate a commitment to values, beliefs, and practices aligned with the vision, mission and goals for student learning.
- ☐ **Element C. High Standards for Self and Others:** Leaders model and expect Exceeding practices for personal and organizational performance, ensuring accountability for high standards of student learning.

ARTIFACTS TO TAG:

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 6: The Education System

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students and advocate for their students, faculty and staff needs by influencing social, cultural, economic, legal, and political contexts affecting education.

- ☐ **Element A. Professional Influence:** Leaders improve the broader social, cultural economic, legal, and political, contexts of education for all students and families.
- ☐ **Element B. The Educational Policy Environment:** Leaders uphold and contribute to policies and political support for excellence and equity in education.
- ☐ **Element C. Policy Engagement:** Leaders engage policymakers to inform and improve education policy.

ARTIFACTS TO TAG:

Form 7**Groton Public Schools****Mid-Year Review****Teacher Reflection**

Prior to the conference you should review your SLOs/IAGDs, feedback goal(s) (e.g. student, parent, and/or peer) and performance and practice focus area to assess the progress made to date. The following prompts can assist you in preparing for your Mid-Year Check-In Conference with your observer. You can fill out the pre-set form, save and share directly on the platform. The observer and learner can highlight text and tag it to the rubric. The observer can choose to filter out any evidence the learner has tagged from his/her view upon final review if he/she chooses.

- 1. Describe your progress to date. Include specific details about your students' progress for each SLO/IAGD you set for their learning and your progress on your feedback goal(s) and performance and practice focus area.**

- 2. Describe any professional learning and/or strategies that have contributed to your progress. Describe any additional professional learning or supports that would help ensure your success.**

- 3. Describe any challenges or barriers to achieving your SLOs/IAGDs, feedback goal(s) or performance and practice focus area.**

4. **What modified action steps and/or adjustments will you implement to address challenges towards achieving your SLOs/IAGDs, feedback goal(s) or performance and practice focus area?**

5. **Please list/describe any additional duties you perform, committees you serve on or stipend positions you hold that help to contribute to our school community.**

Other Comments:

Form 8**Groton Public Schools****Mid-Year Conference Summary****Observer Feedback****Commendations:****Recommendations:****Next Steps:**

Have any goals or SLOs been changed since the initial Goal-Setting Conference? If so, please summarize the changes.

As a final step, the observer should identify commendations, recommendations, and next steps within five days of the Mid-Year Check-In Conference and send them to the teacher.

Form 9**GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Professional Growth****Phase/Year _____ Professional Growth/Year _____****Evaluatee _____****School _____****Evaluator _____****Conference Date _____****Summary:****Action Steps:****Professional Development to support area of focus:****Evaluatee's Signature: _____****Date:****Evaluator's Signature: _____****Date:**

Form 10

GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Self-Evaluation

Evaluatee _____

School _____

Position _____

School Year _____

Student Growth and Development (45%)

Results of each SLO indicator (IAGD) with evidence

For each SLO and indicator (IAGD):

- a. **Provide your overall self-assessment of whether each SLO indicator (IAGD) was met (based on the results of your identified IAGD). Use the ratings:**

Did not meet
 Partially met
 Met
 Exceeded
 Does not apply

- b. **Provide evidence for each indicator (IAGD) by describing what you did that produced the results. Describe what you learned and how you will use the results of the IAGD going forward.**

Performance and Practice (40%)

Describe what progress you made in your performance and practice focus area throughout the year and what supports would better enable you to make further progress going forward.

Parent or Peer Feedback (10%)

Provide evidence for the Peer or Parent feedback component below by describing what you did that produced positive outcomes or resulted in achievement toward a specified goal or strategy.

Describe what you learned throughout this year and how you will use the results of the Peer or Parent feedback going forward.

Whole-School Measures of Student Learning or Student Feedback (5%)

Space is provided below for you to reflect on how you've contributed to this component.

For districts that include the whole-school student learning indicator in teacher evaluations, your rating shall be equal to the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for your administrator's evaluation rating.

For districts that include student feedback in teacher evaluations, provide evidence for the student feedback component below.

Evaluatee's Signature: _____ **Date:**

Evaluator's Signature: _____ **Date:**

Form 11

GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Summative Evaluation Report

_____Band ____/Year

Teacher: _____

School: _____

Position: _____

School Year: _____

Evaluator will rate the

_____ **Teacher Performance and Practice = 40%** of total score

*The evaluator will rate the teacher on each of the indicators on the appropriate rubric.
 (See appendix F)*

_____ **Parent Feedback = 10%** of total score

*The evaluator will rate the teacher on their work towards the school's parent
 feedback goal. (See appendix E)*

The above scores will be calculated for a teacher practice related indicator score: _____

_____ **Student Growth and Development = 45%** of total score

*The evaluator will rate according to the achievement of student learning objectives.
 Each measure is rated and multiplied by the weight set by the learner. (See
 appendix E)*

_____ **Whole-School Student Learning Indicator = 5%** of total score

*The teacher will receive a rating based on the achievement level of the whole school
 goal. (See appendix E)*

The above scores will be calculated for the student outcome related indicator score: _____

*The teacher practice and student outcome indicator scores will be combined to determine the overall
 rating on the appropriate rubric for the final summative score/rating:*

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

Form 12

GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Request for Conflict Resolution

Evaluatee: _____ **School:** _____

Evaluator: _____ **School:** _____

Statement of Conflict:

Signature

Conflict resolved by the Committee.

Date:

Conflict resolved by the Superintendent.

Date:

Form 13**GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Supervisory Assistance Phase for Certified Staff*****Tier 1 _____******Structured Support******Tier 2 _____******Supervisory Assistance******Tier 3 _____******Intensive Assistance***

Evaluatee: _____

School: _____

Evaluator: _____

Start Date: _____ End Date: _____

Statement of Concern:

Plan of Action: (up to 4 target areas)

The evaluator will collaborate with the educator and a representative of the Association to outline the action plan.

Goal/ Objective	Domain or CCT	Data to be collected	Resources Needed	Timeline/ Dates	Notes

Conference Schedule

A schedule of conferences with the evaluator will be agreed upon at the initiation of the plan to review progress toward success of goals and objectives.

Resolution

___ Successful

___ Progressing

___ Unsatisfactory

Notification:

If an educator is placed on Supervisory Assistance or Intensive Assistance, the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent and appropriate Association president(s) will be notified immediately.

Evaluator Signature/ date

Evaluatee signature/ date

Form 14

GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Request for Change of Evaluator

Evaluatee: _____ School: _____

Current Evaluator: _____ School: _____

Statement of Request/Reasons:

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Approved: ☐

New Evaluator: _____

Not approved ☐

Form 15**GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS****Parent Feedback****Evaluatee** _____**School** _____**Evaluator** _____**Date** _____**In what ways did you support positive communication with families?****Website updates****Newsletters****Communication logs****Leading/co-leading parent workshops****Other: please explain****Attach artifact****Evaluatee's Signature:** _____**Date:****Evaluator's Signature:** _____**Date:**

Form 16

GROTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Administrator Student Learning Indicator

ADMINISTRATOR STUDENT LEARNING INDICATORS DEVELOPMENT GUIDE		
This guide is intended to serve as a tool to assist administrators in developing their Student Learning Indicators.		
Administrator:	School/Assignment:	Date:
Student Learning Indicator Statement:		
Component	Guiding Questions	Descriptors
Data Analysis	<i>How does the student learning indicator address a critical area of student growth, a grade or subject not included in state assessment data, and/or a sub-group that has been underperforming at your school?</i> <i>How is the target informed and driven by past performance?</i>	Addresses a content area with clear need for growth for all students or low subgroup performance. Course/content area selected is not covered by state assessment / data. Includes or cites trend/pattern data indicating a need for focus in this area. Includes or cites preliminary data from the current year indicating a need for focus in this area, if available.
Alignment	<i>How is the student learning indicator aligned to district priorities?</i> <i>How does the student learning indicator provide an opportunity for the school to move in a coordinated effort toward increases in student achievement?</i>	Student learning indicator addresses a specific district priority. Success on the student learning indicator will contribute to the identified priorities. Explains why the focus of this student learning indicator was selected in light of the school's or program's need. Explains how the teachers' student learning goals/objectives will support the administrator's student learning indicators.
Measures	<i>How will the measures or assessments help you track progress on the student learning indicator, how they allow you to track benchmarks throughout the year?</i> <i>How will the measures allow you to track growth in addition to attainment of the targets?</i>	Explains how formative and interim assessments will be used to track progress toward goal. Measures identified are aligned to the student learning indicator and can be used to assess growth. Targets are set for growth and/or progress toward mastery.
Strategies	<i>How did the Administrator identify strategies that will support the student learning indicator?</i> <i>How will teachers in appropriate grades and subjects link their student learning indicators to the school-wide student learning goals?</i> <i>What plan is in place to monitor and adjust strategies?</i>	Identifies leadership action(s) that will support the success of the student learning indicator. Identifies supports and resources that will promote success of the student learning indicator. Identifies which teachers, grade levels and subjects will support the school-wide student learning goal and why. Addresses how adjustments will be made and implemented within the timeframe.

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

All material adapted with permission from the Community Training and Assistance Center

Appendix F: Supporting Documents

1. [Common Core of Teaching: Rubric for Effective Teaching](#)
2. [Connecticut Common Core of Teaching: Rubric for Effective Service Delivery](#)
3. [Common Core of Leading](#)
4. [Connecticut School Leadership Standards](#)
5. [Common Core of Leadership Rubric](#)
6. http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Summary_of_Guideline_Requirements_2015-16_3_23_15_2.pdf

Appendix G: Sample Evaluation Support Plan

Sample Evaluation and Support Plan

Administrator's Name _____

Evaluator's Name _____

School _____

Key Findings from Student Achievement and Stakeholder Survey Data	Outcome Goals – 3 SLOs and 1 Survey	Leadership Practice Focus Areas (2)	Strategies	Evidence of Success	Additional Skills, Knowledge and Support Needed	Timeline for Measuring Goal Outcomes
EL Cohort Graduation Rate is 65% and the extended graduation rate is 70%.	SLO 1: Increase EL cohort graduation rate by 2% and the extended graduation rate by 3%.	Focus Area 1: Use assessments, data systems and accountability strategies to improve achievement, monitor and evaluate progress, close achievement gaps and communicate progress. (PE: 2, E: C)	Develop Support Service SLOs to address intervention needs and strategies.	EL graduation rate increases by 2% over last year and the extended graduation rate increases by 3%.	Support needed in reaching out to the EL student population and families to increase awareness of the graduation requirements and benefits.	Credit status will be determined after summer school.
80% of students complete 10th grade with 12 credits.	SLO 2: 90% of students complete 10th grade with 12 credits.	Focus Area 2: Improve instruction for the diverse needs of all students; and collaboratively monitor and adjust curriculum and instruction. (PE: 2, E: B) Use current data to monitor EL student progress and to target students for intervention.	Develop content teacher SLOs to address CT Core standards reading strategies and expectations	90% of students have at least 12 credits when entering the 11th grade.	Work with school counselors to ensure students are enrolled in credit earning courses in 9th and 10th grades and that deficient students are contacted re: summer remedial offerings.	
87% of 10th graders are proficient in reading, as evidenced by STAR assessment scores (if available).	SLO 3: 95% of students are reading at grade level at the end of 10th grade.		Provide teacher PL experiences as needed to target skills in differentiation of instruction.	STAR assessments indicate that 95% of students are reading on grade level at the end of 10th grade.		
75% of students report that teachers present material in a way that is easy for them to understand and learn from. EL Cohort Graduation Rate is 65% and the extended graduation rate is 70%.	Survey 1: 90% of students report that teachers present material in a way that makes it easy for them to understand and learn.			90% of students report by survey response that teachers present material in a way they can understand and learn from.		