

DARIEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Darien, CT

**Administrator Evaluation and
Professional Learning Plan**

July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016

Approved by the Board of Education: June 23, 2015

Darien Public Schools

Administrator Evaluation and Professional Learning Plan 2015-2016

Table of Contents	Page
Darien Board of Education members, District Administration, and Darien Administrator Association leadership	2
Administrator Evaluation and Support - Overview	3
Administrator Evaluation and Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Purpose and Rationale ● Administrator Evaluation and Support Framework ● Process and Timeline ● Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring, and Auditing 	3-9
Support and Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning ● Improvement and Remediation Plans ● Career Development and Growth 	10-11
<i>Leadership Practice Related Indicator</i> <u>Component #1: Observation of Leadership Practice - 40%</u>	12-15
<i>Leadership Practice Related Indicator</i> <u>Component #2: Stakeholder Feedback - 10%</u>	15-18
<i>Student Outcomes Related Indicator</i> Component #3 Student learning - 45% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● State Measures of Academic Learning ● Locally-Determined Measures (Student Learning Objectives) ● Arriving at a Student Learning Summative Rating 	18-21
<i>Student Outcomes Related Indicator</i> <u>Component #4: Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes - 5%</u>	22
Summative Administrator Evaluation Rating <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Summative Scoring ● Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness ● Dispute-Resolution Process 	23-27
<u>APPENDIX A:</u> Darien Code of Professional Responsibility	28-30
<u>APPENDIX B:</u> CCL Leadership Evaluation Rubric (<i>revised June 2015</i>)	31+

Board of Education 2015-16

Elizabeth A. Hagerty-Ross, Chairperson
Michael A. Harman, Vice Chairperson
Sarah S. Zuro, Secretary

Members

Kathrine G. Stein
David B. Martens
Christa S. McNamara
Callie A. Sullivan
David P. Dineen
Michael J. Burke

Administration 2015-16

Lynne B. Pierson, Ed.D., Interim Superintendent of Schools
Michael T. Cicchetti, Ed.D., Interim Director of Human Resources
Marc Marin, District Director of Instructional Technology

Darien Administration Association Leadership 2015-2016

Rita Ferri, Principal, Hindley Elementary School, *Co-President*
Deborah Boccanfuso, Ed.D., Principal, Middlesex Middle School, *Co-President*

Administrator Evaluation and Support

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CDSE)-designed model for the evaluation and support of administrators in Connecticut is based on the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (Core Requirements), developed by a diverse group of educators in June 2012 and based upon best practice research from around the country. The Darien Administrator Evaluation and Professional Learning Plan 2015-2016 was guided by Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED) Administrator Evaluation and Support model.

The Darien model for administrator evaluation and support includes specific guidance for the four components of administrator evaluation:

Leader Practice Related Indicators

- Observation of Leadership Performance and Practice (40%)
- Stakeholder Feedback (10%)

Student Outcomes Related Indicators

- Student Learning (45%)
- Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%)

As part of meeting all requirements connected to the election to use the SEED model, Darien will provide on-going development and support in the following areas:

- Evaluator Training and Ongoing Proficiency/Calibration
- Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning
- Improvement and Remediation Plans
- Career Development and Growth

Administrator Evaluation and Development

Purpose and Rationale

A robust administrator evaluation system is a powerful means to develop a shared understanding of leader effectiveness for the State of Connecticut. The Connecticut administrator evaluation and support model defines administrator effectiveness in terms of (1) administrator practice (the actions taken by administrators that have been shown to impact key aspects of school life); (2) the results that come from this leadership (teacher effectiveness and student growth & development); and (3) the perceptions of the administrator's leadership among key stakeholders in his/her community.

The model describes four levels of performance for administrators and focuses on the practices and outcomes of proficient administrators. These administrators can be characterized as:

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader;
- Meeting expectations in at least 3 other areas of practice;
- Meeting 1 target related to stakeholder feedback;
- Meeting state accountability growth targets on tests of core academic subjects;

- Meeting and making progress on 3 Student Learning Objectives aligned to school and district priorities; and
- Having more than 60% of teachers proficient on the student growth portion of their evaluation

The model includes an *Exemplary* performance level for those who exceed these characteristics, but exemplary ratings are reserved for those who could serve as a model for leaders across their district or even statewide. A *Proficient* rating represents fully satisfactory performance, and it is the rigorous standard expected of most experienced administrators.

This model for administrator evaluation has several benefits for participants and for the broader community. It provides a structure for the ongoing development of principals and other administrators to establish a basis for assessing their strengths and growth areas so they have the feedback they need to get better. It also serves as a means for districts to hold themselves accountable for ensuring that every child in their district attends a school with effective leaders.

This model applies to all administrators holding an 092 endorsement.

System Overview

Administrator Evaluation and Support Framework

The evaluation and support system consists of multiple measures to paint an accurate and comprehensive picture of administrator performance. 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 Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)** as defined in the Common Core of Leading (CCL): Connecticut School Leadership Standards.*
- (b) **Stakeholder Feedback (10%)** on leadership practice through surveys.

2. Student Outcomes Related Indicators: An evaluation of administrator's contributions to student academic progress, at the school and classroom level. This area 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) **Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%)** as determined by an aggregation of teachers' success with respect to Student Learning Objectives (SLOs).

Scores from each of the four components will be combined to produce a summative performance rating designation of *Exemplary*, *Proficient*, *Developing* or *Below Standard*. The performance levels are defined as:

- **Exemplary** – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
- **Proficient** – Meeting indicators of performance
- **Developing** – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
- **Below Standard** – Not meeting indicators of performance

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

Process and Timeline

The evaluation model is designed to encourage two important points:

1. That evaluators prioritize the evaluation process, spending more and better time in schools observing practice and giving feedback; and
2. That both administrators and evaluators focus on the depth and quality of the interactions that occur in the process, not just on completing the steps.

Each administrator participates in the evaluation process as a cycle of continuous improvement. The cycle is the centerpiece of state guidelines designed to have all educators play a more active, engaged role in their professional growth and development. For every administrator, evaluation begins with goal-setting for the school year, setting the stage for implementation of a goal-driven plan. The cycle continues with a mid-year formative review, followed by continued implementation. The latter part of the process offers administrators a chance to self-assess and reflect on progress to date, a step that informs the summative evaluation. Evidence from the summative evaluation and self-assessment become important sources of information for the administrator's subsequent goal setting, as the cycle continues into the subsequent year.

In Darien, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction, K-12 will determine when the cycle starts.

Step 1: Orientation and Context-Setting

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.
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.

Step 2: Goal-Setting and Plan Development

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. Then administrators identify the areas of focus for their practice that will help them accomplish their SLOs and survey targets, choosing from among the elements of the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. While administrators are rated on all six Performance Expectations, administrators are not expected to focus on improving their practice in all areas in a given year. Rather, they should identify two specific focus areas of growth to facilitate professional conversation about their leadership practice with their evaluator. It is likely that at least one and perhaps both, of the practice focus areas will be in instructional leadership, given its central role in driving student achievement. What is critical is that the administrator can connect improvement in the practice focus areas to the outcome goals and survey targets, creating a logical through-line from practice to outcomes.

Next, the administrator and the evaluator meet to discuss and agree on the selected outcome goals and practice focus areas. This is an opportunity to discuss the administrator's choices and to explore questions such as:

- Are there any assumptions about specific goals that need to be shared because of the local school context?
- Are there any elements for which proficient performance will depend on factors beyond the control of the principals? If so, how will those dependencies be accounted for in the evaluation process?
- What are the sources of evidence to be used in assessing an administrator's performance?

The evaluator and administrator also discuss the appropriate resources and professional learning needs to support the administrator in accomplishing his/her goals. Together, these components – the goals, the practice areas and the resources and supports – comprise an individual's evaluation and support plan. In the event of any disagreement, the evaluator has the authority and responsibility to finalize the goals, supports and sources of evidence to be used.

The focus areas, goals, activities, outcomes and timeline will be reviewed by the administrator's evaluator prior to beginning work on the goals. The evaluator may suggest additional goals as appropriate.

Step 3: Plan Implementation and Evidence Collection

As the administrator implements the plan, he/she and the evaluator both collect evidence about the administrator's practice. For the evaluator, this must include at least two and preferably more, school site visits. Periodic, purposeful school visits offer critical opportunities for evaluators to observe, collect evidence and analyze the work of school leaders. At a minimum, fall, winter and spring visits to the school leader's work site will provide invaluable insight into the school leader's performance and offer opportunities for ongoing feedback and dialogue.

Unlike visiting a classroom to observe a teacher, school site visits to observe administrator practice can vary significantly in length and setting. It is recommended that evaluators plan visits carefully to maximize the opportunity to gather evidence relevant to an administrator's practice focus areas. Further, central to this process is providing meaningful feedback based on observed practice. Evaluators should provide timely feedback after each visit.

Besides the school site visit requirement, there are no prescribed evidence requirements. The model relies on the professional judgment of the administrator and evaluator to determine appropriate sources of evidence and ways to collect evidence. Sample sources of evidence can include:

- Data systems and reports for student information
- Artifacts of data analysis and plans for response
- Observations of teacher team meetings
- Observations of administrative/leadership team meetings
- Observations of classrooms where the administrator is present
- Communications to parents and community
- Conversations with staff
- Conversations with students
- Conversations with families
- Presentations at Board of Education meetings, community resource centers, parent groups etc.

It is recommended that the evaluator establish a schedule of school site visits with the administrator to collect evidence and observe the administrator's work. The first visit should take place near the beginning of the school year to ground the evaluator in the school context and the administrator's evaluation and support plan. Subsequent visits may be planned at two-to three-month intervals.

In alignment with state guidelines, all Darien administrator evaluations will include:

- 2 Observations for each administrator
- 4 Observations for any administrator new to the district, school, the profession or who has received a summative rating of Developing or Below Standard in the previous year

As a matter of best practice, it is recommended that school visits be frequent, purposeful, and adequate for sustaining a professional conversation about an administrator's practice.

Step 4: Mid-Year Formative Review

Midway through the school year is time for a formal check-in to review progress. In preparation for meeting:

- The administrator analyzes available student achievement data and considers progress toward outcome goals.
- The evaluator reviews observation and feedback forms to identify key themes for discussion.

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.

Step 5: Self-Assessment

In the spring, the administrator takes an opportunity to assess his/her practice on all 18 elements of the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.* For each element, the administrator determines whether he/she:

- Needs to grow and improve practice on this element;
- Has some strengths on this element but needs to continue to grow and improve;
- Is consistently effective on this element; or
- Can empower others to be effective on this element.

The administrator should also review his/her focus areas and determine if he/she considers him/herself on track or not.

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

Step 6: Summative Review and Rating

The administrator and evaluator meet in the late spring 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.

Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing

All evaluators are required to complete training on the SEED evaluation and support model. The purpose of training is to provide evaluators of administrators with the tools that will result in evidence-based school site observations, professional learning opportunities tied to evaluation feedback, improved teacher effectiveness and student performance. The CSDE provides districts with training opportunities to support evaluators of administrators in implementation of the model across their schools. Districts can adapt and build on these tools to provide comprehensive training and support to ensure that evaluators are proficient in conducting administrator evaluations.

In line with state expectations, Darien will engage in the CSDE-sponsored multi-day training. This comprehensive training will give evaluators the opportunity to:

- Understand the various components of the SEED administrator evaluation and support system;
- Understand sources of evidence that demonstrate proficiency on the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric;
- Establish a common language that promotes professionalism and a culture for learning through the lens of the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric;
- Establish inter-rater reliability through calibrations of observer interpretations of evidence and judgments of leadership practice; and
- Collaborate with colleagues to deepen understanding of the content.

Participants in the training will have opportunities to interact with colleagues and engage in practice and optional proficiency exercises to:

- Deepen understanding of the evaluation criteria;
- Define proficient leadership;
- Collect, sort and analyze evidence across a continuum of performance; and
- Determine a final summative rating across multiple indicators

The evaluator completes the summative evaluation report, shares it with the administrator and adds it to the administrator's personnel file with any written comments attached that the administrator requests to be added within two weeks of receipt of the report.

Summative ratings must be completed for all administrators by **June 30** of a given school year. Should state standardized test data not yet be available at the time of a final rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. When the summative rating for an administrator may be significantly impacted by state standardized test data or teacher effectiveness outcomes ratings, the evaluator should recalculate the administrator's summative rating when the data is available and submit the adjusted rating no later than **September 15**.

Initial ratings are based on all available data and are made in the spring so that they can be used for any employment decisions as needed. Since some components may not be completed at this point, here are rules of thumb to use in arriving at a rating:

- If stakeholder survey results are not yet available, then the observation of practice rating should count for 50% of the preliminary rating.
- If the teacher effectiveness outcomes ratings are not yet available, then the student learning measures should count for 50% of the preliminary rating.
- If the state accountability measures are not yet available, then the Student Learning Objectives should count for the full assessment of student learning.
- If none of the summative student learning indicators can yet be assessed, then the evaluator should examine the most recent interim assessment data to assess progress and arrive at an assessment of the administrator's performance on this component.

Support and Development

Evaluation alone cannot hope to improve leadership practice, teacher effectiveness and student learning. However, when paired with effective, relevant and timely support, the evaluation process has the potential to help move administrators along the path to exemplary practice.

Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning

Student success depends on effective teaching, learning and leadership. The Darien vision for professional learning is that each and every educator engages in continuous learning every day to increase professional effectiveness, resulting in positive outcomes for all students. For Darien'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.

Throughout the process of implementing the Darien Evaluation and Professional Learning Plan 2015-2016, 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. Connecticut's Standards for Professional Learning were adopted in May 2015 and will inform the work of Darien administrators in the 2015-2016 school year.

Improvement and Remediation Plans

If an administrator's performance is rated as *Developing* or *Below Standard*, it signals the need for focused support and development. The District and Darien Administrator Association (DAA) will mutually agree on a system to support administrators not meeting the Proficiency standard. Improvement and remediation plans will be developed in consultation with the administrator and a DAA representative, when applicable, and be differentiated by the level of identified need and/or stage of development.

A system of stages or levels of support may be considered. For example:

- 1. Structured Support:** An administrator 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 administrator would receive special assistance when he/she earns an overall performance rating of developing or below standard 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 administrator 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.

A well-articulated improvement and remediation plan should:

- Clearly identify targeted supports, in consultation with the administrator, which may include specialized professional development, collegial assistance, increased supervisory observations and feedback, and/or special resources and strategies aligned to the improvement outcomes.
- Clearly delineate goals linked to specific indicators and domains within the observation of practice framework/rubric that specify exactly what the administrator must demonstrate at the conclusion of the Improvement and Remediation Plan in order to be considered proficient.
- Indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is developed. Determine dates for interim and final reviews in accordance with stages of support.
- Include indicators of success, including a rating of proficient or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.

Career Development and Growth

Rewarding exemplary performance identified through the evaluation process with opportunities for career development and professional growth is a critical step in both building confidence in the evaluation and support system itself and in building the capacity and skills of all leaders. Examples of such opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring aspiring and early-career administrators; participating in development of administrator improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is developing or below standard; leading Professional Learning Communities; differentiated career pathways; and focused professional learning based on goals for continuous growth and development.

Leadership Practice Related Indicators

The Leadership Practice Related Indicators evaluate the administrator's knowledge of a complex set of skills and competencies and how these are applied in leadership practice. It is comprised of two components:

- Observation of Leadership Practice, which counts for 40%; and
- Stakeholder Feedback, which counts for 10%

Component #1: Observation of Leadership Practice 40%

An assessment of an administrator's leadership practice – by direct observation of practice and the collection of other evidence – is 40% of an administrator's summative rating. Leadership practice is described in the Common Core of Leading (CCL) Connecticut School Leadership Standards adopted by the Connecticut State Board of Education in June of 2012, which use the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards as their foundation and define effective administrative practice through six performance expectations.*

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.

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

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.

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

5. Ethics and Integrity: Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by being ethical and acting with integrity.

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 systems of political, social, economic, legal and cultural contexts affecting education.

All six of these performance expectations contribute to successful schools, but research shows that some have a bigger impact than others. In particular, improving teaching and learning is at the core of what effective educational leaders do. As such, Performance Expectation 2 (Teaching and Learning) comprises approximately half of the leadership practice rating and the other five performance expectations are equally weighted.

(It is acknowledged that in 2014, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) released revised ISSLC Standards to better incorporate an expanding body of research and best practices*

from the field for public comment. The CCSSO anticipates publication of revised standards in the coming year.)

These weightings should be consistent for all principals. For assistant principals and other school or district-based 092 certificate holders in non-teaching roles, the six performance expectations are weighed equally, reflecting the need for emerging leaders to develop the full set of skills and competencies in order to assume greater responsibilities as they move forward in their careers. While assistant principals' roles and responsibilities vary from school to school, creating a robust pipeline of effective principals depends on adequately preparing assistant principals for the principalship.

In order to arrive at these ratings, administrators are measured against the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric which describes leadership actions across four performance levels for each of the six performance expectations and associated elements. The four performance levels are:

- **Exemplary:** The Exemplary Level focuses on the concepts of developing capacity for action and leadership beyond the individual leader. Collaboration and involvement from a wide range of staff, students and stakeholders is prioritized as appropriate in distinguishing Exemplary performance from Proficient performance.
- **Proficient:** The rubric is anchored at the Proficient Level using the indicator language from the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The specific indicator language is highlighted in bold at the Proficient level.
- **Developing:** The Developing Level focuses on leaders with a general knowledge of leadership practices but most of those practices do not necessarily lead to positive results.
- **Below Standard:** The Below Standard Level focuses on a limited understanding of leadership practices and general inaction on the part of the leader.

Two key concepts, indicated by bullets, are often included as indicators. Each concept demonstrates a continuum of performance across the row, from below standard to exemplary

Examples of Evidence are provided for each element of the rubric. While these Examples of Evidence can be a guide for evaluator training and discussion, they are only examples and should not be used as a checklist. As evaluators learn and use the rubric, they should review these Examples of Evidence and generate additional examples from their own experience that could also serve as evidence of Proficient practice.

Strategies for Using the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric*

*(*Revisions to the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric are expected in June 2015)*

Helping administrators get better: The rubric is designed to be developmental in use. It contains a detailed continuum of performance for every indicator within the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards in order to serve as a guide and resource for school leaders and evaluators to talk about practice, identify specific areas for growth and development, and have language to use in describing what improved practice would be.

Making judgments about administrator practice: In some cases, evaluators may find that a leader demonstrates one level of performance for one concept and a different level of

performance for a second concept within a row. In those cases, the evaluator will use judgment to decide on the level of performance for that particular indicator.

Assigning ratings for each performance expectation: Administrators and evaluators will not be required to complete this rubric at the Indicator level for any self-assessment or evaluation process. Evaluators and administrators will review performance and complete evaluation detail at the Performance Expectation level and may discuss performance at the Element level, using the detailed Indicator rows as supporting information as needed. As part of the evaluation process, evaluators and school leaders should identify a few specific areas for ongoing support and growth.

Assessing the practice of administrators other than principals: All indicators of the evaluation rubric may not apply to assistant principals or central office administrators. Districts may generate ratings using evidence collected from applicable indicators in the CCL:Connecticut School Leadership Standards .

Performance Expectation 1: Visions, Mission and Goals

(*It is acknowledged that changes in the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric, expected in June 2015, will have an impact on indicators and performance description.)

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 Expectation for All

Leaders* ensure that the creation of the vision, mission and goals establishes high expectations for all students and staff**

**Leader: Connecticut School Leaders who are employed under their immediate administrator 092 certificate (e.g., curriculum coordinator, principal, assistant principal, department head and other supervisory positions.*

***Staff: All educators and non-certified staff*

Arriving at a Leadership Practice Summative Rating

Summative ratings are based on the evidence for each performance expectation in the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric. Evaluators collect written evidence about and observe the administrator's leadership practice across the performance expectations described in the rubric. Specific attention is paid to leadership performance areas identified as needing development

This is accomplished through the following steps, undertaken by the administrator being evaluated and by the evaluator completing the evaluation:

The administrator and evaluator meet for a Goal-Setting Conference to identify focus areas for development of the administrator's leadership practice.

1. The administrator collects evidence about his/her practice and the evaluator collects evidence about administrator practice with a particular emphasis on the identified focus areas for

development. Evaluators of administrators must conduct at least two school site observations for any administrator and should conduct at least four school site observations for administrators who are new to their district, school, the profession or who have received ratings of *Developing* or *Below Standard*.

2. The administrator and evaluator hold a Mid-Year Formative Conference with a focused discussion of progress toward proficiency in the focus areas identified as needing development.

3. Near the end of the school year, the administrator reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a summative self-assessment for review by the evaluator, identifying areas of strength and continued growth, as well as progress on the focus areas.

4. The evaluator and the administrator meet to discuss all evidence collected to date. Following the conference, the evaluator uses the preponderance of evidence to assign a summative rating of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing or Below Standard for each performance expectation. Then the evaluator assigns a total practice rating based on the criteria in the chart below and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.

The rating scale in the 2015 SEED Handbook may be referenced. However, given the potential changes to the rubric, this rating scale may be subject to change.

Component #2: Stakeholder Feedback (10%)

Feedback from stakeholders – assessed by administration of a survey with measures that align to the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards – is 10% of an administrator’s summative rating.

For each administrative role, the stakeholders surveyed should be those in the best position to provide meaningful feedback. For school-based administrators, stakeholders solicited for feedback must include teachers and parents, but may include other stakeholders (e.g., other staff, community members, students, etc.). If surveyed populations include students, they can provide valuable input on school practices and climate for inclusion in evaluation of school-based administrative roles.

Applicable Survey Types

There are several types of surveys – some with broader application for schools and districts – that align generally with the areas of feedback that are relevant for administrator evaluation. These include:

Leadership practice surveys focus directly on feedback related to a leader’s performance and the impact on stakeholders. Leadership Practice Surveys for principals and other administrators are available and there are also a number of instruments that are not specific to the education sector, but rather probe for information aligned with broader leadership competencies that are also relevant to Connecticut administrators’ practice. Typically, leadership practice surveys for use in principal evaluations collect feedback from teachers and other staff members.

School practice surveys capture feedback related to the key strategies, actions and events at a school. They tend to focus on measuring awareness and impact from stakeholders, which can include faculty and staff, students and parents.

School climate surveys cover many of the same subjects as school practice surveys but are also designed to probe for perceptions from stakeholders on the school's prevailing attitudes, standards and conditions. They are typically administered to all staff as well as to students and their family members.

In Darien, the survey(s) selected for gathering feedback must be valid (that is, the instrument measures what it is intended to measure) and reliable (that is, the use of the instrument is consistent among those using it and is consistent over time). In order to minimize the burden on schools and stakeholders, the surveys chosen need not be implemented exclusively for purposes of administrator evaluation, but may have broader application as part of teacher evaluation systems, school- or district-wide feedback and planning or other purposes. Ensuring adequate participation and representation of school stakeholder population is important

Any survey selected must align to some or all of the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards, so that feedback is applicable to measuring performance against those standards. In most cases, only a subset of survey measures will align explicitly to the Leadership Standards, so administrators and their evaluators are encouraged to select relevant portions of the survey results to incorporate into the evaluation and support model.

For each administrative role, stakeholder providing feedback might include:

SCHOOL-BASED ADMINISTRATORS

Principals:

All family members
All teachers and staff members
All students

Assistant Principals and other school-based administrators:

All or a subset of family members
All or a subset of teachers and staff members
All or a subset of students

CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS

Line managers of instructional staff (e.g., Assistant/Regional Superintendents):

Principals or principal supervisors
Other direct reports
Relevant family members

Leadership for offices of curriculum, assessment, special services and other central academic functions:

Principals
Specific subsets of teachers

Other specialists within the district
Relevant family members

Leadership for offices of finance, human resources and legal/employee relations offices and other central shared services roles:

Principals
Specific subsets of teachers
Other specialists within the district

Stakeholder Feedback Summative Rating

Ratings should reflect the degree to which an administrator makes growth on feedback measures, using data from the prior year or beginning of the year as a baseline for setting a growth target.

Exceptions to this include:

- Administrators with high ratings already, in which case, the rating should reflect the degree to which measures remain high.
- Administrators new to the role, in which case, the rating should be based on a reasonable target, using district averages or averages of schools in similar situations.

This is accomplished in the following steps, undertaken by the administrator being evaluated and reviewed by the evaluator:

- Step 1 - Select appropriate survey measures aligned to the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.
- Step 2 - Review baseline data on selected measures, which may require a fall administration of the survey in year one.
- Step 3 - Set 1 target for growth on selected measures (or performance on selected measures when growth is not feasible to assess or performance is already high).
- Step 4 - Later in the school year, administer surveys to relevant stakeholders.
- Step 5 - Aggregate data and determine whether the administrator achieved the established target.
- Step 6 - Assign a rating, using this scale:

Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Made little or no progress against target	Made substantial progress but did not meet target	Met target	Substantially exceeded target

Establishing what results in having “substantially exceeded” the target or what constitutes “substantial progress” is left to the discretion of the evaluator and the administrator being evaluated in the context of the target being set. However, more than half of the rating of an administrator on stakeholder feedback must be based on an assessment of improvement overtime.

Examples of Survey Applications and scenarios can be found in the 2015 SEED Handbook.

Student Outcomes Related Indicators includes two components:

- Student Learning, which counts for 45%;and
- Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes, which counts for 5 %.

Component #3: Student learning (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 system 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.

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

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%

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:

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

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.

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.

**Sample SLO are available in the 2015 SEED Handbook.*

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)
 - (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).
- The administrator shares the SLOs with her/his evaluator, informing a conversation designed to ensure that:
 - 1) The objectives are adequately ambitious.
 - 2) There is adequate data that can be collected to make a fair judgment about whether the administrator met the established objectives.

- 3) 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.
 - 4) 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:

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

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 Measure of Academic Learning			
		4	3	2	1
Locally Determined Measures of Academic Learning	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

Component #4: Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%)

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.

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

Summative Administrator Evaluation Rating

Summative Scoring

Every educator will receive one of four performance* ratings:

1. **Exemplary:** Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
2. **Proficient:** Meeting indicators of performance
3. **Developing:** Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
4. **Below standard:** Not meeting indicators of performance

** The term “performance” in the above shall mean “progress as defined by specified indicators.” Such indicators shall be mutually agreed upon, as applicable. Such progress shall be demonstrated by evidence.*

A rating of *Proficient* represents fully satisfactory performance. It is the rigorous standard expected for most experienced administrators. Specifically, proficient administrators can be characterized as:

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader;
- Meeting expectations in at least 3 other areas of practice;
- Meeting and making progress on 1 target related to stakeholder feedback;
- Meeting state accountability growth targets on tests of core academic subjects;
- Meeting and making progress on 3 student learning objectives aligned to school and district priorities; and
- Having more than 60% of teachers proficient on the student growth portion of their evaluation.

Supporting administrators to reach proficiency is at the very heart of this evaluation model. Exemplary ratings are reserved for performance that significantly exceeds proficiency and could serve as a model for leaders district-wide or even statewide. Few administrators are expected to demonstrate exemplary performance on more than a small number of practice elements.

A rating of *Developing* means that performance is meeting proficiency in some components but not others. Improvement is necessary and expected and two consecutive years at the developing level is, for an experienced administrator, a cause for concern. On the other hand, for administrators in their first year, performance rating of *Developing* is expected. If, by the end of three years, performance is still rated *Developing*, there is cause for concern.

A rating of *Below Standard* indicates performance that is below *Proficient* on all components or unacceptably low on one or more components.

Determining Summative Ratings

The rating will be determined using the following 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.

Each Step is illustrated below:

A. 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	110

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

B. 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

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	145

Student Outcomes Related Indicator 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 developing and the Student Outcomes-Related rating is proficient. The summative rating is therefore proficient.

If the two major categories are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of exemplary for Leader Practice and a rating of below standard for Student Outcomes), then the evaluator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to determine a summative rating.

		Overall Leader Practice Rating			
Overall Student Outcomes Rating		4	3	2	1
	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 must be completed for all administrators by **June 30** of a given school year. Should state standardized test data not yet be available at the time of a summative rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. When the summative rating for an administrator may be significantly affected by state standardized test data, the evaluator should recalculate the administrator's final summative rating when the data is available and submit the adjusted rating not later than **September 15**. These adjustments should inform goal setting in the new school year.

Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

Each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system. A pattern may consist of a pattern of one rating. The state model recommends the following patterns: Novice administrators shall generally be deemed effective if said administrator receives at least two sequential proficient ratings, one of which must be earned in the fourth year of a novice administrator's career. A *Below Standard* rating shall only be permitted in the first year of a novice administrator's career, assuming a pattern of growth of developing in year two and two sequential *Proficient* ratings in years three and four. An experienced administrator shall generally be deemed ineffective if said administrator receives at least two sequential *Developing* ratings or one *Below Standard* rating at any time.

Dispute-Resolution Process

The local or regional board of education shall include a process for resolving disputes in cases where the evaluator and administrator cannot agree on goals/objectives, the evaluation period,

feedback or the professional development plan. When such agreement cannot be reached, the issue in dispute will be referred for resolution to a subcommittee of the Professional Development and Evaluation Committee (PDEC). The superintendent and the respective collective bargaining unit for the district will each select one representative from the PDEC to constitute this subcommittee, as well as a neutral party, as mutually agreed upon between the superintendent and the collective bargaining unit. In the event that the designated committee does not reach a unanimous decision, the issue shall be considered by the Superintendent of Schools whose decision shall be binding.

APPENDIX A

DARIEN CODE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

(based upon the Connecticut Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators, August 2010)

(a) Preamble

The Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators is a set of principles which the education profession expects its members to honor and follow. These principles set forth, on behalf of the education profession and the public it serves, standards to guide conduct and the judicious appraisal of conduct in situations that have professional and ethical implications. The Code adheres to the fundamental belief that the student is the foremost reason for the existence of the profession.

The education profession is vested by the public with a trust and responsibility requiring the highest ideals of professionalism. Therefore, the educator accepts both the public trust and the responsibilities to practice the profession according to the highest possible degree of ethical conduct and standards. Such responsibilities include the commitment to the students, the profession, the community and the family.

Consistent with applicable law, the Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators shall serve as a basis for decisions on issues pertaining to certification and employment. The code shall apply to all educators holding, applying or completing preparation for a certificate, authorization or permit or other credential from the State Board of Education. For the purposes of this section, "educator" includes superintendents, administrators, teachers, special services professionals, coaches, substitute teachers and paraprofessionals.

PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

(b) Responsibility to the student

- (1) The professional educator, in full recognition of his or her obligation to the student, shall:
 - (A) Recognize, respect and uphold the dignity and worth of students as individual human beings, and, therefore, deal justly and considerately with students;
 - (B) Engage students in the pursuit of truth, knowledge and wisdom and provide access to all points of view without deliberate distortion of content area matter;
 - (C) Nurture in students lifelong respect and compassion for themselves and other human beings regardless of race, ethnic origin, gender, social class, disability, religion, or sexual orientation;
 - (D) Foster in students the full understanding, application and preservation of democratic principles and processes;
 - (E) Guide students to acquire the requisite skills and understanding for participatory citizenship and to realize their obligation to be worthy and contributing members of society;
 - (F) Assist students in the formulation of worthy, positive goals;
 - (G) Promote the right and freedom of students to learn, explore ideas, develop critical thinking, problem-solving, and necessary learning skills to acquire the knowledge needed to achieve their full potential;
 - (H) Remain steadfast in guaranteeing equal opportunity for quality education for all students;

- (I) Maintain the confidentiality of information concerning students obtained in the proper course of the educational process, and dispense such information only when prescribed or directed by federal or state law or professional practice;
- (J) Create an emotionally and physically safe and healthy learning environment for all students; and
- (K) Apply discipline promptly, impartially, appropriately and with compassion.

(c) Responsibility to the profession

- (1) The professional educator, in full recognition of his/her obligation to the profession, shall:
 - (A) Conduct himself or herself as a professional realizing that his or her actions reflect directly upon the status and substance of the profession;
 - (B) Uphold the professional educator's right to serve effectively;
 - (C) Uphold the principle of academic freedom;
 - (D) Strive to exercise the highest level of professional judgment;
 - (E) Engage in professional learning to promote and implement research-based best educational practices;
 - (F) Assume responsibility for his or her professional development;
 - (G) Encourage the participation of educators in the process of educational decision-making;
 - (H) Promote the employment of only qualified and fully certificated, authorized or permitted educators;
 - (I) Encourage promising, qualified and competent individuals to enter the profession;
 - (J) Maintain the confidentiality of information concerning colleagues and dispense such information only when prescribed or directed by federal or state law or professional practice;
 - (K) Honor professional contracts until fulfillment, release, or dissolution mutually agreed upon by all parties to contract;
 - (L) Create a culture that encourages purposeful collaboration and dialogue among all stakeholders;
 - (M) Promote and maintain ongoing communication among all stakeholders; and
 - (N) Provide effective leadership to ensure continuous focus on student achievement.

(d) Responsibility to the community

- (1) The professional educator, in full recognition of the public trust vested in the profession, shall:
 - (A) Be cognizant of the influence of educators upon the community-at-large, obey local, state and national laws;
 - (B) Encourage the community to exercise its responsibility to be involved in the formulation of educational policy;
 - (C) Promote the principles and ideals of democratic citizenship; and
 - (D) Endeavor to secure equal educational opportunities for all students.

(e) Responsibility to the student's family

- (1) The professional educator in recognition of the public trust vested in the profession, shall:
 - (A) Respect the dignity of each family, its culture, customs, and beliefs;
 - (B) Promote, respond, and maintain appropriate communications with the family, staff and administration;

- (C) Consider the family's concerns and perspectives on issues involving its children; and
- (D) Encourage participation of the family in the educational process.

UNPROFESSIONAL CONDUCT*

- (f) The professional educator, in full recognition of his or her obligation to the student, shall not:
 - (A) Abuse his or her position as a professional with students for private advantage;
 - (B) Discriminate against students.
 - (C) Sexually or physically harass or abuse students;
 - (D) Emotionally abuse students; or
 - (E) Engage in any misconduct which would put students at risk; and
- (g) The professional educator, in full recognition of his or her obligation to the profession, shall not:
 - (A) Obtain a certificate, authorization, permit or other credential issued by the state board of education or obtain employment by misrepresentation, forgery or fraud;
 - (B) Accept any gratuity, gift or favor that would impair or influence professional decisions or actions;
 - (C) Misrepresent his, her or another's professional qualifications or competencies;
 - (D) Sexually, physically or emotionally harass or abuse district employees;
 - (E) Misuse district funds and/or district property; or
 - (F) Engage in any misconduct which would impair his or her ability to serve effectively in the profession; and
- (h) The professional educator, in full recognition of the public trust vested in the profession, shall not:
 - (A) Exploit the educational institution for personal gain;
 - (B) Be convicted in a court of law of a crime involving moral turpitude or of any crime of such nature that violates such public trust; or
 - (C) Knowingly misrepresent facts or make false statements.

*Unprofessional conduct is not limited to the descriptors listed above. When in doubt regarding whether a specific course of action constitutes professional or unprofessional conduct please seek advice from your school district or preparation institution.

(i) Code revision

This Code shall be reviewed for potential revision concurrently with the revision of the Regulations Concerning State Educator Certificates, Permits and Authorizations, by the Connecticut Advisory Council for Teacher Professional Standards. As a part of such reviews, a process shall be established to receive input and comment from all interested parties.

APPENDIX B

To be added upon release:

CCL Leadership Evaluation Rubric (revised June 2015)