



**ISAAC Educator Development and
Evaluation Plan:**

**A Process of Support and Evaluation for
ISAAC Teachers & Administrators**

Dr. Nicholas J. Spera
ISAAC Executive Director

SEPTEMBER 2020

*Adopted by the ISAAC Board of Directors on September 18, 2020
Board Approved Edited Revisions August 2023*

Section I: ISAAC Educator Development and Performance Plan

Table of Contents:

Introduction

- I. Introduction: Purposes of Educator Evaluation
- II. Guiding Beliefs/Core Values
- III. Goals of Program
- IV. Core Requirements/law

Section One: Teacher Development and Performance Plan

- a. Overall process, timeline, roles responsibilities
- b. 45% Student Outcomes/Achievement
- c. 5% Whole School Student Learning
- d. 40% Teacher Performance and Practice
- e. 10% Parent Feedback
- f. Summative ratings
 - i. Outcome Rating
 - ii. Practice Rating
 - iii. Combining
- g. Intensive assistance plan
 - i. Process
 - ii. Timeline

Section Two: ISAAC Administrator Development and Performance Plan

Appendix

Definition of Terms

Citation from Revised CT General Statutes

2017 Connecticut Common Core of Teaching for Effective Teaching

2017 Connecticut Common Core of Teaching for Effective Delivery

ISAAC/Shoreline Leadership Framework Rubric

Leadership Performance Expectation Rubric

Forms:

Goal Setting Form

Mid-Year Check-in Goal Conference Form

Pre-Observation Conference Form

Post-Observation Conference Form

End of the Year Summative Rating Form

ISAAC Written Observation and Conference Summary Form

Informal Observation/Review of Practice Feedback Form

ISAAC Teacher Evaluation and Support Plan

Process Timeline:

- **Before October 30:** Collaborative Goal Development meeting between the faculty member and his/her evaluator. The goal is to be submitted to the evaluator on or before October 15th.
- **October 15 – November 15:** Goals are finalized by mutual agreement among the teacher, and Primary Evaluator.
- **January/February:** Formative Mid-year Review conducted to assess progress to date toward mutually agreed upon performance goal(s).

Note: The evaluator and evaluatee may mutually agree upon mid-year adjustments of student learning goals/objectives, if warranted.

- **April/May:** A year-end meeting is held with the evaluator on or before May 15 to review and discuss the year's work on the goal(s). A year-end Self-Reflection from the evaluatee is due to the Primary Evaluator on or before May 25.
- **May/June:** An End-of-Year Summative Evaluation meeting is conducted between the teacher and the Primary Evaluator. At this meeting, the Primary Evaluator presents and discusses the End-of-Year Summative Evaluation with the teacher.

Note: The evaluatee will provide evidence of student progress toward meeting the student learning goals/objectives and submit to the evaluator. Following the conference, the evaluator will assign a rating based on the extent to which students met the learning goals/objectives.

ISAAC Educator Development and Evaluation Plan

Background Information and Acknowledgments

The committee charged by the Executive Director with the revision of the Evaluation Plan includes representatives of the teachers bargaining unit, ISAAC Education Association (IEA), containing instructional and non-instructional faculty, and members of the administrative team. The Evaluation and Professional Development Committee initially adopted the state SEED plan in its original state in previous years.

The Connecticut State Department of Education mandates that all districts annually submit to the state revisions or changes to teacher evaluation. For the past several years, ISAAC has reviewed the plan that had been in implementation with no major revisions.

In response to the development of SEED, Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development, and the Connecticut State Department of Education's (CT SDE) directive that schools revise their programs of evaluation and professional development, ISAAC reviewed and updated its plan.

The Professional Development and Evaluation Committee reviewing and revising the proposed 2021-2022 plan was made up of educators representing the school administration (3), central office (1), and teacher's union (6). The IEA supported the involvement of the following committee members:

- Dean Avery, Social Worker
- Tanya Collins, Associate Principal
- Mercedes Alger, 6th Grade Science Teacher
- Amy Geary, Director of Special Education
- Lisa Lazarou, SRBI Coordinator, Co-President of IEA
- William Linski, Principal
- Mikaela Remondi, SRBI Instructor
- Tucker Regan, Student Supports Coordinator
- Dr. Nicholas J. Spera, Executive Director
- Kathleen Machnik, School Counselor

Core Values and Belief About Learning

At ISAAC Middle School, we pride ourselves on fostering a safe, fun, and nurturing environment that promotes hard work, happiness, and effort for all who work, learn, and grow within our school community. We believe that *All Students Can Succeed* with high expectations, maximum effort, and a growth mindset. Our success as an ISAAC Family is deeply rooted in the positive relationships shared among our diverse student body, devoted staff, and engaged families. Our professional learning community of talented and passionate educators is committed to the delivery of a rigorous and innovative curriculum, which promotes the shared belief that *Effort Creates Ability*. We support the growth of each student by developing the academic, civic, and social skills essential to succeed in high school and beyond.

INTERDISTRICT FOR ARTS AND COMMUNICATION

EDUCATOR DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE PLAN

Philosophy

The fundamental purpose of the Educator Development and Performance Plan at the Interdistrict School for Arts and Communication is to ensure that each student can experience high quality learning by assuring that highly competent professionals are employed and by stimulating the continued professional growth of all faculty members involved in the educational process.

This plan recognizes that ISAAC employs and continually seeks to employ, outstanding teachers and other professionals who are committed to excellence through the regular enhancement of skills and knowledge and who model the habits of lifelong learning that they hope to instill in students. Moreover, the retention and growth of our diverse staff is a priority for the Board of Directors and school administration.

ISAAC's evaluation plan aligns with the four core design principles of the state model:

1. Considering multiple, standards-based measures of performance, promoting both professional judgment and consistency,
2. Fostering dialogue about student learning,
3. Encouraging aligned professional development, coaching, and feedback to support teacher growth,
4. Ensuring feasibility of implementation.

ISAAC's evaluation plan concentrates a great deal of time and attention on new teachers (and in very rare cases tenured teachers who need intensive assistance). We have worked diligently to conduct multiple observations of teachers before they attain tenure in order to support them; foster their growth as professionals and ensure that only outstanding teachers receive tenure status. Therefore, we remain confident in maintaining our existing practice of frequent observations (by multiple evaluators) of non-tenured faculty members and supporting the ongoing professional growth and improvement of tenured faculty members.

Our plan also aligns with the state's induction program (TEAM) through our consistent focus on the four domains of Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching:

1. Learning Environment, Engagement, and Commitment to Learning
2. Planning for Active Learning
3. Service Delivery
4. Professional Responsibilities

ISAAC's plan is based on our extensive work to expand knowledge and awareness of the Common Core of Teaching Domains and the requirements of the TEAM program by involving all interested faculty members in the support of new teachers. To that end, approximately twenty-one percent of our faculty members are also trained mentors in the Connecticut TEAM program. We partner with Connecticut College, Sacred Heart University, and the University of Connecticut to welcome college students, interns, clinical student placements, and student teachers to work with our talented faculty each semester.

Our plan is designed to encourage creativity, innovation, and the sharing of expertise in the planning and implementation of teaching strategies. It is expected that all professional staff members work together to support each other in the shared quest for effective instructional programs through our Professional Learning Community model. This cooperative effort may take several forms:

- teachers and other professionals collaboratively working together as peers
- mentor teachers providing assistance and leadership to other teachers
- providing leadership opportunities for teachers within the building
- administrative staff members working with teachers to provide support and guidance

This plan recognizes that an effective program that enables students to perform at high levels will rest upon a foundation comprised of:

- The school's goals
- The specific definition of each professional position in the school system where general responsibilities and the specific tasks of each position are described
- The written objectives developed as a result of faculty member and evaluator collaboration, which are directly related to instruction and the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching, as well as professional standards for support service faculty

In the following description of the evaluation process, the term "teacher" includes each employee of ISAAC, below the rank of Executive Director, who holds a certificate or permit issued by the CT State Department of Education. The term "evaluator" includes members of the administrative staff and coordinators given responsibility for the evaluation of ISAAC faculty members. All assigned evaluators hold intermediate administrator certification (Endorsement #092) and receive continued training for the enhancement of their evaluative skills. All evaluation assignments will be made by the Executive Director.

The evaluation process includes two components: Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning and Career Development and Professional Growth. The evaluation component involves the assessment of current performance by an assigned evaluator. We conduct three (3) formal evaluative observations of new teachers during each of their first two years, two (2) formal evaluations and one (1) informal observations in the third and fourth year, and one (1) formal observation while teachers who received tenure prior to being hired at ISAAC will begin in the third and fourth year evaluation process. After completing the TEAM program and receiving tenure, tenured faculty members will be evaluated as follows:

- 1.) Tenured teachers with a previous summative rating of accomplished or exemplary: One formal classroom observation and two informal and/or review of practice each year.
- 2.) Tenured teachers with a rating of developing or below standard: A minimum of three formal classroom observations per year.

The professional development component involves the annual setting of and working toward meeting objectives for continued enhancement of professional skills. The evaluation process provides for clear, constructive feedback at regular intervals throughout the evaluation period.

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION

The Interdistrict School for Arts and Communication (ISAAC), a Connecticut Public Charter School, is a choice school that provides educational experiences in a safe and diverse environment that delivers an academically rigorous curriculum with opportunities to experience unique programmatic courses in the fields of arts and communication. Our core values and beliefs guide our work:

The Interdistrict School for Arts and Communication is a safe, nurturing, and diverse middle school in which arts and communication act as the heartbeat. Our professional learning community, comprised of passionate educators, are committed to the delivery of a rigorous curriculum that promotes effort through a growth mindset. We believe that all students can succeed with hard work and grit. Our stakeholders support the development of each student's journey in becoming lifelong learners by developing the academic, civic, and social skills needed to be difference makers as active citizens in our communities. Learning at ISAAC prepares our students to become empathetic and courageous leaders through authentic tasks and experiences that promote creativity, critical thinking, and excellence.

ISAAC leaders and teachers promote the success of all students by supporting and living our core values and beliefs about learning. To meet and support the needs of our students, the ISAAC Educator Development and Performance Plan was derived from a collaborative effort between administrators, teachers, and certified support staff with an interest in strengthening our evaluation and accountability model. The model is aligned with state law and core requirements for evaluation. It has drawn from Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED), the experiences of the BEST and TEAM new teacher programs, current research on best practices, and the wisdom and practical experience of the educators in this organization. Although the roles of all staff members who work at ISAAC are unique in nature, this common set of expectations attempts to set guidelines and expectations that cut across all of the positions that exist at ISAAC. Through the multitude of roles with our school, a set of expectations aligns within the evaluation practices throughout ISAAC. This document addresses: 1) teacher evaluation 2) school administrator evaluation, and 3) director evaluation (i.e. those not required under the law—no 092 required) - but who are an integral part of the ISAAC Leadership team.

Purposes of Educator Evaluation

The purpose of educator evaluation is to improve and support high levels of achievement for all students by supporting and strengthening teacher and administrator performance and practice. This plan includes:

The Teacher Development and Performance Plan

The ISAAC Administrator Development and Performance Plan

The ISAAC Educator Development and Performance Plan is grounded in a theory of action of growth and continuous improvement. Our plan uses the work from our regional educational service center's plan that was co-written by a member from the ISAAC leadership team. This plan is grounded in the theory that improvement in teaching is derived from work in the key components of the "instructional core" that is "the teacher and the student in the presence of content." (City, Elmore, Fiarman and Teitel, 2009, p. 22). The instructional core provides the basic framework for how to intervene in the instructional process so as to improve the quality and level of student learning. The authors assert:

"...There are only three ways to improve student learning at scale. The first is to increase the level of knowledge and skill that the teachers bring to the instructional process. The second is to increase the level and complexity of the content that students are asked to learn. And the third is to change the role of the student in the instructional process. That's it. If you are not doing one of these three things, you are not improving instruction and learning. Everything else is instrumental. That is, everything that's not in the instructional core can only affect student learning and performance by somehow influencing what goes on inside the core." (p. 24).

At ISAAC we also acknowledge that changes in context can affect the teaching/learning process and outcome.

Guiding Values and Beliefs

The following guiding values and beliefs have guided the development of this plan:

- 1) We are committed to our students' learning and our own learning as professionals.
- 2) We know the students that we teach and personalize learning experiences to meet student needs.
- 3) We are responsible for collecting data using multiple means to analyze students' performance, and to use that data to inform planning and instruction.
- 4) We think systematically about our practice and continuously learn from our experience and others.
- 5) We learn from challenges, mistakes and setbacks and use that learning to inform our practice.

- 6) Our professional learning is driven by student learning needs, teacher needs, and research/best practices in teaching, learning, and content.
- 7) We build professional learning communities through a systematic process that is engrained in improving our instructional practice, analyzing assessment data, collaborating our feedback, and organically revising our curriculum.
- 8) We hold ourselves accountable for demonstrating/practicing our core values and beliefs in action.

Goals of Program

The purpose of the evaluation model is to evaluate teacher performance fairly and accurately and to help each educator strengthen his/her practice to improve student learning. The process of evaluation has four purposes:

1. to increase student learning,
2. to promote effective teaching,
3. to enhance school improvement, and
4. to provide for accountability in the educational system.

This evaluation plan aligns with the four core design principles of the state model:

1. Considering multiple, standards-based measures of performance, promoting both professional judgment and consistency
2. Fostering dialogue about student learning
3. Encouraging aligned professional development, coaching, and feedback to support teacher growth
4. Ensuring feasibility of implementation

The ISAAC Educator Development and Performance Plan connects to student achievement and aligns with professional development and school improvement. The purpose of the new evaluation model is to evaluate teacher performance fairly and accurately and to help each teacher strengthen his/her practice to improve student learning. Our teacher evaluation model is founded on a set of core principles about the power of great teachers and the critical role of accountability in developing them.

The following four design principles are interdependent; each is critical in determining that evaluations meet the needs of teachers, school leaders and students.

1. Focus on Student Learning

Research continues to show that high quality classroom instruction has the greatest impact on student learning than any other school-level factor. In a study titled, *Understanding Teachers' Impact on Student Achievement*, conducted by Isaac M. Opper, the greatest impact for student success was based on the effectiveness of the teacher as best identified by their performance, not by their background or experience. The ISAAC Educator Development and Performance Plan aims to improve student learning outcomes through effective instruction and support for student and educator learning.

Furthermore, through the use of a variety of data sources, teachers will organize, plan, and set goals that meet the needs of the individual student and the class. Moreover, teachers will be held

accountable for the use of various types of assessment data throughout the school year to evaluate student progress and to make adjustments to the teaching and learning process.

2. Multiple Measures of Performance Data

No single data point can paint a complete picture of a teacher's performance. The ISAAC Educator Development and Performance Plan uses multiple measures to determine whether teachers have met performance expectations. Each measure within the plan has a specific weight that allows teachers and administrators to understand how each component will factor into the final evaluation rating.

3. Evaluation Outcomes with Significance

An evaluation process must have meaningful implications, both positive and critical nature, in order to earn sustained support from teachers and school leaders and to contribute to the systematic improvement of the teaching profession. The ability to identify, develop and retain talented teachers is arguably the most important priority of any school leader. Therefore, evaluators are held responsible for evaluating teachers fairly, accurately, and consistently while acting on results and helping teachers to improve over time. Moreover, the model provides clear, concise tools and professional development to help administrators evaluate teachers consistently.

4. Support, Professional Development, and Regular Feedback

This plan allows instructional leaders to cultivate a performance-focused culture by observing their teachers frequently. Administrators will have regular conversations with teachers to discuss overall classroom performance and student progress; to establish professional goals and developmental needs; and to provide the support available to meet those needs.

PART TWO: TEACHER DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE PLAN

The Teacher Development and Performance Plan includes multiple measures to assess a teacher's performance comprehensively. It is grounded in our Model of Continuous Improvement.

The ISAAC Model of Continuous Improvement

The ISAAC Model of Continuous Improvement is one of supporting the development of teacher skill, knowledge, understanding and practice. It is grounded in our definition of high-quality teaching, defined in the rubric later in this document. It depends on teacher reflection, teacher collaboration, and ultimately, teacher growth.

This model is a concrete representation of our board's vision and strategy for improvement. The ISAAC Model of Continuous Improvement, creates interdependence among the school, classroom improvement plans, priorities, and efforts. The model requires a collective effort, centered on aligned expectations, and creates focused energy for positive change. At the executive level, the strategic approach, recursive in its nature, must be driven by data—multiple forms of performance measures and indicators that inform the cycle of improvement. Analysis of data occurs throughout ISAAC. Collectively, we own the data, the results, and the efforts and initiatives to support those results. This model is then replicated at the school level and at the classroom level, where teams of teachers examine student data to shape their instruction and use assessment results to refine and revise instruction. Moreover, the ISAAC Model of Continuous Improvement is grounded in the notion that leadership must be “distributed,” that is, all members of the school community should have an opportunity to contribute to the action and decisions that most directly affect their work. In other words, the knowledge base of the entire professional staff is valued as a critical variable for improvement.

Therefore, for teacher evaluation, the ISAAC Model of Continuous Improvement, is *the process* by which we design and carry out teacher development, teacher support, and teacher evaluation. Created to foster ongoing teacher growth, it is driven by data collection, data analysis, teaching practice, collaboration, and reflection. The process is aligned with our ISAAC Core Values, Beliefs About Learning, and the Vision of the Graduate. It reflects and honors the processes that our educators use every day, year in and year out, in their work with students and families. The work of improvement is an ongoing and continuous process over the life of a teacher's career. This model highlights the role of professional learning as central and collaboration and teacher collaborative teams as the means to teacher continuous growth and development.

At each stage of the process, student learning and student achievement are at the center. From the individual level of creating student learning objectives, to the PLC team level of working on instructional planning or practices together, to the departmental or school level, professional learning *about learning* is a central tenet of the ISAAC Model of Continuous Improvement. Research, assessment, empirical observation, and experience continue to inform the best practice of teaching and learning. The collective knowledge and skills of staff are a key source of new learning as they continue to extend their knowledge base and develop as reflective, collaborative professionals. The

model acknowledges that ISAAC school is shaped by its unique context, be it the charter theme, the course curriculum, or setting, the culture of the school and its own goals/core values and beliefs about learning. The context, culture, and community all help to shape the learning expectations of children and teachers alike.

Professional collaboration is central to this model. Collaborative teaming forms the foundation of our continuous improvement efforts through Professional Learning Community teams. PLC Teams begin with student learning data and use it to design, redesign, and modify instructional practices together. A PLC Team may examine individual student work generated from common assessments, locally determined assessments, as well as state assessments as starting points. ISAAC has designated opportunities for staff to engage in professional collaboration. Their professional responsibility is to adhere to the continuous improvement cycle, to examine student learning data together, to engage in collaborative planning for high quality curricular and instructional design, to deliver that instruction, then to examine the results of that instruction. The process applies, whether teachers are setting individual student learning goals or collective whole school goals.

The process of continuous improvement is shaped by the school goals and requires ongoing professional development to help keep teachers vibrant and growing. Professional development is broadly defined to include not only traditional teacher professional development sessions, but also observations of teaching, coaching, feedback, *Learning Walks*, and sharing student work outcomes, calibration of grading summative and formative, to name a few. Professional development is driven by the school goals, student learning data and results in this plan.

The ISAAC Teacher Development and Performance Plan is grounded in the work of continuous improvement. The processes and structures described herein rely upon both collaborative and individual work.

Summary of Steps in the Process

The steps in the process of teacher development are summarized below. It includes, at a minimum, the following steps in the process:

1. Orientation: *At the start of the school year*

All teachers receive an orientation to the program, its processes and expectations, including their roles and responsibilities in the process and the standards that are used to assess teaching and learning. This is an appropriate time to share school goals or district priorities that should be reflected in future goal setting meetings.

2. Goal Setting Conference: *By October 30th*

Reflection: In advance of the goal setting meeting, teachers examine student data, prior year's evaluation, and other relevant school or stakeholder data to establish individual goals. It is appropriate for teachers to collaborate in PLC Teams to support the goal setting process. Teachers draft at least two goals to address the student learning and achievement needs, which will comprise 45% of a teacher's summative evaluation. They also establish goals related to whole school student learning or student feedback and the parent feedback.

Goal Setting Conference: The teacher and administrator meet to discuss the proposed goals and arrive at mutual agreement about them. The goals for the year must be informed by data and evidence collected by the teacher and evaluator. The evaluator may request revisions to the proposed goals and objectives if they do not meet approval criteria.

3. Observations of Practice: *Throughout the Year*

The administrator observes teacher practice using a rubric, and conducts conferences related to those observations. The administrator provides a rating on the rubric.

4. Ongoing Data Collection Related to Performance and Practice: *Throughout the Year*

Throughout the year, the teacher and administrator collect data related to the student outcomes and learning goals as well as data regarding teacher practice and performance as required by the rubric.

5. Interim Mid-year Check-in Conference: *January/February*

The teacher and evaluator will hold at least one mid-year conference. The conference should focus on processes and progress toward meeting the goals established in the goal setting conference. Evidence about practice and student learning data should be reviewed. If necessary, teachers and evaluators may mutually agree to revisions of strategies, approaches, or targets to accommodate other changes in the goals.

6. End of Year Summative Review: *By May 30*

Teacher Self-Assessment: The teacher reviews and reflects on all information and data collected during the year related to the goals and completes a self-assessment for review by the evaluator.

End of Year Conference: The evaluator and teacher meet to discuss all of the evidence collected to date. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation. The summative report may be revised based on additional assessment data collected during the summer.

7. Final Summative Rating

After all data, including state test data, are available, the evaluator may adjust the summative rating if the state test data has a significant impact on the final rating.

It is expected that teachers' roles in the process are to be active participants throughout:

- Establishing goals based on student learning data
- Engaging in collaborative processes to create or review and revise curriculum
- Designing instruction
- Engaging in high quality teaching.

The teacher must then reflect on the outcomes and take intelligent action.

This following chart on the next page, provides a summary of the responsibilities.

Areas of Evaluation	Teacher Responsibility	Director Responsibility
Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-reflection on teaching standards • Identification of professional learning needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre (if applicable) and Post Conferences • Three (3) Observations or according to experience and prior summative rating • Summative Rating
Parent Feedback (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mutual goal setting and strategies • Established through a collective process – faculty or PLC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection • Mutual goal setting • Summative rating
Whole School Student Learning or Student Feedback (5%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mutual goal setting and strategies • Established through a collective process – faculty or PLC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection • Mutual goal setting • Summative rating
Student Learning/Achievement Measures (45%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two (2) student learning goals • Fall, mid-year, end of year conferences • Data collection/reflection • Mutual goal setting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall, mid-year, end of year conferences • Mutual goal setting • Summative rating
Final Rating (100%)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Summative Rating

Summative Teacher Development and Performance Review:

The Core Requirements of the Connecticut Guidelines for Teacher Evaluation require that districts weight the components of a teacher’s annual summative evaluations and ratings as follows:

Teacher Performance and Practice	Student Outcomes and Learning
40% Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice	45% Student Learning/Achievement Measures
10% Parent Feedback	5% Whole School Student Learning or Student Feedback
= 50%	= 50%
100% = Summative Rating	

All teachers are evaluated in four primary categories, grouped into two major focus areas: 1) teacher performance and 2) student outcomes and learning. Each area is comprised of sub-categories. Together, a summative evaluation considers all of these dimensions of teaching and learning. The specifics of each portion of the plan are outlined below.

Student Outcomes and Learning

45% Student Learning/Achievement Measures

The process for assessing student growth uses multiple indicators of academic growth and development. The goals related to the student learning/achievement measures will be developed through mutual agreement by the teacher and evaluator.

The teacher will establish a minimum of two goals for student growth. For those teachers teaching tested subjects (standardized state indicators for grades and subjects—SBAC, NGSS), one half (22.5%) must use the state tests as indicators. A non-standardized indicator is used for the other 22.5%. If a teacher is not teaching a tested grade or subject, non-standardized indicators may be used for both. (i.e. performances rated against a rubric, local assessments)

A Complete Goal includes the following aspects:

A Complete Goal	Definition	Reflection/Preparation
The Rationale	The rationale defines why we are focused on this area. It connects to ISAAC goals, and is grounded in student learning needs (student outcome data, behavioral data, program data, and perceptual data).	What is the baseline data and background information that I use to lead me to this goal? What are the academic track record and overall needs and strengths of my students? What is the most important purpose of my teaching assignment? Why was this SLO chosen? Which CCSS did I address?
Student Learning Objective	The objective defines, what we will work to accomplish. It should be specific and measurable, attainable, and relevant and time bound. It must be relevant to a teacher’s assignment and address a large proportion of his/her students, be ambitious and represent at least one year’s growth.	As a result of my work, what learning or positive change will my learners demonstrate? What specifically am I trying to accomplish with my students?
Action Steps	This part of the goal specifies what a teacher will do to achieve the goal/objective, how a teacher intends to “get there” It includes a plan of action, both what teacher will do in the classroom as well as what they may need to learn.	How will you meet this objective? What strategies will you employ? What professional learning do you need? What supports do you need? What teaching standards are you focused on?
Indicators of Academic Growth and Development	How well? This part of the goal specifies how we will know if the target is met. What percentage, degree? It provides specific, measurable evidence of student outcome data and demonstrates knowledge about students’ growth and development. This is the measure of success.	What is the targeted performance expectation for selected students? What data will I collect to assess progress?

Goal Setting Conference: By October 30th

Reflection: The teachers will begin the school year with reflection on their students and student learning needs. They will conduct an analysis of their students' performance relative to the core content and essential learning of their course/classroom/teaching assignment. In advance of the goal setting meeting, teachers examine student data, prior year evaluation and other relevant school or stakeholder data to establish individual goals. It is appropriate for teachers to collaborate in teams to support the goal setting process. Teachers draft at least two goals to address the student learning and achievement needs, which will comprise 45% of a teacher's summative evaluation. They also establish goals related to whole school student learning or student feedback and the parent feedback goal (discussed below).

Goal Setting Conference: The teacher and administrator meet to discuss the proposed goals and arrive at mutual agreement about them. The teacher will use performance data to establish the learning objectives, plans for improvement and indicators of academic success and growth. The goals for the year must be informed by data and evidence collected by the teacher and evaluator. The evaluator may request revisions to the proposed goals and objectives if they do not meet the expectations listed above.

Interim Conference: Mid-year check-in: January/February

The teacher and evaluator will hold at least one mid-year conference. The conference should focus on processes and progress toward meeting the goals established in the goal setting conference. Evidence about practice and student learning data should be reviewed. If necessary, teachers and evaluators may mutually agree to revisions to strategies, approaches, or targets to accommodate changes. Local assessment data may inform this process, as well as student behavioral data (such as absences, referrals), program data (such as student participation in particular programs), and perceptual data, (such as learning styles, anecdotal notes). The goals may be revised/adjusted.

End of Year Summative Review: By May 30

Teacher Self-Assessment: The teacher reviews and reflects on all information and data collected during the year related to the goals and completes a self-assessment for review by the evaluator. Teachers reflect on the goals that they have established and the following reflective prompts:

Describe the results and provide evidence for each indicator of academic growth

Describe what you did that produced those results

Provide your overall assessment as to the extent to which the goal was met

Describe what you learned and how you will use that information going forward

End of Year Conference: The evaluator and teacher meet to discuss all of the evidence collected to date and the teacher's self-reflection on the process. The teacher and evaluator discuss the extent

to which the student met the goals/objectives. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation.

Evaluators review the evidence and the teacher’s self-assessment and assign one of four points to each goal: Exceeded (4 points), Accomplished (3 points), Partially Accomplish (2 points), or Did Not Accomplish (1 point).

These ratings are defined as follows:

Exceeded	All or most students met or substantially exceeded the target(s) contained in the indicator(s).
Accomplished	Most students met the target(s) contained in the indicators within a few points on either side of the target(s).
Partially Accomplished	Many students met the target(s) but a notable percentage missed the target by more than a few points. However, taken as a whole, significant progress towards the goal was made.
Did Not Accomplish	A few students met the target(s) but a substantial percentage of students did not. Little progress toward the goal was made.

For SLOs with more than one indicator, the evaluator may score each indicator separately, and then average those scores for the SLO score, or he/she can look at the results as a body of evidence regarding the accomplishment of the objective and score the SLO holistically.

The final student growth and development rating for a teacher is the average of their two SLO scores. For example, if one SLO was Partially Accomplished, for 2 points, and the other SLO was Accomplished, for 3 points, the student growth and development rating would be 2.5 $[(2+3)/2]$. The individual SLO ratings and the student growth and development rating will be shared and discussed with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference. Evaluators are strongly urged to use their professional judgment, not just an algorithm to determine the final summative rating.

NOTE: For SLOs that include an indicator based on state standardized tests, results may not be available in time to score the SLO prior to the June 30 deadline. In this instance, if evidence for other indicators in the SLO is available using Common Core or NGSS standards aligned summative assessment data, the evaluator can score the SLO on that basis. Or, if state tests are the basis for all indicators, then the teacher’s student growth and development rating will be based only on the results of the SLO that is based on non-standardized indicators.

However, once the state test evidence is available, the evaluator is required to score or rescore the SLO, then determine if the new score changes the teacher’s final (summative) rating. If the new results change the rating, the evaluator shall call a conference with the teacher to review the results and their impact. The evaluation rating can be amended at that time as needed, but no later than August 15.

5% Whole School Student Learning or Student Feedback

Each year, the Executive Director may select either the whole school indicator or Student Feedback. If the Executive Director selects the whole school indicator, the ISAAC Accountability Index can be used and connects to the administrator's evaluation process for the school or the Executive Director may elect to use both a whole school indicator and student feedback as well.

Option 1: Whole-School Student Learning Indicator

A teacher's indicator rating is equal to the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the principal's evaluation rating at the school. This is based on the ISAAC Accountability Index, which correlates to the whole-school student learning on a principal's/director's evaluation.

Option 2: Student Feedback

The Principal may mutually decide with the Executive Director to use feedback from students, collected through whole-school surveys, to comprise this category of a teacher's evaluation rating. It is anticipated that this feedback could be focused on the aspects examined through the NEASC Accreditation Process and/or the Charter Renewal Process.

Option 3: Both Whole School Indicator and Student Feedback

The Principal may decide with the Executive Director, to use both the ISAAC Accountability Index and Student Feedback through surveys to determine the whole school goals used in the rating.

Student surveys must be administered in a way that allows students to feel comfortable providing feedback without fear of retribution. Surveys should be confidential and survey responses must not be tied to students' names. If it is feasible and planned, ISAAC will conduct two student and parent feedback surveys each year. If conducting two surveys in the same academic year is not possible or decided against, then teachers should use the previous spring survey to set growth targets.

Teachers and their evaluators will establish a goal relative to the whole school learning or student feedback or both. This may be done collectively as a school or individually.

Arriving at a Student Feedback Summative Rating

In most cases, summative ratings should reflect the degree to which a teacher or teachers made growth on feedback measures, using data from the prior school year or the fall of the current year as a baseline for setting growth targets. For teachers with high ratings already, summative ratings should reflect the degree to which ratings remain high.

This is accomplished in the following steps, undertaken by the teacher being evaluated through mutual agreement with the evaluator:

1. Review survey results from prior period.
2. Set **one** measurable goal for growth or performance that could contain multiple measures from the survey.
3. Later in the school year, administer surveys to students.

4. Aggregate data and determine whether the teacher achieved the goal.
5. Assign a summative rating, using the following scale to be discussed and finalized with their evaluator during the End-of-Year Conference.

Below Standard	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Did not meet the goal	Partially met the goal	Met the goal	Exceeded the goal

Teacher Performance and Practice

40% Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice

Forty percent (40%) of a teacher’s evaluation will be based on observation of teacher practice and performance, using a rubric based on the *Common Core of Teaching* (CCT). We are using the 2017 Connecticut Common Core of Teaching for Effective Teaching and the 2017 Connecticut Common Core of Teaching for Effective Delivery.

The CCT defines for Connecticut educators, key aspects of effective teaching, correlated with student learning and achievement through the lens of four domains. The overarching principles of this rubric aligns with the purposes of our ISAAC Educator Development and Performance Plan.

The CCT rubric maintains consistency with Connecticut’s TEAM program of mentorship and professional development of new teachers. This rubric relies upon reflection on professional practice to advance teacher effectiveness and student learning. Consistency between the CT new teacher program and program for all teachers allows the development of a common understanding and common language about teaching and learning, enriching collaboration, communication, and community to support success for all students.

The following Domains are assessed:

Domain 1: Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning	Teachers create a positive learning environment, promote developmentally appropriate standards of behavior, and maximize instructional time	In-class observations or live observations of practice
Domain 2: Planning for Active Learning	Teachers plan instructional content, plan instruction to cognitively engage students, and select appropriate assessment strategies	Non-classroom observations/ reviews of practice
Domain 3: Instruction for Active Learning	Teachers implement instructional content, lead students to construct meaning and apply new learning, assess student learning, provide feedback to students, and adjustments to instruction	In-class observations or live observations of practice
Domain 4: Professional Responsibility and Teacher Leadership	Teachers engage in continuous professional learning, collaborate to develop and sustain a professional learning environment, and works with colleagues, students, and families to develop and sustain positive school climate	Non-classroom observations/ reviews of practice

(Both full rubrics can be accessed in the appendix)

To rate through use of the rubrics, administrators collect data through formal observations, informal observations, dialogue, and reviews of practice, (such as lesson plans, student work, etc.) in order to arrive at a summative rating for this category.

The ISAAC process requires that teachers self-assess against the CCT rubrics and collect and reflect with their administrator on documentation and artifacts relative to effective practice as defined in the domains. Observations by administrators are a key data source for this category. Through the related conferences, teachers are encouraged to examine their goals and strategies and to self-identify areas of teaching to work on and to consider how these teaching expectations relate to their student learning goals, professional development needs, and classroom practices.

Minimum Criteria Based on Core Requirements

Beginning in the 2020-2021 implementation of the plan, all new teachers at ISAAC will receive at least three formal and/or in-class observations. For new teachers, two of three formal evaluations should include pre-conferences, and all include post-conferences. Formal observations shall be approximately 30 minutes.

Thereafter:

Year 1 and 2 teachers will receive at least three formal in-class observations. Two of three will include pre-conferences and all include post-conferences.

Teachers who receive a performance rating of **below standard** or **developing** will receive a number of observations appropriate to their individual plan, but no fewer than three formal in-class observations. Two of the three must include a pre-conference and all include a post-conference. Teachers may be observed in other settings.

Experienced teachers who receive a performance rating of **accomplished** or **exemplary** will receive a combination of at least three observations of practice, one of which must be formal in-class observation. The other two may include other teacher responsibilities such as observations of PLC Team meetings, SRBI Team meetings, coaching/mentoring other teachers, observation of the delivery of professional development to other teachers, review of lesson plans, or other teaching artifacts.

Evaluation Ratings for Teacher Performance and Practice

For each observation, the evaluator will use the rubric to provide feedback and engage in professional dialogue with the teacher. An evaluation rating for teacher performance and practice will be assigned at the end of the school year, at the summative conference. After gathering and analyzing evidence for all of the indicators collected throughout the school year, evaluators will use the appropriate CCT rubric according to their position at ISAAC to assign ratings at the domain level. Once domain ratings have been assigned and supported by evidence, evaluators will use the *Rating Guidelines for Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice* (below) to assign a summative rating for this category.

Summative Rating Guidelines for Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice

Rating	Criteria
Exemplary	Minimum of two Exemplary ratings and no rating below Accomplished
Accomplished	Minimum of two Accomplished ratings and no ratings Below Standard
Developing	No more than one rating Below Standard
Below Standard	One or more ratings Below Standard

To ensure consistency in the observation and documentation of teacher performance and practice, administrators will participate in collaboration trainings and remain accomplished in the use of the rubric. Training will be conducted annually to ensure consistency, and high-quality application of the rubric in observations and evaluation. Formal observations include pre- and post-conferences that provide opportunities for meaningful professional dialogue about teaching and learning and to allow teachers and administrators to set goals, implement teaching strategies, and reflect on results of the teaching and their progress toward their own professional goals.

Each year, we intend to train and collaborate with other professionals in the area. Moreover, each year, teachers will engage in professional development regarding this plan and the corresponding Common Core of Teaching rubrics.

10% Parent Feedback

Ten percent (10%) of a teacher's evaluation will be based on parent feedback, including data from surveys. Surveys will be used to capture parent feedback that is anonymous and demonstrates fairness, validity and usefulness.

The School Climate survey may be used as a source of data for this indicator.

ISAAC will use the whole school parent survey data to support goal setting during the beginning of the year. ISAAC will set whole school goals, connected to the Executive Director's and Principal's whole school goal, and teachers will design strategies to support those goals as well as targets related to the goal that they select. Parent feedback will be aggregated, reviewed, and compared with the data from the beginning and end of year while considering the degree to which the teachers have met individual or whole school targets set at the beginning of the year. Teachers and evaluators should use their judgment in setting growth/improvement targets for parent feedback. Ratings for this category are based on either evidence of improvement in areas of need as identified by the school level survey results or evidence of teacher's implementation of strategies to address areas of need as identified by the survey results.

The parent feedback rating should reflect the degree to which the school/program/individual successfully reaches the parent goal/improvement targets. This is accomplished through a review of

evidence provided by the teacher and/or whole school. The final summative rating will be done at one of four levels. The scale is as follows:

Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard
Exceeded the goal	Met the goal	Partially met the goal	Did not meet the goal

Professional Learning Opportunities

Throughout the overall process, the teacher’s professional learning should be a central focus. For each goal or each step in the process, the evaluator is expected to consider what professional learning will support teachers individually and collectively. As reflected in this document and its forms, teachers establish goals and action steps, which include professional learning and reflection on teaching standards. This is part of the process, dialogue, and documentation. Specific professional learning in a teacher’s goals are clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process as it relates to student learning results, observations of professional practice, and the results of stakeholder feedback. It is expected that professional learning will vary by individual or groups of teachers based upon the data.

ISAAC administration will integrate the professional learning plans into their school development and performance plans. The support for professional learning is a key expectation for each administrator’s own evaluation.

ISAAC will provide opportunities for career development and professional growth based upon the performance identified through the evaluation process. For example, teachers who consistently perform at high levels will have opportunities to serve as mentors, coaches, engage in peer observation or other leadership opportunities.

Summative Ratings

As required in the state guidelines, the ISAAC Development and Performance Plan uses a four-level matrix rating system.

The four areas are as follows:

Student Learning Achievement Measures (45%)

Exceeded	All or most students met or substantially exceeded the target(s) contained in the indicator(s).
Met	Most students met the target(s) contained in the indicators within a few points on either side of the target(s).
Partially Met	Many students met the target(s) but a notable percentage missed the target by more than a few points. However, taken as a whole, significant progress towards the goal was made.
Did Not Meet	A few students met the target(s) but a substantial percentage of students did not. Little progress toward the goal was made.

Whole School Student Learning (5%)

Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard
Exceeded the goal	Met the goal	Partially met the goal	Did not meet the goal

Teacher Performance and Practice (40 %)

Rating Guidelines for Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice by CCT Domain

Rating	Criteria
Exemplary	Minimum of two Exemplary ratings and no rating Below Accomplished
Accomplished	Minimum of two Accomplished ratings and no ratings in Below Standard
Developing	No more than one rating Below Standard
Below Standard	One or more ratings Below Standard

Parent Feedback (10%)

Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard
Exceeded the goal	Met the goal	Partially met the goal	Did not meet the goal

These four areas are summed as follows:

Teacher Performance and Practice	Student Outcomes and Learning
40%	45%
Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice	Student Learning/Achievement Measures
10%	5%
Parent Feedback	Whole School Student Learning or Student Feedback
= 50%	= 50%
100% = Summative Rating	

Annual summative evaluations must provide each teacher with a summative rating aligned to one of four performance evaluation designations: Exemplary, Accomplished, Developing, Below Standard.

The performance levels are defined as follows:

- Exemplary: Exceeding standards of performance
- Accomplished: Meeting standards of performance
- Developing: Meeting some standards of performance, but not others
- Below Standard: Not meeting standards of performance

In order to determine summative rating designations for each teacher, ISAAC evaluators will:

- A. Rate teacher performance in each of the four categories:
 - a. Student Learning/Achievement Measures
 - b. Whole School Student Learning or Student Feedback
 - c. Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice
 - d. Parent Feedback

- B. Combine the Student Learning/Achievement Measures and Whole School Student Learning into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights. Arrive at an overall “Student Outcomes and Learning Rating”

- C. Combine the Observation of teacher performance and practice rating and parent feedback rating, taking into account their relative weights. This will represent a “Teacher Performance and Practice Rating”

- D. Identify the rating for each focus area and follow the respective column and row to the center of the table. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. If the two focus areas are highly discrepant then the evaluator would examine the data and gather additional information in order to make a rating.

		<i>TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICE RATING</i>			
		Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	<i>Below Standard</i>
<i>STUDENT OUTCOMES AND LEARNING RATING</i>	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Accomplished	<i>Gather Further Information</i>
	Accomplished	Exemplary	Accomplished	Accomplished	<i>Gather further information</i>
	Developing	Accomplished	Developing	Developing	Below Standard
	<i>Below Standard</i>	<i>Gather further Information</i>	Below Standard	Below Standard	Below Standard

Evaluators are encouraged to use their professional judgment and their learning from their proficiency training to determine a summative rating, not just numbers alone. Beginning teachers shall generally be deemed effective if the teachers receive at least two sequential “accomplished” ratings, by the fourth year of a beginning teacher’s career. It is expected for those teachers who receive tenure to have final summative ratings of “accomplished” or “exemplary” (See the appendix for more details regarding Core Requirements, SEED and ratings).

Professional Assistance Plan

A teacher who receives a final summative rating of “Developing” or “Below Standard” will be required to work with their evaluator and local association president (or designee) to design a teacher performance professional assistance plan. The plan will be created within 30 days after the completion of the summative evaluation rating conference.

Teachers who have demonstrated instructional and professional skills that are in need of improvement according to the SEED rubric and have not responded to the assistance as prescribed from administration, will be put on a plan.

Evaluation Criteria: The evaluation criteria are derived from the components of the Teacher Development and Performance Plan:

Teacher Performance and Practice

- a. Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice
- b. Parent Feedback

Student Outcomes and Learning

- a. Student Learning/Achievement Measures
- b. Whole School Student Learning or Student Feedback

Methods: The methods to evaluate are the same as those described above and include some of the following, depending on the areas of need:

- Observations in a range of settings
- Examination of artifacts/student work
- Reflective conversations with supervisors, coaching
- Constructive, ongoing feedback
- Assistance and support from evaluator or designee
- Comprehensive goal setting

Time period: The timeframe for improvement is for teachers in the “Developing” category, there are 30 school days to achieve a rating of “Accomplished”. For teachers with a rating of

“Below Standard”, the timeframe is 30 school days to achieve a “Developing” rating and 60 total school days (additional 30 school days) to achieve an “Accomplished” rating.

Accountability: Documentation of evaluation criteria will include summative ratings supported by evidence. It may include strengths, areas needing improvement and recommended strategies for meeting any next steps. It may also include a recommendation regarding continued employment.

Peer support: The primary support for staff in this format will be the administrator. Others, including peers, may provide additional supervision or assistance.

Evaluator: The evaluator for staff in this format will be an administrator.

Appeals Process

Guidelines

1. The Appeals Committee consists of a subcommittee of three members who are current members of the Teacher Evaluation Committee and will be comprised of a bargaining unit representative, executive staff, and an administrator who is not the assigned evaluator. The Appeals Committee will be convened to (1) resolve conflict when goals cannot be mutually determined, and (2) resolve when either party--evaluator or evaluatee--does not adhere to the process. These are the only two reasons the Appeals Committee will meet.
2. Appeals are made by contacting the Executive Director. The person requesting the appeal becomes the applicant.
3. Upon contact, the Executive Director will advise the applicant of the process and will assure that the formal appeals letter has been written within the timeframe.
4. Submission of the appeal letter that specifically identifies the concern, formally initiates the appeals procedure, and timelines go into effect.
5. The following timelines will apply:
 - a. Identification of a problem, the determination to use the appeals process and the submission of the completed appeals letter by either party initiates the appeals process.
 - b. A formal letter of appeal must be submitted within five school days of the concern indicated.

- c. Within five school days of the receipt of the completed appeal letter, the committee will notify applicant of a scheduled conference (which must be held within ten school days).
- d. The conference will be held. If the group comes to agreement, the process is terminated. If no agreement can be reached, the matter will be referred to the Executive Director who must set a meeting of the parties within ten school days and render a final decision.
- e. Resolution of the problem by both parties at any time may result in a mutual request to withdraw intervention of the Appeals Committee or the Executive Director.

Core Requirements/Law

Sections 51 through 56 of PA 12-116, signed into law by Governor Dannel P. Malloy on May 15, 2012 and amended by sections 23 and 24 of PA 12-2 of the June 12 special session, requires the State Board of Education to adopt, on or before July 1, 2012 and in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC), guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program. The PEAC have renamed these “core requirements”. The ISAAC evaluation system was developed and revised pursuant to this statutory requirement.

Appendix A1
ISAAC Goal Setting Form

- 1st Student Outcome Goal (SLO)
- 2nd Student Outcome Goal (SLO)

NAME:
SUBJECT: |

What is your evidence that supports your goal?
What is your goal?
As a result of your work, what learning or positive change will our learners demonstrate? Students will be able to... <i>This objective is aligned to these standards (where applicable) (e.g., CCSS, school learning expectations, NGSS, SBAC)</i>
What strategies will you employ to meet these objectives?
Professional learning that will support you with this objective (e.g., professional support, resources, workshop, peer support, research, professional learning community):
Which domain/indicator on the Common Core of Teaching will this professional learning support? Indicators of Academic Growth and Development: <i>How will I know that the objective has been met? (What is the targeted performance expectation for selected students? What data will I collect to assess progress? Please provide specific percentage of growth or achievement.</i>
Domain 1 (Class Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning), Domain 2 (Planning for Active Learning), Domain 3 (Instruction for Active Learning), Domain 4 (Professional and Teacher Responsibilities).



MID-YEAR CHECK-IN GOAL CONFERENCE

Teacher Form

Teacher's Name: _____ School: _____ Date of Conference: _____

Describe your progress to date for each of the four goals.

(Please number and label each goal)

--

Describe the professional learning and/or strategies or teaching standards focus that have contributed to your progress.

--

Describe any challenges or barriers to achieving any of your four goals.

(Please specify the goal)

--

What modified action steps and/or adjustments will you implement to address challenges or continue to make progress toward your goals?

--

Must be submitted electronically to administrator prior to goal conference



Pre-Observation Conference Form

To be submitted electronically prior to Pre-Observation Conference

Teacher:
Subject/Class:

School:
Time/Period:

Grade(s):
Date of Observation:

Lesson Objectives: What will the students know, understand, and be able to do as a result of the lesson?

Content standards met (include literacy strategies where applicable):

Lesson objective(s):

What came before?

What comes next?

Previous data used to plan this lesson:

Learner background information – prior knowledge and skills related to this lesson:

Outline any teaching strategies and/or learning activities that you have planned

What will you be doing? What will your students be doing?

Materials/Resources:

Do Now/Initiation:

Mini-Lesson:

Work Period:

Closure/Debrief:

Differentiation:

Outline any assessments/approaches you plan to use to monitor student learning.

(How will you know if your students achieved the objective?)

Formative Assessment:

Summative Assessment:

What aspects of the lesson or specific teaching standards would like specific feedback on or about?



Post-Observation Conference Form

Formal Observation:

#1 #2 #3

Teacher:
Subject/Class:

School:
Time/Period:

Grade(s):
Date of Observation:

*This form must be filled out by the evaluator after conferencing with the teacher.
Use the questions to guide the conversation with the teacher.*

Feedback to the teacher was given: Verbal Written

How successful was the lesson and how do you know it? To what degree did the students achieve the lesson objective?

--

What, if anything, did you change from your plan?

--

If you were to teach this lesson again, what would you do differently next time?

--

Other Discussion Points/Wonderings:

--



END OF THE YEAR SUMMATIVE RATING

Evaluator Form

Teacher's Name:

Grade/Subject:

Date of Conference:

Student Learning Achievement Measures (SL01)					22.5%	
Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard			
All or most students met or substantially exceeded the target(s) contained in the indicator(s).	Most students met the target(s) contained in the indicators within a few points on either side of the target(s).	Many students met the target(s) but a notable percentage missed the target by more than a few points. However, taken as a whole, significant progress towards the goal was made.	A few students met the target(s) but a substantial percentage of students did not. Little progress toward the goal was made.			
Student Learning Achievement Measures (SL02)					22.5%	
Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard			
Exceeded the goal	Met the goal	Partially met the goal	Did not meet the goal			
Whole School Student Learning					5%	
Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard			
Exceeded the goal	Met the goal	Partially met the goal	Did not meet the goal			
OVERALL STUDENT OUTCOMES AND LEARNING RATING (50%)						
<i>Arrive at an overall Student Outcomes and Learning Rating. Combine the Student Learning Achievement Measures and Whole School Student Learning into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights.</i>						
Teacher Performance and Practice					40%	
Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard			
Minimum of three exemplary ratings and no rating below accomplished	Minimum of three accomplished ratings and no rating below standard	Minimum of two accomplished rating and not more than one rating below standard	Two or more ratings below standard			
Parent Feedback					10%	
Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard			
Exceeded the goal	Met the goal	Partially met the goal	Did not meet the goal			
Teacher Performance and Practice Rating (50%)						
<i>Arrive at an overall Teacher Performance and Practice Rating, combine the observation of Teacher Performance and Practice rating and Parent Feedback rating, taking into account their relative weights.</i>						
FINAL RATING					100%	
<i>Identify the rating for each focus area and follow the respective column and row to the center of the table. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. If the two focus areas are highly discrepant then the evaluator would examine the data and gather additional information in order to make a rating.</i>						
		<i>Teacher Performance and Practice Rating</i>				
		Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard	
<i>Student Outcomes and Learning Rating</i>	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Accomplished	<i>Gather Further Information</i>	
	Accomplished	Exemplary	Accomplished	Accomplished	<i>Gather further Information</i>	
	Developing	Accomplished	Developing	Developing	Below Standard	
	Below Standard	<i>Gather further Information</i>	Below Standard	Below Standard	Below Standard	



**ISAAC Written Observation and
Conference Summary**

Formal Observation:		
<input type="checkbox"/> #1	<input type="checkbox"/> #2	<input type="checkbox"/> #3
Informal Observation:		
<input type="checkbox"/> #1	<input type="checkbox"/> #2	<input type="checkbox"/> #3

Teacher:
Subject:
Date of Observation:

School: ISAAC
Time/Durations:
Pre-Conference:

Grade(s):
Evaluator:
Post Conference:

Domain 1: Classroom Environment, Student Engagement, and Commitment to Learning: Teachers promote student engagement, independence and interdependence in learning and facilitate a positive learning community by:					
	<i>Consistently Demonstrated</i>	<i>Not Observed</i>	<i>Improvement Needed</i>		
1a. Creating a positive learning environment that is responsive to and respectful of the learning needs of 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.					
Supporting Statements: <i>What was observed; What is needed for next observation; Identify expected growth, resources, strategies:</i>					
Overall Domain 1 Rating:	E	A	D	BS	
Domain 2: Planning for Active Learning: Teacher plan instruction to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:					
	<i>Consistently Demonstrated</i>	<i>Not Observed</i>	<i>Improvement Needed</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.					
Supporting Statements: <i>What was observed; What is needed for next observation; Identify expected growth, resources, strategies:</i>					
Overall Domain 2 Rating:	E	A	D	BS	

Domain 3: Instruction for Active Learning: Teachers implement instruction to engage student in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:				
	<i>Consistently Demonstrated</i>	<i>Not Observed</i>	<i>Improvement Needed</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.				
Supporting Statements: <i>What was observed; What is needed for next observation; Identify expected growth, resources, strategies:</i>				
Overall Domain 3 Rating:	E	A	D	BS
Domain 4: Professional Responsibility and Teacher Leadership: Teachers maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration and leadership by:				
	<i>Consistently Demonstrated</i>	<i>Not Observed</i>	<i>Improvement Needed</i>	
4.a. Engaging in continuous professional learning to impact instruction and student learning.				
4.b. Collaborating to develop and sustain a professional learning environment to support student learning.				
4.c. Working with colleagues, students and families to develop and sustain a positive school climate that supports student learning.				
Supporting Statements: <i>What was observed; What is needed for next observation; Identify expected growth, resources, strategies:</i>				
Overall Domain 4 Rating:	E	A	D	BS

Administrator

Teacher



Informal Observation/ Review of Practice Feedback

Teacher:
Subject:

School: ISAAC
Time/Period:

Grade(s):
Date of Observation:

This form is to be completed by the evaluator and given to the teacher.

Feedback given to the teacher: Verbal Written Date:

Describe the context of the observation (class observation, team meeting, review of practice, etc.).

Describe what you observed – the teacher’s statements and actions as well as those of students or others involved. Connect these observations to a specific domain within the CCT.

1: Classroom environment, student engagement, and commitment to learning

2: Planning for active learning

3: Instruction for active learning

4: Professional responsibilities and teacher leadership

Other discussion points or thoughts:

TEACHER

ADMINISTRATOR

PART TWO: ADMINISTRATOR DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE PLAN

The ISAAC Administrator Development and Performance Plan aligns with the Teacher Development and Performance Plan. It is grounded in the following purposes as defined by our team:

- To support student learning, growth and development as a key measure of our success as leaders;
- To commit to continuous growth and development for ourselves and individuals that we lead;
- To use data, not just hunches, as a means to examine our practice and to drive our plans and actions;
- To use reflection as a key tool, both individually and collectively, to shape our practice;
- To ensure that we develop and maintain high quality relationships with our stakeholders;
- To ensure that we communicate well and give and receive feedback on our leadership;
- To ensure that we examine and seek to strengthen our capacity and resources.

It is grounded in the belief that great leaders lead great schools. The Model of Continuous Improvement in the Teacher Development and Performance Plan is a defining connection between the plans.

The purpose of the new evaluation model is to evaluate administrator performance fairly and accurately and to help each educator strengthen his/her practice to improve student learning. The process of evaluation has four purposes: to increase student learning, to enhance leadership practices, to enhance school improvement, and to provide for accountability in the educational system.

The ISAAC Administrator Development and Performance Plan connects to student achievement and aligns with professional development and school improvement. The purpose of the new evaluation model is to evaluate administrator performance fairly and accurately and to help each leader strengthen his/her practice to lead to school improvement. Our administrator evaluation model is founded on a set of core principles about the power of great leaders and the critical role of accountability in developing them.

Design Principles

The following four design principles are interdependent; each is critical in determining that evaluations meet the needs of teachers, school leaders and students. They are derived from the 2017 Connecticut Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric model:

1. Focus on What Matters Most

The four areas defined by the state board as what matters for administrators are: Student Learning (45%), Administrator Practice (40%), Stakeholder Feedback (10%), and Teacher Effectiveness (5%). Instructional leadership is the key defining trait of high-quality school leadership and is weighted as such in this plan. It connects directly to our teacher core principle: the instructional core matters and focusing on student learning and the teaching that shapes that learning is key.

2. Emphasize Growth Over Time

No single data point can paint a complete picture of a leader's performance. The ISAAC Administrator Development and Performance Plan uses multiple measures and begins with the premise that an individual's performance should be about their improvement from an established starting point. This applies to their professional practice goals and the outcomes they are striving to reach. Attaining high levels of performance matters, and maintaining high results is part of the work, but the model should encourage administrators to pay attention to continually improving practice.

3. Leave Room for Judgment

An evaluation process must have meaningful implications, both positive and negative, in order to earn sustained support from school leaders and to contribute to the systematic improvement of schools. Of key importance is the professional conversation between the administrator and his/her supervisor that can be accomplished through a well-designed and well-executed evaluation system. The model requires evaluators to observe the practice of administrators enough to make well informed judgments about the quality and efficacy of practice.

4. Consider Implementation at Least as Much as Design

This plan is designed to limit excessive demands on those doing evaluations or being evaluated. The work needs to be integrated into the overall school improvement efforts of ISAAC and be seen as integral to the work, not an addition to it. The plan underscores the importance of the need for evaluators to build skills in setting goals (for themselves and with others), observing practice, and providing high quality feedback.

Model of Continuous Improvement

The ISAAC Administrator Development and Performance Plan parallels the Teacher Development and Performance Plan defining administrator effectiveness in terms of practice and performance (practice and stakeholder feedback), and student outcomes and teacher effectiveness/learning (academic progress and teacher growth and development).

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

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader

- Meeting expectations in at least three other areas of practice
- Meeting one target related to stakeholder feedback
- Meeting state accountability growth targets on tests of core academic subjects
- Meeting and making progress on two student learning objectives aligned to school and ISAAC priorities
- Having more than 60% of teachers whose rating is accomplished on the student growth portion of the evaluation

What follows is a description of the plan and the four components on which administrators will be evaluated: 1) leadership practice, 2) stakeholder feedback, 3) student learning, and 4) teacher effectiveness. The document also includes steps for arriving at a final summative rating. The model is derived from the state's *New Leaders* document, authored by a national, non-profit organization committed to developing transformational school leaders and advancing the policies and practice that allow great leaders to succeed. In addition, this tool is being used to evaluate administrators by several districts in southeastern Connecticut. It is designed to meet the requirements as specified in the core requirements for administrator evaluation.

Overview of the Process

Each administrator participates in the evaluation process as a cycle of continuous improvement. It parallels the Teacher Continuous Improvement Plan, beginning with the examination of student learning data, the administrator then develops a school development and performance plan, including meaningful goals. The school development plans must support high quality instruction and include the collective examination of results as well as how administrators provide feedback and collaborate with all stakeholders throughout the process.

The 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.

The cycle itself begins with the following processes:

June-July: Orientation and Context Setting

To begin the process, the administrator needs the following:

1. Student learning data that is available for review by the administrator and the school has been assigned to the Accountability Index rating
2. Stakeholder survey data that is available for review by the administrator
3. The Executive Director has communicated student learning priorities for the year

4. The administrator has developed a school development plan that includes student learning goals
5. The evaluator has reviewed the written plan with the administrator to orient him/her to the evaluation process.

Each year, the Executive Director will provide professional development for all administrators being evaluated so that they will understand the evaluation system, the processes, and the timeline for their evaluation. Special attention will be given to the Common Core of Leading Performance Expectations.

Prior to the start of the school year, if necessary or applicable, ISAAC will provide evaluators of administrators with training focused on the administrator evaluation system. Training will include an in-depth overview of the four categories that are part of the plan, the process and timeline for the plan implementation, and the process for arriving at summative evaluation. Training will be provided on the rubric so that evaluators are thoroughly familiar with the language, expectations, and examples of evidence required for administrator proficiency.

July-September: Goal Setting and Plan Development

Before a school year starts, school administrators identify three student learning objectives and one survey target, drawing on available data, the Executive Director's priorities, their school development plan, and prior evaluation results (where applicable). They also determine two areas of focus for their practice. 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 school context?
- Are there any elements for which accomplished performance will depend on factors beyond the control of the administrator? 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 development needs to support the administrator in accomplishing the goals. Together, these components – the goals, the practice areas and the resources and supports – comprise an individual's evaluation 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 the beginning work on the goals. The evaluator may suggest additional goals as appropriate.

September-December: Plan Implementation and Collect Evidence

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 observation visits. Periodic, purposeful school observation 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 are essential.

Unlike visiting a classroom to observe a teacher, school visits to observe administrator practice can vary significantly in length and setting. Further, central to this process is providing meaningful feedback based on observed practice. Evaluators need to provide timely feedback after each visit. This process relies on the professional judgment of the administrator and evaluator to determine appropriate sources of evidence and ways to collect evidence.

January: Mid-year Formative Review

Midway through the school year (especially at a point when interim student assessment data are available for review) is the appropriate 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 Conference, 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 a new population of students) that could impact accomplishment of outcome goals; goals may be changed at this point.

April: Self-Assessment

In the spring, the administrator is expected to assess their practice on all 18 elements of the Connecticut Leadership Standards. For each element, the administrator determines whether he/she:

- Needs to grow and improve their 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 their focus areas and determine if they consider themselves on track or not. This reflection should be used to inform their rating for the year. The administrator submits their self-assessment to their evaluator.

May: Preliminary Summative Assessment (adjusted in August, if appropriate).

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. The meeting is intended as an opportunity to convey strengths, growth areas, and probable ratings. After the meeting, the evaluator assigns a rating, based on all available evidence.

The evaluator completes the summative evaluation report, shares it with the administrator, and adds it to the personnel file with any written comments attached that the director requests to be added within two weeks of receipt of the report. Summative ratings are expected to be completed for all administrators by June 30 of a given school year. Should state standardized test data not 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 ratings, the evaluator may recalculate the summative rating when the data is available and submit the adjusted rating no later than September 15. This adjustment should take place before the start of the new school year so that prior year results can inform goal setting in the new school year.

The Four Components of the Evaluation

Administrators will be evaluated and supported on the basis of four key components: 1) Leadership Practice, 2) Stakeholder Feedback, 3) Student Learning, and 4) Teacher Effectiveness.

Component One: Leadership Practice Rating (40%)

An assessment of an administrator's leadership practice is 40% of the summative rating. It is determined by direct observation of practice and the collection of other evidence. These expectations are described in the Connecticut Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric, adopted by the Connecticut State Board of Education in June 2017, defines effective administrative practice through four performance expectations.

1. **Instructional Leadership**
2. **Talent Management**
3. **Organizational Systems**
4. **Culture and Climate**

Improving teaching and learning is at the core of what effective educational leaders do. As such, teaching and learning comprises half of the Instructional Leadership practice rating and the other five performance expectations are weighted as described in the document.

These weightings are consistent for all administrators. For school-based 092 certificate holders in non-teaching roles, the four 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.

In order to arrive at these ratings, administrators are measured against the Leader Evaluation Rubric (Appendix) 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 Accomplished performance.
- **Accomplished:** The rubric is anchored at the Accomplished Level using the indicator language from the Connecticut Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric. 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 included as indicators. Each of the concepts demonstrates a continuum of performance across the row, from below standard to exemplary.

Arriving at a Leadership Practice Summative Rating

Summative ratings are based on the preponderance of evidence for each performance expectation in the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. Evaluators collect written evidence about and observe the administrator's leadership practice across the six 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:

1. The administrator and evaluator meet for a Goal-Setting Conference to identify focus areas for development of the administrator's leadership practice.
2. The administrator collects evidence about his/her practice and the evaluator collects evidence about administrator practice with particular focus on the identified focus areas for development. **Administrator evaluators must conduct at least two school site observations for any administrator and should conduct at least four school site observations for administrators who have received ratings of *developing* or *below standard*.**
3. 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.
4. 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 their focus areas.
5. 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*, *accomplished*, *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. (Supported by the "Summative Rating Form," **Appendix**.)

School Based Administrators:

Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard
<i>Exemplary on at least 2 other performance expectations</i> No rating below <i>Accomplished</i> on any performance expectation	<i>At least Accomplished on a majority of performance expectations</i> No rating below Developing on any performance expectation	<i>At least Developing on a majority of performance expectations</i>	<i>Below Standard on at least half of performance expectations</i>

Other School-Based Administrators:

Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard
<i>Exemplary on at least half of measured performance expectations</i> No rating below <i>Accomplished</i> on any performance expectation	<i>At least Accomplished on a majority of performance expectations</i> No rating below Developing on any performance expectation	<i>At least Developing on a majority of performance expectations</i>	<i>Below Standard on at least half of performance expectations</i>

Component Two: Stakeholder Feedback (10%)

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

The stakeholders surveyed will be those in the best position to provide meaningful feedback to the administrator. For school-based administrators, stakeholders will include teachers and parents, but may include other stakeholders (e.g, other staff, community members, students, etc.). Surveys will be administered anonymously, and all ISAAC administrators will collect and analyze stakeholder feedback data that will be used for continuous improvement. The surveys shall be administered annually. Data will be used as baseline data for the following year. Using the survey data, administrators will establish goals, within their school development plans, to address stakeholder feedback.

Once the stakeholder feedback goal has been determined, the administrator will identify the strategies he/she will employ to meet the target.

Arriving at a 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:

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

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

Component Three: 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 administrators’ evaluation.

The state’s accountability system includes multiple measures of student academic learning:

1. School Accountability Index
2. Progress for student subgroups – changes from year to year in student achievement for subgroups on Connecticut’s standardized assessments and other reported measures
3. Absolute measure of student achievement on Connecticut’s standardized assessments
4. Rating student subgroups – absolute measure of student achievement for subgroups on Connecticut’s standardized assessments
5. Other measures as measured in the Accountability Index

This score represents 22.5% of the rating for this area of focus. For any school that does not have tested grades, the entire rating on student learning indicators is based on the locally determined indicators.

All protections related to the assignment of school accountability index 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.

Locally Determined Measures

Administrators establish a minimum of three student learning objectives (SLOs) on measures they select that they will integrate into their school development plans. In selecting measures, certain parameters apply:

- All measures must align to Connecticut learning standards. In instances where there are no such standards that apply to a subject/grade level, the school 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.

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
- Students' performance or growth on school-developed formative or summative assessments in subjects and grade levels for which there are not available state assessments.
- The process for selecting measures and creating SLOs should strike a balance between alignment to Executive Director student learning priorities and a focus on the most significant school-level student learning needs. To do so, it is critical that the process unfold in this way.
 - First, the Executive Director 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. 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 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.
 - 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 (ex: 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	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard
Met all three (3) objectives	Met two (2) objectives substantially with substantial progress on the third	Met one (1) objective and made substantial progress on at least one (1) other	Met zero (0) objectives OR Met one (1) objective and did not make substantial progress on the other two (2)

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

		STATE TEST PORTION (22.5%)			
		Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard
LOCALLY DETERMINED PORTION (22.5%)	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Accomplished	Gather Further Information
	Accomplished	Exemplary	Accomplished	Accomplished	Gather further information
	Developing	Accomplished	Developing	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	<i>Gather further information</i>	Below Standard	Below Standard	Below Standard

Component Four: Teacher Effectiveness (5%)

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

Improving teacher effectiveness is central to an administrator’s role in driving improved student learning outcomes. In addition to measuring the actions that administrators take to increase teacher effectiveness – from hiring and placement to ongoing professional development to feedback on

performance – the administrator evaluation model also assesses the outcomes of all of that work.

As part of ISAAC’s teacher evaluation model, teachers are assessed in part on their accomplishment of goals. This is the basis for assessing administrators’ contribution to teacher effectiveness outcomes.

In order to maintain a strong focus on teachers setting ambitious goals for their evaluation, it is imperative that evaluators discuss with the administrators their strategies in working with teachers to set goals.

Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard
>80% of teachers are rated <i>accomplished</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student growth portion of their evaluation	>60% of teachers are rated <i>accomplished</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student growth portion of their evaluation	>40% of teachers are rated <i>accomplished</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student growth portion of their evaluation	<40% of teachers are rated <i>accomplished</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student growth portion of their evaluation

Summative Administrator Evaluation Rating

Each administrator shall annually receive a summative rating in one of four levels:

- 1. Exemplary:** Exceeding indicators of performance
- 2. Accomplished:** Meeting indicators of performance
- 3. Developing:** Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
- 4. Below Standard:** Not meeting indicators of performance

Accomplished represents fully satisfactory performance. It is the rigorous standard expected for most experienced administrators. Specifically, accomplished administrators can be characterized as:

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader
- Meeting expectations in a majority of other areas of practice
- Meeting and making progress on one target related to stakeholder feedback
- Meeting state accountability growth targets on tests of core academic subjects
- Meeting and making progress on three student learning objectives aligned to school and district priorities
- Having more than 60% of teachers accomplished on the student growth portion of their evaluation

Supporting administrators to reach *Accomplished* is at the very heart of this evaluation model. *Exemplary* ratings are reserved for performance that significantly exceeds *Accomplished* 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 *Accomplished* 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 principals in their first year, performance rated *Developing* is expected. If, by the end of three years, performance is still *Developing*, there is cause for concern.

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

Determining Summative Ratings

The process for determining summative evaluation ratings has three steps: (a) determining a practice rating, (b) determining an outcomes rating and (c) combining the two into an overall rating.

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

The practice rating derives from an administrator's performance on the six performance expectations of the leader evaluation rubric and the three stakeholder feedback targets. Evaluators record a rating for the performance expectations that generates an overall rating for leadership practice. This forms the basis of the overall practice rating, but the rating is adjusted upward or downward one level in the event that the stakeholder feedback is either *Exemplary* or *Below Standard*, respectively.

B. OUTCOMES: Student Learning (45%) + Teacher Effectiveness (5%) = 50%

The outcome rating derives from the two student learning measures – state test results and student learning objectives – and teacher effectiveness outcomes. State reports provide an assessment rating and evaluators record a rating for the student learning objectives agreed to in the beginning of the year. These two, combine to form the basis of the overall outcomes rating, but the rating is adjusted upward or downward one level in the event that the teacher effectiveness is either *Exemplary* or *Below Standard*, respectively.

C. OVERALL: Practice (50%) + Outcomes (50%) = 100%

The overall rating combines the practice and outcomes ratings using the matrix below. If the two categories are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of 4 for practice and a rating of 1 for outcomes), then the Executive Director should examine the data and gather additional information in order to make a final rating.

		<i>PRACTICE RELATED INDICATORS RATING</i>			
		Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard
<i>OUTCOMES RELATED INDICATORS RATING</i>	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Accomplished	<i>Gather further information</i>
	Accomplished	Exemplary	Accomplished	Accomplished	<i>Gather further information</i>
	Developing	Accomplished	Developing	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	<i>Gather further information</i>	Below Standard	Below Standard	Below Standard

ISAAC/Shoreline Leadership Framework

Key Attributes of Leadership Practice	Personal Leadership Practice				Potential Evidence of Performance
Educational Leadership Practice	A. Efficacy, Initiative, and Strategy:	B. Feedback and Decision Making:	C. Change Management	H. Communication and Relationships:	
1. Instructional Leadership	<p>A. Efficacy, Initiative, and Strategy: <i>Demonstrates an urgency to improve outcomes for all students through a strategic improvement plan. Consistently applies initiative and persistence to accomplish ambitious goals.</i></p>	<p>B. Feedback and Decision Making: <i>Develops and implements systems that generate feedback for and from school community (teachers, students, parents). Uses multiple sources of information when making decisions.</i></p>	<p>C. Change Management <i>Manages resistance to change and engages school community to maintain a consistent focus on high levels of achievement.</i></p>	<p>H. Communication and Relationships: <i>Builds trusting and positive relationships with adults, students, families, and communities to improve student learning.</i></p>	
<p>1.1 Mission, Vision and Goals: Develops and maintains a clear instructional mission and vision for all students that is shared by the school community and articulated in a strategic plan.</p>	<p>1.1A: Develops a strategic improvement plan aligned to school and district mission and goals</p> <p>Establishes and supports a common vision of high-quality instruction.</p>	<p>1.1B: Engages broad stakeholder input into the implementation of the school's strategic plan aligned to the core value, beliefs about learning, vision of the graduate, and goals. Uses the strategic plan in conjunction with the school's vision, mission and goals to guide decisions</p>	<p>1.1C: In monitoring the implementation of the strategic plan, uses data systems to identify student strengths and needs, assess and modify programs, and addresses barriers to achieving the vision, mission and goals</p>	<p>1.1D: Collaboratively develops a shared mission and vision to guide the work of the school. Clearly communicates mission, vision, and strategic initiatives to stakeholders. Regularly shares strategic plan with school community</p>	<p>School Improvement Plan Leadership Team Meetings Professional Development Sessions</p>
<p>1.2 Student Achievement Focus: Sets clear and high expectations for student academic, social, and behavioral outcomes. Regularly develops and uses multiple sources of student learning information in collaboration with school and district staff to develop, monitor, and adjust instructional focus and strategic plan based on student needs.</p>	<p>1.2A: Ensures the implementation and evaluation of curriculum, instruction and assessment by aligning content, standards, teaching and professional development.</p>	<p>1.2B: Provides timely, accurate, specific, and ongoing feedback using data, assessments, and evaluation methods that improve teaching and learning. Regularly monitors and evaluates progress toward strategic goals based on real time data to address student and adult learning needs. Develops clear and measurable indicators of progress toward school and district goals.</p>	<p>1.2C: Develops a shared understanding of standards-based curriculum, instructional best practices and ongoing monitoring of student progress. Attends to the differentiated needs of stakeholders as the school implements strategic plan.</p>	<p>1.2D: Develops shared commitment to close the achievement gap and raise the achievement of all students, provides support, time and resources, and evaluates effectiveness of improvement efforts. Builds positive and trusting relationships and uses authority to create opportunities for shared understanding, commitment, and effort toward building student success.</p>	<p>School Improvement Plan Student Learning Data Professional Development Sessions Teacher Feedback</p>
<p>1.3 Collaborative Practice: Works with others for the good of the school. Creates a clear structure and direction for the work of teams. Builds the capacity of teams to make decisions aligned to mission of the school and district.</p>	<p>1.3A: Collaboration and distributed leadership are key components of mission, vision, and strategic plan.</p>	<p>1.3B: Monitors and gives feedback to teams. Ensures that staff and community members engage in leadership roles and actively supports the distribution of leadership responsibilities. Seeks and applies feedback from key stakeholders and colleagues to guide leadership work.</p>	<p>1.3C: Manages team growth and internal conflict and effectively engages others in a collaborative culture where difficult and respectful conversations encourage diversity of thought and perspective.</p>	<p>1.3D: Builds collaborative and productive relationships with colleagues, teachers, parents, students, and other stakeholders. Regularly communicates with individuals and teams and facilitates communication within and among key stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>Team Meetings School Schedule Formative Data Professional Development Sessions</p>

2. Human Capital	A. Efficacy, Initiative and Strategy	B. Feedback and Decision Making	C. Change Management	D. Communication and Relationships	Sample Evidence of Performance
<p>2.1: Recruitment, Selection, and Retention: Recruits, selects, develops, and retains effective educators needed to implement school mission and strategic plan.</p>	<p>2.1A: Develops and applies a recruitment and selection strategy that is integrated with strategic plan.</p>	<p>2.1B: Consistently uses evidence/data of effective teaching (e.g., demonstration lessons, lesson/unit plan analysis) as primary factor in recruiting and selection decisions.</p> <p>Involves teacher leaders in selection process for all instructional staff.</p>	<p>2.1C: Uses multiple channels to identify the most effective teachers and strategically places them into positions based on his/her knowledge of teachers' strengths and areas for growth, considering student needs</p>	<p>2.1D: Creates and maintains trusting and positive relationships with teachers and staff. Builds relationships in profession (e.g., training programs) and within district to obtain highly qualified and diverse staff</p>	<p>Staffing Patterns</p>
<p>2.2: Professional Learning: Establishes a collaborative professional learning program linked to student, classroom, and school data, individual teacher needs, and school goals.</p>	<p>2.2A: Provides support, time, and resources to engage faculty in reflective practice that leads to evaluating and improving instruction and in pursuing leadership opportunities. Models a commitment to continuous learning.</p>	<p>2.2B: Aligns school professional development plan to strategic plan and data collected through performance evaluation and student learning information. Ensures that all teachers receive feedback and aligned professional learning opportunities.</p>	<p>2.2C: Ensures coherence in the development, implementation and evaluation of curriculum, instruction and assessment by aligning content standards, teaching, professional development and assessment methods.</p>	<p>2.2D: Collaborates to foster a professional learning culture through ongoing, differentiated and job-embedded professional development to strengthen teaching and learning. Actively seeks and allocates resources to build and sustain improvement</p>	<p>School development plan Team Meetings PD Calendar</p>
<p>2.3: Observation and Performance Evaluation: Ensures high quality, standards based instruction by building the capacity of teachers to lead and perfect their craft.</p>	<p>2.3A: Administrators and teachers collaboratively develop a shared understanding of effective performance aligned with the instructional mission and vision of the school and district</p>	<p>2.3B: Regularly gives staff clear, timely, and actionable feedback based on observation, student learning data, and other evaluation criteria.</p>	<p>2.3C: Regularly looks at a body of evidence, including student achievement data, to assess performance in order to identify supports and make performance management decisions.</p>	<p>2.3D: Addresses areas of underperformance in a timely manner with individuals, teams and staff; proactively leads difficult conversations with staff to improve and enhance student learning and results as necessary</p>	<p>School Improvement Plan Observations and Evaluations Special Education Data</p>
3. Management and Operations	A. Efficacy, Initiative and Strategy	B. Feedback and Decision Making	C. Change Management	D. Communication and Relationships	Sample Evidence of Performance
<p>3.1 Management of the Learning Environment: Uses all available resources to create an environment conducive to student and adult learning.</p>	<p>3.1A: Establishes and implements plans, procedures, and routines that ensure orderly and efficient operation of the school to support student learning.</p>	<p>3.1B: Uses problem-solving skills and knowledge of operational planning to continuously improve the operational system.</p>	<p>3.1C: Develops information systems and capacity of staff to document and access student learning progress over time. Uses information systems to ensure optimal use of time for teaching, learning, and collaboration</p>	<p>3.1D: Communicates in a regular, timely and clear manner reflecting the core values of school. Develops meaningful processes for creating communication systems with stakeholders. Uses a variety of media to clarify and report on school operating and learning systems.</p>	<p>Parent and Staff Communication Newsletters Schedules Office Environment Parent and Student Surveys</p>
<p>3.2 Safety and Security: Develops, Implements, and regularly evaluates a comprehensive safety and security plan</p>	<p>3.2A: Continually engages the school community in the development, implementation and evaluation of a comprehensive safety plan aligned with the strategic plan, including the provision of appropriate health and social services.</p>	<p>3.2B: Implements a clear crisis management plan that is known by all staff, periodically tested, and updated as needed.</p>	<p>3.2C: Assists teachers in engaging in effective classroom management practices and supports the provision of appropriate health and social services</p>	<p>3.2D: Develops positive and trusting relationships with adults and students. Ensures that school community takes initiative and ownership to support a safe and effective learning environment</p>	<p>Crisis Team Plan Safety Plan ED166</p>

3.3 Resource Management: Conducts needs analysis and clearly aligns budget with instructional vision and school strategic plan	3.3A: Develops and implements a budget aligned to the school and district improvement plans that is transparent and fiscally responsible	3.3B: Aligns resources based on data to address the gaps between the current outcomes and goals toward continuous improvement	3.3C: Engages and supports individuals and school community when faced with reduced or increasing resources.	3.3D: Collaborates with multiple stakeholders to develop a fiscally responsible budget and secure necessary resources to support school and district improvement goals	Budget Spending patterns
4. Culture and Climate	A. Efficacy, Initiative and Strategy	B. Feedback and Decision Making	C. Change Management	D. Communication and Relationship	Sample Evidence of Performance
4.1 Family and Community Engagement: Promotes the growth of all students by actively engaging with families, community partners, and other stakeholders to support the mission of the school and district	4.1A: Publicly advocates the vision, mission and goals so that the school community understands and supports equitable and effective learning opportunities for all students.	4.1B: Ensures that all members of the school community have a strong voice in regard to concerns, ideas, and interests	4.1C: Consistently and effectively empowers parents to use a variety of strategies to engage families as leaders and partners in decisions about improving school- wide and student- specific learning	4.1D: Maintains a high degree of visibility, accessibility and responsiveness by consistently interacting with students, staff, parents, and community. Actively communicates the successes of the school to the broader community.	School Improvement Plan Parent Survey Parent Meetings
4.2 School Culture and Climate: Builds a culture of high achievement by promoting equitable and inclusionary practices. Implements and monitors clear expectations for adult and student conduct aligned to stated values of the school	4.2A: Implements and monitors clear expectations for adult and student conduct aligned to stated values for the school and provides appropriate training for staff to uphold these expectations.	4.2B: Uses assessment strategies and research methods to collaboratively monitor school culture and climate and understand and address the diverse needs of students and community.	4.2C: Effectively anticipates and responds to challenges and conflicts and remains focused on the vision of high expectations when faced with adversity. Takes a proactive approach to defusing and resolving disagreements among stakeholders.	4.2D: Models positive relationship building and teamwork for the benefit of all students. Involves colleagues, families and the community in developing, implementing, and monitoring guidelines and community norms for accountable behavior to ensure student learning.	Observation School Improvement Plan Discipline Data Bully Log Staff Survey SRBI Data
4.3 Equitable and Ethical Practice: Maintains a focus on ethical decisions, cultural competencies, social justice, and inclusive practice for all members of the school community.	4.3A: Advocates for and acts on commitments in the vision, mission, and goals to provide equitable and effective learning opportunities for all students in the broad educational community.	4.3B: Using school district and state data, communicates effectively with decision-makers and the community to improve public understanding of federal, state and local laws, policies and regulations	4.3C: Models, promotes and holds self and others accountable for professional conduct, ethics, student equity and rights and confidentiality of students in accordance with the CT Code of Responsibility for Educators	4.3D: Implements best practice in outreach and forms partnerships with parent and community organizations to be inclusive of diverse stakeholders. Ensures an inclusive process and incorporates different perspectives and dissenting voices in decision making.	Student Learning Data SRBI Data Special Education Data

Rate Each Performance Expectation:

1. Instructional Leadership:

<p>Effective instructional leaders work in their school communities/contexts to collaboratively articulate a mission, vision and goals focused on academic achievement for all through collaborative processes.</p> <p>Examine all three attributes (1.1 Mission, Vision and Goals; 1.2 Student Achievement Focus; 1.3 Collaborative Practice), with evidence determine:</p>			
<p>(4) Exemplary: Collaboratively integrates a wide range of personal leadership practices to provide instructional leadership to engage all members of the school community to achieve the mission, vision and goals for academic, behavioral and social improvement for all students.</p>	<p>(3) Accomplished: Integrates a range of personal leadership practices to provide instructional leadership to engage the school community to achieve the mission, vision, and goals for instructional improvement for students.</p>	<p>(2) Developing: Uses some or inconsistent leadership practices to address some aspects of achieving the mission, vision and goals for improvement.</p>	<p>(1) Below Standard: Applies inappropriate personal leadership practices or implements personal or leadership practices that work against instructional improvement.</p>

2. Human Capital/Talent Development:

<p>Effective leaders recruit, select, retain, and develop staff over the course of their careers through systems of high quality support and evaluation.</p> <p>Examine all three attributes (2.1 Recruitment, Selection and Retention, 2.2 Professional Learning, 2.3 Observation and Performance Evaluation), with evidence determine:</p>			
<p>(4) Exemplary: Collaboratively integrates a wide range of personal and educational leadership practices to effectively recruit, select, retain and develop staff throughout their careers through differentiated approaches</p>	<p>(3) Accomplished: Integrates a range of personal and educational leadership practices to develop staff over the course of their career through support and evaluation and staff development.</p>	<p>(2) Developing: Uses some or inconsistent personal and educational leadership practices to address some aspects of recruiting, selecting, or developing and retaining staff.</p>	<p>(1) Below Standard: Applies inappropriate personal or educational leadership practices or implements personal or educational leadership practices that lead to staff turnover or lack of focus on the school mission.</p>

3. Management and Operations:

<p>Effective leaders manage and create environments that are conducive to learning and use their personal and leadership practices to ensure safety, security and resource management.</p> <p>Examine all three attributes (3.1 Management of the Learning Environment, 3.2, Safety and Security, 3.3, Resource Management), with evidence determine:</p>			
<p>(4) Exemplary: Integrates a wide range of personal and educational leadership practices to create a safe, secure environment that is conducive to learning through appropriate and innovative resource management.</p>	<p>(3) Accomplished: Uses a range of personal and educational leadership practices to create a safe, secure environment that is conducive to learning, with resources that align with the school priorities.</p>	<p>(2) Developing: Uses some or inconsistent personal or educational leadership practices to create a learning environment that is at times conducive to learning; resources are mostly aligned with priorities</p>	<p>(1) Below Standard: Applies inappropriate personal or educational leadership practices or implements personal or educational leadership practices that negatively impact the learning environment; resources are not or are misaligned.</p>

4. Culture and Climate:

<p>Effective leaders promote family and community engagement through personal and educational leadership practices and promote equitable and inclusionary practices, grounded in ethical and equitable practices.</p> <p>Examine all three attributes (4.1 Family and Community Engagement, 4.2, School Culture and Climate, 4.3, Equitable and Ethical Practice), with evidence determine:</p>			
<p>(4) Exemplary: Integrates a wide range of inclusive personal and educational leadership practices to create a positive culture and climate that promotes high expectations, and equitable and inclusionary practices through equitable and ethical practices.</p>	<p>(3) Accomplished: Uses a range of personal and educational leadership practices to create a positive school culture and climate through equitable and ethical practices.</p>	<p>(2) Developing: Uses some or inconsistent personal or educational leadership practices to create learning environments that are at times conducive to learning; resources are mostly aligned with priorities.</p>	<p>(1) Below Standard: Applies inappropriate personal leadership practices or implements personal or educational leadership practices that negatively impact the learning environment; resources are not aligned or are misaligned.</p>

RATE each Performance Expectation:

Performance Expectation 1: Instructional Leadership Performance Expectation 2: Human Capital/Talent Development

Performance Expectation 3: Management and Operations Performance Expectation 4: Culture and Climate

Based on an analysis of educational and personal leadership practice, weighing instructional leadership as half, draw a summative conclusion:

Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard
Exceeds the expectations of educational and personal leadership practices of the Leadership Framework.	Meets expectations of educational and personal leadership practices of the Leadership Framework.	Progressing toward expectations of educational and personal leadership practices of the Leadership Framework.	Below standard on Instructional Leadership expectations or below standard on the remaining educational and personal leadership practices of the Leadership Framework.

