



**CONNECTICUT
GUIDELINES FOR
EDUCATOR EVALUATION**

**Connecticut State Department of
Education**

Updated June 2015

Preface

Connecticut's educators are committed to ensuring that students develop the skills and acquire the knowledge they will require to lead meaningful and productive lives as citizens in an interconnected world. This responsibility is shared among students, teachers, administrators, parents, the community, local boards of education, the state board of education, and local and state governments. The following educator evaluation guidelines will help ensure that Connecticut's schools develop the talented workforce that it requires to inspire our students to higher levels of performance.

Excellent schools begin with great school leaders and teachers. The importance of highly-skilled educators is beyond dispute, as a strong body of evidence now confirms what parents, students, teachers, and administrators have long known: effective teachers are among the most important school level factors in student learning and effective leadership is an essential component of any successful school.

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) is committed to raising the overall quality of our schools' workforce. To meet this goal, the state, in partnership with local and regional school districts, aims to create a comprehensive approach to developing Connecticut's educators so that Connecticut prepares, recruits, hires, supports, develops, and retains the best educators to lead our classrooms and schools.

Educator evaluation is the cornerstone of this holistic approach and contributes to the improvement of individual and collective practice, and the growth and development of teachers and leaders. High-quality evaluations are necessary to inform the individualized professional development and support that an educator may require. Such evaluations also identify professional strengths which should form the basis of new professional opportunities. High-quality evaluations are also necessary to make fair employment decisions based on teacher and leader effectiveness. Used in this way, high-quality evaluations will bring greater accountability and transparency to schools and instill greater confidence to employment decisions across the state.

Educator evaluation also serves to articulate our priorities. The evaluation and support framework adopted by the Connecticut State Board of Education, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC), gives student learning the priority that it deserves. The components of this framework, requiring multiple indicators of student academic growth and development and multiple observations of teacher and leader practice from a variety of perspectives, also aim to ensure that formative and summative ratings are a fair, valid, reliable, useful, and accurate reflection of an educator's work.

The following educator evaluator guidelines provide direction to school districts as they develop and adopt new systems of educator evaluation and support. These guidelines aim to ensure that districts have common and high expectations that educators are evaluated in a fair and consistent manner, and that employment decisions are based on fair, valid, reliable, and useful indicators of an educator's work. Educators in Connecticut are committed to ensuring that all students achieve and develop the skills that will enable them to become lifelong learners and productive citizens in a global world. This shared responsibility must be reached collaboratively in order to help students attain excellence.

Connecticut's *Guidelines for Educator Evaluation* will assist districts in accomplishing this goal.



Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Context

Sections 51 through 56 of P.A. 12-116, signed into law by Governor Dannel P. Malloy on May 15, 2012, and amended by sections 23 and 24 of P.A. 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 following Guidelines were developed pursuant to this statutory requirement and replace the Connecticut Core Requirements for Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development adopted by the State Board of Education in May of 1999. *See appendix for list of current PEAC membership and statute language referenced.*

Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) and national publications form the foundation of the new requirements:

(1) Connecticut's Core Standards, which clearly establish high expectations for learning for all of Connecticut's children.

(2) Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching (CCT), adopted February 2010 (replacing the Common Core of Teaching adopted in 1999), which defines effective teaching practice throughout the career continuum of educators from pre-service to induction to experienced teaching status in six domains:

1. Content and Essential Skills
2. Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning
3. Planning for Active Learning
4. Instruction for Active Learning
5. Assessment for Learning
6. Professional Responsibilities and Educator Leadership

(3) Common Core of Leading: Connecticut Leadership Standards, adopted in June of 2012, which use the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards as their foundation and define effective administrative practice through six performance expectations:

1. Vision, Mission, and Goals
2. Teaching and Learning
3. Organizational Systems and Safety
4. Families and Stakeholders
5. Ethics and Integrity
6. The Education System

(4) National Pupil Personnel Standards documents.

Using these documents as the foundation for educator evaluation establishes critical links among effective teaching, professional learning and increased student achievement. It should be noted that the term "teacher" refers to all individuals in positions requiring certification, including, but not limited to



classroom teachers. “Leaders” refer to those individuals in positions requiring an administrative certification, including, but not limited to principals.

Pursuant to subsection (c) of 10-151b of the Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.), as amended by Sec. 51 of P.A. 13-245, on or before July 1, 2012 the State Board of Education shall adopt, in consultation with PEAC, guidelines for a model educator evaluation program. Such guidelines shall provide guidance on the use of multiple indicators of student academic growth in teacher and administrator evaluations. Such guidelines shall include, but not be limited to: (A.) the use of four performance evaluations designators: *Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Below Standard*; (B.) the use of multiple indicators of student academic growth and development in teacher and administrator evaluations; and (C.) Methods for assessing student academic growth; (D.) a consideration of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school information system, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-10a of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), that may influence teacher and administrator performance ratings, including, but not limited to, student characteristics, student attendance and student mobility; and (E.) minimum requirements for teacher and administrator evaluation instruments and procedures. Consideration of such control factors and minimum requirements shall be undertaken and accomplished through the joint deliberations and determinations of the goal-setting conference process.

1.2 Introduction and Guiding Principles

(1) The primary goal of the educator evaluation and support system is to strengthen individual and collective practices so as to increase student learning and development. Connecticut’s Guidelines for Educator Evaluation are based on *Connecticut’s Common Core of Teaching* and the *Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards*, which guide the observation of professional practice. The Core Requirements also include multiple indicators of student academic growth and development, stakeholder feedback and the context in which an educator works. Evaluation processes are designed to promote collaboration and shared ownership for professional growth, renewal, and employment decisions.

The Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation are based on the following guiding principles:

- (a) The primary purpose of educator evaluation is to strengthen individual and collective practices in order to improve student growth;
- (b) Educator evaluation is standards-based, using the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching for teacher evaluation, Common Core of Leading: Connecticut Leadership Standards for administrator evaluation, and National Pupil Personnel Services standards documents for evaluation of educators in pupil services;
- (c) Connecticut’s Core Standards, The Connecticut Framework: K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards, the CMT/CAPT Assessments, Smarter Balanced Assessments, as well as locally-developed curriculum standards are the basis for establishing outcomes at the district and school levels;
- (d) The Guidelines foster continuing collaborative dialogue around teaching and learning in order to increase student academic growth and development; and
- (e) The Guidelines clearly connect professional learning to the outcomes of the evaluation process.

1.3 Evaluation Approval Process

(1) Educator evaluation and support system plans or revisions to such plans must be approved annually by the CT State Department of Education prior to district implementation. Such process will be an iterative one—between the State Department of Education and district superintendent or in the instance of a consortium of districts, superintendents—until the CSDE approves the teacher and administrator evaluation and support systems plan. The CSDE will inform districts of the approval process timeline.

(2) The State Department of Education provides a model-teacher and administrator evaluation and support system: Connecticut’s System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED) is a model evaluation and support system that is aligned to the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation and serves as one option for districts that choose to implement a pre-approved evaluation system. Districts may choose to propose variations upon the SEED model so long as the model is consistent with the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation.

(3) In accordance with the requirement in the 1999 Connecticut Guidelines for Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development, in establishing or amending the local educator evaluation plan, the local or regional board of education shall include a process for resolving disputes in cases where the evaluator and educator cannot agree on goals/objectives, the evaluation period, feedback or the professional development plan. As an illustrative example of such a process (which serves as an option and not a requirement for districts), when such agreement cannot be reached, the issue in dispute may be referred for resolution to a subcommittee of the professional development and evaluation committee (PDEC). In this example, the superintendent and the respective collective bargaining unit for the district may each select one representative from the PDEC to constitute this subcommittee, as well as a neutral party as mutually agreed upon between the superintendent and the collective bargaining unit. In the event the designated committee does not reach a unanimous decision, the issue shall be considered by the superintendent whose decision shall be binding. This provision is to be utilized in accordance with the specified processes and parameters regarding goals/objectives, evaluation period, feedback, and professional development contained in this document entitled “Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation.” Should the process established as required by the document entitled “Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation,” dated June 2012 not result in resolution of a given issue, the determination regarding that issue shall be made by the superintendent. An example will be provided within the State model.

1.4 Effect of the Neag Study on the Guidelines

The Neag School of Education at the University of Connecticut completed a study of the pilot implementation of the State model - the System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED) - and submitted the results of the study to the State Board of Education and Education Committee on January 1, 2014. Recommendations concerning implementation of the educator evaluation and support program were presented to PEAC and were used to inform ongoing implementation and modifications to the State model.



Section 2: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teachers

As provided in subsection (a) of Sec. 10-151b (C.G.S.), as amended by Sec. 51 of P.A. 13-245, requires, in part, that the superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each teacher, in accordance with guidelines established by the State Board of Education, in accordance with the requirements of this section. Local or regional boards of education shall develop and implement teacher evaluation programs consistent with these requirements. For the purposes of these guidelines, the term “teacher” refers to any teacher serving in a position requiring teacher certification within a district, but not requiring 092 certification. What follows are the Connecticut Guidelines of the Educator Evaluation System for teachers.

2.1: 4-Level Matrix Rating System

(1) Annual summative evaluations provide each teacher with a summative rating aligned to one of four performance evaluation designators: Exemplary, Proficient, Developing and Below Standard.

- (a) The performance levels shall be defined as follows:
- Exemplary – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
 - Proficient – Meeting indicators of performance
 - Developing – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
 - Below standard – Not meeting indicators of performance

The term “performance” in the above shall mean “progress as defined by specified indicators.” Such indicators shall be mutually agreed upon, as applicable. Such progress shall be demonstrated by evidence. The CSDE will work with PEAC to identify best practices as well as issues regarding the implementation of the 4-Level Matrix Rating System for further discussion prior to the 2015-16 academic year.

- (b) In order to determine summative rating designations for each teacher, districts shall:
1. Rate teacher performance in each of four categories – indicators of student academic growth and development; observations of teacher performance and practice; parent or peer feedback, which may include surveys; and whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback, which may include surveys.
 2. Combine the indicators of student growth and development rating and whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “outcomes rating” of *Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard*.
 3. Combine the observations of teacher performance and practice rating and the peer or parent feedback rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “practice rating” of *Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard*.
 4. Combine the outcomes rating and practice rating into a final rating. In undertaking this step, the district must assign a summative rating category of *Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard*. See Appendix for example.

2.2: Teacher Evaluation Process

The annual evaluation process for a teacher shall at least include, but not be limited to, the following steps, in order:

(1) Goal-setting conference/process:

- (a) Orientation on process – To begin the process, the principal or designee provides the teacher with materials outlining the evaluation process and other information as appropriate and meets and reviews these materials. The orientation shall not occur later than November 15 of a given school year.
- (b) Goal-setting conference – At the start of the school year, the principal or designee and teacher meet to discuss information relevant to the evaluation process and set goals for the year.
- (c) Evidence collection and review – The teacher collects evidence about his/her practice and the principal or designee collects evidence about teacher practice to support the review.

See 2.3 for details on the Teacher Evaluation Process.

(2) Mid-year check-ins:

- (a) The principal or designee and teacher hold at least one mid-year check-in.

See 2.3 for details on the Teacher Evaluation Process.

(3) End-of-year summative review:

- (a) Teacher self-assessment - The teacher reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the principal or designee. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the Goal-setting conference.
- (b) End-of-year conference - The principal or designee and the teacher meet to discuss all evidence collected to date. Following the conference, the principal assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.

See 2.3 for details on the Teacher Evaluation Process.

(4) Local reporting – The district superintendent shall report the status of teacher evaluations to the local or regional board of education on or before June 1 of each year.

(5) State reporting – Not later than September 15 of each year, each superintendent shall report to the Commissioner of Education the status of the implementation of teacher evaluations, including the frequency of evaluations, aggregate evaluation ratings, the number of teachers who have not been evaluated and other requirements as determined by the CT Department of Education.

(6) Summative rating revisions – After all data, including state test data, are available, the principal or designee may adjust the summative rating if the state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating. A final rating may be revised when state test data are available, before September 15 of a school year.

2.3: Teacher Evaluation Components

(1) Forty-five percent (45%) of a teacher's evaluation shall be based on attainment of goals and/or objectives for student growth, using multiple indicators of academic growth and development to measure those goals/objectives.

- (a) The process for assessing student growth using multiple indicators of academic growth and development for teacher evaluation will be developed through mutual agreement by each teacher and their evaluator at the beginning of the year.
- (b) The process for assessing student growth will have three phases:
 - 1. Goal-setting conference:
 - a. Each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select at least 1 but no more than 4 goals/objectives for student growth, the exact number based on a consideration of a reasonable number of goals/objectives taking into account teaching responsibilities and teacher experience. For each objective/goal, each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD) and evidence of the IAGD based on the range of criteria used by the district.
 - b. Each goal/objective will:
 - i. Take into account the academic track record and overall needs and strengths of the students the teacher is teaching that year/semester;
 - ii. Address the most important purposes of a teacher's assignment through self-reflection;
 - iii. Be aligned with school, district and state student achievement objectives; and
 - iv. Take into account their students' starting learning needs vis a vis relevant baseline data when available.
 - v. Pursuant to section 10-151b (C.G.S.), as amended by subsection (c) of Sec. 51 of P.A. 12-116, such guidelines shall include consideration of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school information system that may influence teacher performance ratings, including, but not limited to, student characteristics, student attendance and student mobility and minimum requirements for teacher evaluation instruments and procedures. Consideration of such control factors and minimum requirements shall be undertaken and accomplished through the joint deliberations and determinations of the Goal Setting process. (Also see 1.1.).
 - 2. Mid-year check-ins:
 - a. Evaluators and teachers will review progress toward the goals/objectives at least once during the school year, which is to be considered the midpoint of the school year, using available information, including agreed upon indicators. This review may result in revisions to the strategies or approach being used and/or teachers and evaluators may mutually agree on mid-year adjustment of student learning goals to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignment).



3. End-of-year summative review:
- a. Teacher Self-Assessment – The teacher reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the principal or designee. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the goal-setting conference.
 - b. End-of-year Conference – The teacher shall collect evidence of student progress toward meeting the student learning goals/objectives. This evidence will be produced by using the multiple indicators selected to align with each student learning goal/objective. The evidence will be submitted to the evaluator, and the teacher and evaluator will discuss the extent to which the students met the learning goals/objectives. Following the conference, the evaluator will rate the extent of student progress toward meeting the student learning goals/objectives, based on criteria for 4 levels of performance. If state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating, a final rating may be revised before September 15 when state test data are available.
- (c) One half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goals/objectives are met shall not be determined by a single, isolated standardized test score, but shall be determined through the comparison of data across assessments administered over time, including the state test for those teaching tested grades and subjects or another standardized indicator for other grades and subjects where available. A state test can be used only if there are interim assessments that lead to that test, and such interim assessments shall be included in the overall score for those teaching tested grades and subjects. Those without an available standardized indicator will select, through mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute-resolution procedure as described in section 1.3, an additional non-standardized indicator.
- a. For the 2014-15 and 2015-16 academic years, the required use of state test data is suspended, pending federal approval, pursuant to PEAC's flexibility recommendation on January 29, 2014 and the State Board of Education's action on February 6, 2014.
 - b. Prior to the 2015-16 academic year, the CSDE will work with PEAC to examine and evolve the system of standardized and non-standardized student learning indicators, including the use of interim assessments that lead to the state test to measure growth over time.

For the other half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development, there may be:

- a. A maximum of one additional standardized indicator, if there is mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute resolution procedure as described in section 1.3.
- b. A minimum of one non-standardized indicator.

(See section 2.9 for Flexibility Components on setting goals/objectives.)

- (d) Examples of indicators that may be used to produce evidence of academic growth and development include but are not limited to:
1. Standardized indicators;



- a. Standardized assessments are characterized by the following attributes:
 - i. Administered and scored in a consistent – or “standard” – manner;
 - ii. Aligned to a set of academic or performance “standards;”
 - iii. Broadly administered (e.g. nation- or statewide);
 - iv. Commercially produced;
 - v. Often administered only once a year.
 - b. Standardized assessments include, but are not limited to:
 - i. AP exams;
 - ii. SAT-9;
 - iii. DRA (administered more than once a year);
 - iv. DIBELS (administered more than once a year);
 - v. NWEA (administered more than once a year);
 - vi. Trade certification exams;
 - vii. Standardized vocational ED exams;
 - viii. Curriculum based assessments taken from banks of state-wide or assessment consortium assessment item banks.
2. Non-standardized Indicators
- a. Non-standardized indicators include, but are not limited to:
 - i. Performances rated against a rubric (such as: music performance, dance performance);
 - ii. Performance assessments or tasks rated against a rubric (such as: constructed projects, student oral work, and other written work);
 - iii. Portfolios of student work rated against a rubric;
 - iv. Curriculum-based assessments, including those constructed by a teacher or team of teachers;
 - v. Periodic assessments that document student growth over time (such as: formative assessments, diagnostic assessments, district benchmark assessments);
 - vi. Other indicators (such as: teacher developed tests, student written work, constructed project).
 - (e) When selecting indicators used to gauge attainment of goals/objectives, teachers and their evaluators shall agree on a balance in the weighting of standardized and non-standardized indicators as described in 2.3.d.
 - (f) Within the process, the following are descriptions of selecting indicators of academic growth and development: In the context of the evaluation of a teacher’s performance, 2.3.f.1 is an opportunity to evaluate the degree to which the teacher provides students fair opportunity and 2.3.f.2 is an opportunity to evaluate the context in which the teacher is working to show that the teacher is given fair opportunity. Indicators of academic growth and development should be fair, reliable, valid and useful to the greatest extent possible. These terms are defined as follows:
 1. Fair to students - The indicator of academic growth and development is used in such a way as to provide students an opportunity to show that they have met or are making progress in meeting the learning objective. The use of the indicator of academic growth and development is as free as possible from bias and stereotype.



2. Fair to teachers - The use of an indicator of academic growth and development is fair when a teacher has the professional resources and opportunity to show that his/her students have made growth and when the indicator is appropriate to the teacher's content, assignment and class composition.
3. Reliable - Use of the indicator is consistent among those using the indicators and over time.
4. Valid - The indicator measures what it is intended to measure.
5. Useful - The indicator may be used to provide the teacher with meaningful feedback about student knowledge, skills, perspective and classroom experience that may be used to enhance student learning and provide opportunities for teacher professional growth and development.

(2) Forty percent (40%) of a teacher's evaluation shall be based on observation of teacher practice and performance.

(a) Teacher evaluation programs developed and implemented by local or regional boards of education shall ensure that processes related to observation of teacher practice and performance:

1. Facilitate and encourage effective means for multiple in-class visits necessary for gathering evidence of the quality of teacher practice.
2. Provide constructive oral and written feedback of observations in a timely and useful manner.
3. Provide on-going calibration of evaluators in the district.
4. Use a combination of formal, informal, announced, and unannounced observation.
5. Consider differentiating the number of observations related to experience, prior ratings, needs and goals.
6. Include pre- and post-conferences that include deep professional conversations that allow evaluators and teachers to set goals, allow administrators to gain insight into the teacher's progress in addressing issues and working toward their goals, and share evidence each has gathered during the year.

(b) Observations of teacher practice and performance shall meet the following minimum criteria:

1. Observation models must be standards-based. Examples of acceptable standards based frameworks include, but are not limited to the Danielson, Marzano and Marshall frameworks, or locally developed frameworks based on best practice.
2. Observation models must be aligned to the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching. Districts that do not adopt the state model must specify how district-selected or developed models demonstrate this alignment.
3. Observations must be rated using rubrics that have four performance levels.

(c) First and second year teachers shall receive at least three in-class formal observations. Two of the three observations must include a pre-conference, and all of the observations must include a post-conference with timely written and verbal feedback.

(d) Teachers who receive a performance evaluation designation of *below standard* or *developing* shall receive a number of observations appropriate to their individual development plan, but no fewer than three in-class formal observations. Two of the three observations must include a pre-conference, and all of the observations must include a post-conference with timely written and verbal feedback.

(e) Teachers who receive a performance evaluation designation of *proficient* or *exemplary* shall receive a combination of at least three formal observations/reviews of practice, one of which must be a formal in-class observation. The exact combination shall be mutually agreed upon by the teacher and evaluator at the beginning of the evaluation process. Examples of non-classroom observations or reviews of practice include but are not limited to: observations of data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, review of lesson plans or other teaching artifacts.

(f) Districts shall provide all evaluators with training in observation and evaluation, and how to provide high-quality feedback. Districts shall describe how evaluators must demonstrate proficiency on an ongoing basis in conducting teacher evaluations.

(See section 2.9 for Flexibility Components on the observation protocol.)

(3) Five percent (5%) of a teacher's evaluation shall be based on whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback.

(a) For districts that include whole-school student learning indicators in teacher evaluations, a teacher's indicator ratings shall be represented by the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the administrator's evaluation rating.

(b) For districts that include student surveys:

1. Student responses must be anonymous.
2. Surveys must demonstrate properties of fairness, reliability, validity and usefulness.
3. School governance councils shall assist in the development of whole-school surveys, if applicable, in order to encourage alignment with school improvement goals.
4. An age-appropriate student survey must be administered to each student. Both the language used in the survey and the administration protocol (e.g., paper or on-line; read by student or read by an adult) shall be appropriate for the grade level.
5. Results from surveys addressed by teachers should align with student learning goals.
6. For whole-school student surveys, ratings may be based on one of two options:
 - a. Evidence from teacher developed student level indicators of improvement in areas of need as identified by the school level survey results; or
 - b. Evidence of teacher's implementation of strategies to address areas of need as identified by the survey results.
7. Teacher ratings in this area may be based on a teacher's improvement in performance goals based on student feedback or on the criteria found in Domain 6 (Professional Practice) of the Common Core of Teaching. See Appendix for details.



(c) Approaches such as focus groups, interviews, or teachers' own surveys may be used to collect information from students.

(d) The whole-school student learning indicators rating or student feedback rating shall be among four performance levels.

(4) Ten percent (10%) of a teacher's evaluation shall be based on parent or peer feedback, including surveys.

(a) For districts that include parent surveys:

1. Parent responses must be anonymous.
2. Surveys must demonstrate properties of fairness, reliability, validity and usefulness.
3. School governance councils shall assist in the development of whole-school surveys, if applicable, in order to encourage alignment with school improvement goals.
4. Survey is administered to each parent either on-line or paper version.
5. Results from surveys addressed by teachers should align with student improvement goals.
6. For whole-school parent surveys, ratings may be based on one of two options:
 - a. Evidence from teacher developed student level indicators of improvement in areas of need as identified by the school level survey results; or
 - b. Evidence of teacher's implementation of strategies to address areas of need as identified by the survey results.
7. Teacher ratings in this area may be based on a teacher's improvement in performance goals based on parent feedback or on the criteria found in Domain 6 (Professional Practice) of the Common Core of Teaching. See appendix for details.

(b) Approaches such as focus groups, interviews, or teachers' own surveys may be used to collect information from parents.

(c) Peer observation or peer focus groups may be developed.

(d) The parent or peer feedback rating shall be among four performance levels.

2.4 Evaluation-based Professional Learning

Districts and schools shall provide professional learning opportunities for teachers, pursuant to subsection (b) of Sec. 10-220a of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process. These learning opportunities shall be clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process as it relates to student learning results, observation of professional practice or the results of stakeholder feedback. See Appendix for statutory language referenced.

2.5 Individual Teacher Improvement and Remediation Plans

Districts shall create plans of individual teacher improvement and remediation for teachers whose performance is *developing* or *below standard*, developed in consultation with such teacher and his or her exclusive bargaining representative for certified teachers chosen pursuant to section 10-153b of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), and that (A) identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies, (B) indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued, and (C) include indicators of success including a summative rating of *proficient* or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.

2.6 Career Development and Growth

Districts must provide opportunities for career development and professional growth based on performance identified through the evaluation process. Examples of opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring/coaching early-career teachers; participating in development of teacher improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is *developing* or *below standard*; leading Professional Learning Communities for their peers; differentiated career pathways; and targeted professional development based on areas of need.

2.7 Orientation Programs

The local or regional board of education or regional educational service center for the school district shall offer annual orientation programs regarding the teacher evaluation and support system to teachers who are employed by such local or regional board of education and whose performance is being evaluated.

2.8 Defining Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness; Evaluation Audit and Validation

- (1) Each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system.
- (2) At the request of a district or employee, the CT State Department of Education or a third-party entity approved by the CSDE will audit the evaluation components that are combined to determine an individual's summative rating in the event that such components are significantly dissimilar (i.e. include both *exemplary* and *below standard* ratings) to determine a final summative rating.
- (3) The CT State Department of Education or a third-party designated by the CSDE will audit evaluations ratings of *exemplary* and *below standard* to validate such *exemplary* or *below standard* ratings by selecting ten districts at random annually and reviewing evaluation evidence files for a minimum of two educators rated *exemplary* and two educators rated *below standard* in those districts selected at random, including at least one classroom teacher rated *exemplary* and at least one teacher rated *below standard* per district selected.

2.9 Flexibility Components

- (1) Local and regional school districts may choose to adopt one or more of the evaluation plan flexibility components described within Section 2.9, in mutual agreement with district's professional development and evaluation committee pursuant to 10-151b (b) and 10-220a (b), to enhance implementation. Any district that adopts flexibility components in accordance with this section in the 2013-14 school year shall, within 30 days of adoption of such revisions by its local or regional board of education, and no later than March 30, 2014, submit their plan revisions to the CT State Department of Education (CSDE) for its review and approval. For the 2014-15 and all subsequent school years, the submission of district evaluation plans for CSDE review and approval, including flexibility requests, shall take place no later than the annual deadline set by the CSDE.
 - (a) Each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select 1 goal/objective for student growth. For each goal/objective, each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select multiple Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD) and evidence of those IAGDs based on the range of criteria used by the district. For any teacher whose primary responsibility is not the direct instruction of students, the mutually agreed upon goal/objective and indicators shall be based on the assigned role of the teacher.
 - (b) One half (or 22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goal/objective is met shall be based on standardized indicators other than the state test (CMT, CAPT, or Smarter Balanced Assessment) for the 2014-15 and 2015-16 academic years, pending federal approval. Other standardized indicators for other grades and subjects, where available, may be used. For the other half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development, there may be:
 1. A maximum of one additional standardized indicator other than the state test (CMT, CAPT or SBAC) for the 2014-15 academic year, pending federal approval, if there is mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute resolution procedure as described in 1.3.
 2. A minimum of one non-standardized indicator.
 - (c) Teachers who receive and maintain an annual summative performance evaluation designation of *proficient* or *exemplary* (or the equivalent annual summative ratings in a pre-existing district evaluation plan) during the 2012-13 or any subsequent school year and who are not first or second year teachers shall be evaluated with a minimum of one formal in-class observation no less frequently than once every three years, and three informal in-class observations conducted in accordance with Section 2.3(2)(b)(1) and 2.3(2)(b)(2) in all other years, and shall complete one review of practice every year. Teachers with *proficient* or *exemplary* designations may receive a formal in-class observation if an informal observation or review of practice in a given year results in a concern about the teacher's practice. For non-classroom teachers, the above frequency of observations shall apply in the same ways, except that the observations need not be in-classroom (they shall instead be conducted in appropriate settings). All other teachers, including first and second year teachers and teachers who receive a performance evaluation designation of *below standard* or *developing*, will be evaluated according to the procedures in 2.3(2)(c) and 2.3(2)(d). All observations shall be followed



with timely feedback. Examples of non-classroom observations or reviews of practice include but are not limited to: observations of data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, reviews of lesson plans or other teaching artifacts.

2.10 Data Management Protocols

- (1) On or before September 15, 2014 and each year thereafter, professional development and evaluation committees established pursuant to 10-220a shall review and report to their board of education the user experience and efficiency of the district's data management systems/platforms being used by teachers and administrators to manage evaluation plans.
- (2) For implementation of local evaluation plans for the 2014-15 school year, and each year thereafter, data management systems/platforms to be used by teachers and administrators to manage evaluation plans shall be selected by boards of education with consideration given to the functional requirements/needs and efficiencies identified by professional development and evaluation committees.
- (3) For implementation of local evaluation plans for the 2014-15 school year, and each year thereafter, educator evaluation plans shall contain guidance on the entry of data into a district's data management system/platform being used to manage/administer the evaluation plan and on ways to reduce paperwork and documentation while maintaining plan integrity. Such guidance shall:
 - (a) Limit entry only to artifacts, information and data that is specifically identified in a teacher or administrator's evaluation plan as an indicator to be used for evaluating such educators, and to optional artifacts as mutually agreed upon by teacher/administrator and evaluator;
 - (b) Streamline educator evaluation data collection and reporting by teachers and administrators;
 - (c) Prohibit the CSDE from accessing identifiable student data in the educator evaluation data management systems/platforms, except as needed to conduct the audits mandated by C.G.S. 10-151b(c) and 10-151i, and ensure that third-party organizations keep all identifiable student data confidential;
 - (d) Prohibit the sharing or transference of individual teacher data from one district to another or to any other entity without the teacher or administrator's consent, as prohibited by law;
 - (e) Limit the access of teacher or administrator data to only the primary evaluator, superintendent or his/her designee, and to other designated professionals directly involved with evaluation and professional development processes. Consistent with Connecticut General Statutes, this provision does not affect the CSDE's data collection authority;
 - (f) Include a process for logging the names of authorized individuals who access a teacher or administrator's evaluation information.
- (4) The CSDE's technical assistance to school districts will be appropriate to the evaluation and support plan adopted by the district, whether or not the plan is the state model.



Section 3: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Administrators who Serve in Roles Requiring a 092 Certification

As provided in subsection (a) of 10-151b (C.G.S.) as amended by Sec. 51 of P.A. 12-116, the superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each administrator who serves in a role requiring a 092 certification, in accordance with the requirements of this section. Local or regional boards of education shall develop and implement administrator evaluation programs consistent with these requirements. Except where noted below as applying to particular job roles, the requirements apply to all roles requiring a 092 certification. 092 certificate holders whose primary job duties include teaching students shall be evaluated using the requirements in Section 2.

3.1: 4-Level Matrix Rating System

(1) Annual summative evaluations provide each administrator with a summative rating aligned to one of four performance evaluation designators: Exemplary, Proficient, Developing and Below Standard.

(a) The performance levels shall be defined as follows:

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

The term “performance” in the above shall mean “progress as defined by specified indicators.” Such indicators shall be mutually agreed upon, as applicable. Such progress shall be demonstrated by evidence. The CSDE will work with PEAC to identify best practices as well as issues regarding the implementation of the 4-Level Matrix Rating System for further discussion prior to the 2015-16 academic year.

(b) In order to determine summative rating designations for each administrator, districts shall:

1. Rate administrator performance in each of four categories – multiple student learning indicators, teacher effectiveness outcomes, observations of administrator performance and practice, and stakeholder feedback.
2. Combine the multiple-student learning indicator rating and the teacher effectiveness outcomes rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “outcomes rating” of *Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard*.
3. Combine the observations of administrator performance and practice rating and stakeholder feedback rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “practice rating” of *Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard*.
4. Combine the outcomes rating and practice rating into a final rating that equally weights the outcomes and practice ratings. In undertaking this step, the district must assign a summative rating performance level (i.e., *Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Below Standard*). The district must provide at the start of each school year how the “practice rating” and “outcomes rating” will be combined into one summative rating. See Appendix for example.

3.2 Administrator Evaluation Process

The annual evaluation process for an administrator shall at least include, but not be limited to, the following steps, in order:

(1) Goal-setting conference/process:

(a) Orientation on process – To begin the process, the superintendent or designee provides the administrator with materials outlining the evaluation process and other information as appropriate. Process information provided in orientation must include the rubric used for assessing administrator practice, the instruments to be used to gather feedback from staff, families, and/or students and their alignment to the rubric, the process and calculation by which all evaluation elements will be integrated into an overall rating.

(b) Goal-setting conference – At the start of the school year, the superintendent or designee and administrator meet to discuss information relevant to the evaluation process, and agree on the specific measures and performance targets for the student learning indicators, teacher effectiveness outcomes, and stakeholder feedback. In the absence of agreement, the superintendent or designee makes the final determination about the performance targets. The evaluator and administrator also identify focus areas for development of administrator practice aligned to the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The evaluator and administrator also discuss the appropriate resources and professional development needs to support the administrator in meeting the performance targets.

(c) Evidence collection – The administrator collects evidence about his/her practice and the superintendent or designee collects evidence about administrator practice to support the review.

1. The superintendent or designee must conduct at least two school site observations for any administrator and should conduct at least four school site observations for administrators who are new to their district, school, the profession, or who have received ratings of *developing* or *below standard*.

Examples of school site observations could include observing the administrator leading professional development or facilitating teacher teams, observing the administrator working with parents and community members, observing classrooms and instructional quality, or assessing elements of the school culture.

(2) Mid-year formative review:

The superintendent or designee and administrator 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

(3) End-of-year summative review:

(a) Administrator self-assessment - The administrator reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the superintendent or designee. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the goal-setting conference.

(b) End-of-year conference - The superintendent or designee and the administrator meet to discuss all evidence collected to date. Following the conference, the superintendent or designee

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

(4) Local reporting – The district superintendent shall report the status of administrator evaluations to the local or regional board of education on or before June 1 of each year.

(5) State reporting – Not later than September 15 of each year, each superintendent shall report to the Commissioner of Education the status of the implementation of administrator evaluations, including the frequency of evaluations, aggregate evaluation ratings, the number of administrators who have not been evaluated and other requirements as determined by the CT Department of Education.

(6) Summative rating revisions – After all data, including state test data, are available, the superintendent or designee may adjust the summative rating if the state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating. A final rating may be revised when state test data are available, before September 15 of a school year.

3.3 Administrator Evaluation Components

(1) Forty five percent (45%) of an administrator's summative rating shall be based on multiple student learning indicators.

(a) Twenty-two point five percent (22.5%) of an administrator's evaluation shall be based only on student performance and/or growth on the state-administered assessments in core content areas that are part of the state's approved school accountability system.

This portion must include:

1. School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year
2. SPI progress for student subgroups

This portion may include:

1. SPI rating
2. SPI rating for student subgroups

Districts may determine locally the relative weight on each of components 1-4 within 3.3.a.

For 092 holders serving in central office administrative roles, districts shall rate performance based on results in the group of schools, group of students, or subject area most relevant to the administrator's job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.

All protections related to the assignment of school accountability ratings (e.g., the minimum number of days a student must be enrolled in order for that student's scores to be included in an accountability measure) shall apply to the use of state test data for administrator evaluation. If the state adds a student growth indicator tied to content-area assessments to the state accountability system for schools, then that indicator shall become a required element of this portion of the administrator evaluation system.

For any school that does not have tested grades (such as a K-2 school), the entire 45% of an administrator's rating on student learning indicators shall be based on the locally-determined indicators described below in subsection (b).



(b) Twenty-two point five percent (22.5%) of an administrator's evaluation shall be based on at least two locally-determined indicators of student learning, at least one of which must include student outcomes from subjects and/or grades not assessed on state-administered assessments. Locally-determined indicators must align to Connecticut learning standards. In instances where there are no such standards that apply to a subject/grade level, districts must provide evidence of alignment to research-based learning standards. For administrators in high schools, selected indicators must include:

1. The cohort graduation rate and the extended graduation rate, as defined in the State's approved application for flexibility under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. All protections related to the assignment of school accountability ratings for cohort graduation rate and extended graduation rate shall apply to the use of graduation data for principal evaluation.

(c) For all school-based administrators, selected indicators must be relevant to the student population (e.g., grade levels) served by the administrator's school, and may include:

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

(d) For assistant principals, indicators may focus on student results from a subset of teachers, grade levels, or subjects, consistent with the job responsibilities of the assistant principal being evaluated.

(e) For central office administrators, indicators may be based on results in the group of schools, group of students, or subject area most relevant to the administrator's job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.

In selecting indicators, districts may establish district-wide indicators or may allow administrators and their evaluators to craft mutually agreed-upon student learning objectives specific to that administrator. The school or district must be able to collect adequate information on any chosen indicator to make a fair judgment about whether the administrator met the established goal. When setting targets or objectives, the superintendent or designee must include a review of relevant student characteristics (e.g., mobility, attendance, demographic and learning characteristics). The evaluator and administrator must also discuss the professional resources appropriate to supporting the administrator in meeting the performance targets.



For any administrator assigned to a school in “review” or “turnaround” status in the state’s accountability system, the indicators used for administrator evaluation must align with the performance targets set out in the school’s mandated Improvement Plan. Districts are encouraged to have such alignment for all administrators.

(2) Five percent (5%) of an administrator’s summative rating shall be based on teacher effectiveness outcomes.

Acceptable measures include:

- (a) Improving the percentage (or meeting a target of a high percentage) of teachers who meet the student learning objectives outlined in their performance evaluations (If this measure is used, districts should have a process for ensuring that the process for setting student learning objectives is rigorous).
- (b) Other locally-determined measures of teacher effectiveness.

For assistant principals, measures of teacher effectiveness shall focus only on those teachers the assistant principal is responsible for evaluating. If the assistant principal’s job duties do not include teacher evaluation, then the teacher effectiveness rating for the principal of the school shall apply to the assistant principal.

(3) Forty percent (40%) of an administrator’s evaluation shall be based on ratings of administrator performance and practice by the district superintendent or her/his designee(s).

Ratings must be based on evidence collected about leadership practice as described in the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards using a rubric aligned to those standards. For principals, districts may vary the relative weights of standards, but must weight the Teaching and Learning Standard at least twice as much as any other standard. The other standards of practice must all have a weighting of at least 5% of the overall evaluation. The weighting of standards may be different for each administrator, but the weights must be established by the evaluator as part of the goal-setting conference at the start of the school year.

An assistant principal’s rating must be based on evidence collected about leadership practice as described in the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards. Districts may vary the relative weights of standards, but must include all six standards and weight each of them at least 5% of the overall evaluation of practice. Within the standards, evaluators may limit the rating to those elements that are relevant to the assistant principal’s job duties. The weighting of standards may be different for each assistant principal, but the weights must be established by the evaluator as part of the goal setting conference at the start of the school year. Districts are encouraged to use the observation of assistant principal practice to highlight an individual’s readiness for the principalship.

Performance ratings that the superintendent or designee make based on direct observations of school-based administrator practice shall be based on a locally-developed or locally-selected rubric that meets the following criteria:

- It is aligned to the Common core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.
- It clearly distinguishes among at least four levels of performance.
- It clearly identifies administrator leadership actions related to improving teacher effectiveness, including conducting teacher evaluations.

For central office administrators, a rubric is not required. Districts may generate ratings from evidence collected directly from the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.

In rating administrators against the rubric, the evaluator must identify a performance rating with written evidence to support the rating for each leadership standard; further, the evaluator must identify the strengths and growth areas of the administrator.

Districts selecting or designing rubrics other than the state-developed rubric shall provide training of evaluators focused on the language of the rubric and its use in practice.

The superintendent or designee shall provide feedback on administrator performance at least, but not limited to, in the mid-year conference and end-of-year conference. It is recommended that such feedback be provided as soon after an observation as is practical.

The district shall provide all evaluators of administrators with training focused on the administrator evaluation system, including at least, but not limited to, training on conducting effective observations and providing high-quality feedback.

The district may conduct the training or have evaluators participate in state-sponsored training.

(4) Ten percent (10%) of an administrator's summative rating shall be based on feedback from stakeholders on areas of principal and/or school practice described in the Connecticut Leadership Standards.

Districts may select a subset of elements and indicators within the Leadership Standards for purposes of gathering feedback. For school-based administrators, stakeholders solicited for feedback must include teachers and parents, but may include other stakeholders (e.g., other staff, community members, students, etc.). Central office administrators shall be rated based on feedback from the stakeholders whom the administrator directly serves.

The instrument(s) selected for gathering feedback must be valid (that is, it measures what it is intended to measure) and reliable (that is, the use of the instrument is consistent among those using it and is consistent over time). In order to minimize burden on schools and stakeholders, the instruments chosen need not be implemented exclusively for purposes of principal evaluation.

More than half of the rating of a principal on stakeholder feedback must be based on an assessment of improvement over time. Districts may also rate administrators based on status performance and may have less of a focus on improvement over time if status performance surpasses a district-determined threshold of adequate performance. Districts may set common targets of improvement and performance for all administrators or set specific targets for individual administrators.

Focus groups, interviews, teacher-level surveys, or other methods may be used to gather stakeholder feedback as long as these methods meet the above definitions of valid and reliable.

If districts elect to use surveys to gather feedback, they may include the survey response rate as an input to the rating on feedback (as a way to increase the accuracy of survey results).

3.4 Evaluation-based Professional Learning

Districts and schools shall provide professional learning opportunities for administrators, pursuant to subsection (b) of Sec. 10-220a of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process. These learning opportunities shall be clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process as it relates to student learning results, observation of professional practice or the results of stakeholder feedback include the provision of useful and timely feedback and improvement opportunities. See Appendix for statutory language referenced.

3.5 Individual Administrator Improvement and Remediation Plans

Districts shall create plans of individual administrator improvement and remediation for principals whose performance is *developing* or *below standard*, developed in consultation with such administrator and his or her exclusive bargaining representative for certified administrators chosen pursuant to section 10-153b of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), and that (A) identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies, (B) indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued, and (C) include indicators of success including a summative rating of *proficient* or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.

3.6 Career Development and Growth

Districts must provide opportunities for career development and professional growth based on performance identified through the evaluation process. Examples of opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring/coaching early-career administrators; participating in development of administrator improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is *developing* or *below standard*; leading Professional Learning Communities for their peers; differentiated career pathways; and, targeted professional development based on areas of need.

3.7 Orientation Programs

The local or regional board of education or regional educational service center for the school district shall offer annual orientation programs regarding the administrator evaluation and support program to administrators who are employed by such local or regional board of education and whose performance is being evaluated and shall train administrators who are employed by such local or regional board of education and who are conducting performance evaluations.

3.8 Defining Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness; Evaluation Audit and Validation

- (1) Each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system.
- (2) At the request of a district or employee, the CT State Department of Education or a third-party entity approved by the CSDE will audit the evaluation components that are combined to determine an individual's summative rating in the event that such components are significantly dissimilar (i.e. include both *exemplary* and *below standard* ratings) to determine a final summative rating.
- (3) The CT State Department of Education or a third-party designated by the CSDE will audit evaluations ratings of *exemplary* and *below standard* to validate such *exemplary* or *below standard* ratings by



selecting ten districts at random annually and reviewing evaluation evidence files for a minimum of two educators rated *exemplary* and two educators rated *below standard* in those districts selected at random, including at least one administrator rated *exemplary* and at least one administrator rated *below standard* per district selected.

Section 4: Guidelines for the Evaluation of Student and Educator Support Specialists

As provided in Sec. 10-151b of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.) as amended by section 51 of P.A. 12-116, “The superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each Student and Educator Support Specialist,” in accordance with the requirements of this section. Local or regional boards of education shall develop and implement Student and Educator Support evaluation programs consistent with these requirements.

4.1 Flexibility from the Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teachers

(1) Student and Educator Support Specialists shall have a clear job descriptions and delineation of their role and responsibilities in the school to guide the setting of indicators of academic growth and development, feedback and observation.

(2) Because of the unique nature of the roles fulfilled by Student and Educator Support Specialists, districts shall be granted flexibility in applying the Guidelines for teacher evaluation in the following ways:

- (a) Districts shall be granted flexibility in using Indicators of Academic Growth and Development to measure attainment of goals and/or objectives for student growth. The goal-setting conference for identifying IAGDs shall include the following steps:
1. The educator and evaluator will agree on the students or caseloads that the educator is responsible for and his/her role.
 2. The educator and evaluator will determine if the indicator will apply to the individual teacher, a team of teachers, a grade level or the whole school.
 3. The educator and evaluator should identify the unique characteristics of the population of students which would impact student growth (e.g., high absenteeism, highly mobile population in school, etc.).
 4. The educator and evaluator will identify the learning standard to measure: the assessment, data or product for measuring growth; the timeline for instruction and measurement; how baseline will be established; how targets will be set so they are realistic yet rigorous; the strategies that will be used; and the professional development the educator needs to improve their learning to support the areas targeted.
- (b) Because some Student and Educator Support Specialists do not have a classroom and may not be involved in direct instruction of students, the educator and evaluator shall agree to appropriate venues for observations and an appropriate rubric for rating practice and performance at the beginning of the school year. The observations will be based on standards when available. Examples of appropriate venues include but are not limited to: observing Student and Educator Support Specialist staff working with small groups of children, working with adults, providing professional development, working with families, participation in team meetings or Planning and Placement Team meetings.

- (c) When student, parent and/or peer feedback mechanisms are not applicable to Student and Educator Support Specialists, districts may permit local development of short feedback mechanisms for students, parents, and peers specific to particular roles or projects for which the Student and Educator Support Specialists are responsible.

Appendix
Section I. Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) Members
(2015-16)

Name	Title	Organization Represented
Dianna Wentzell	Commissioner	CT State Department of Education (CSDE)
Sarah Barzee	Chief Talent Officer	CT State Department of Education (CSDE)
Miguel Cardona	Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning	Meriden Public Schools
David Cicarella	President, New Haven Federation of Teachers	American Federation of Teachers-CT (AFT)
Joe Cirusuolo	Executive Director	CT Association of Public School Superintendents, Inc. (CAPSS)
Sheila Cohen	President	CT Education Association (CEA)
Paula Colen	Executive Director, EASTCONN	RESC Alliance
Randy Collins	Staff Associate for Public Policy	CT Association of Public School Superintendents, Inc. (CAPSS)
Bruce Douglas	Executive Director, CREC	RESC Alliance
Jan Hochadel	President of AFT-CT	American Federation of Teachers-CT (AFT)
V. Everett Lyons	Associate Executive Director	CT Association of Schools (CAS)
Shannon Marimón	Division Director	CT State Department of Education (CSDE)
Gary Maynard	President	CT Federation of School Administrators (CFSA)
Patrice McCarthy	Deputy Executive Director	CT Association of Boards of Education (CABE)
Karissa Niehoff	Executive Director	CT Association of Schools (CAS)
Catherine O'Callaghan	Chair of Education Department	Board of Regents (BOR)
Robert Rader	Executive Director	CT Association of Boards of Education (CABE)
Mark Waxenberg	Executive Director	CT Education Association (CEA)



Section II. AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO THE EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 2012: Sections 51 through 56 of P.A. 12-116, as amended by the sections 1 through 9 of P.A.13-245.

Section 1. Section 10-151b of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective from passage):

(a) The superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each teacher, and for the school year commencing July 1, 2013, and each school year thereafter, such annual evaluations shall be the teacher evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. The superintendent may conduct additional formative evaluations toward producing an annual summative evaluation. An evaluation pursuant to this subsection shall include, but need not be limited to, strengths, areas needing improvement, strategies for improvement and multiple indicators of student academic growth. Claims of failure to follow the established procedures of such teacher evaluation and support program shall be subject to the grievance procedure in collective bargaining agreements negotiated subsequent to July 1, 2004. In the event that a teacher does not receive a summative evaluation during the school year, such teacher shall receive a "not rated" designation for such school year. The superintendent shall report (1) the status of teacher evaluations to the local or regional board of education on or before June first of each year, and (2) the status of the implementation of the teacher evaluation and support program, including the frequency of evaluations, aggregate evaluation ratings, the number of teachers who have not been evaluated and other requirements as determined by the Department of Education, to the Commissioner of Education on or before June thirtieth of each year. For purposes of this section, the term "teacher" shall include each professional employee of a board of education, below the rank of superintendent, who holds a certificate or permit issued by the State Board of Education.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, not later than September 1, 2013, each local and regional board of education shall adopt and implement a teacher evaluation and support program that is consistent with the guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program adopted by the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. Such teacher evaluation and support program shall be developed through mutual agreement between the local or regional board of education and the professional development and evaluation committee for the school district, established pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-220a, as amended by this act. If a local or regional board of education is unable to develop a teacher evaluation and support program through mutual agreement with such professional development and evaluation committee, then such board of education and such professional development and evaluation committee shall consider the model teacher evaluation and support program adopted by the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, and such board of education may adopt, through mutual agreement with such professional development and evaluation committee, such model teacher evaluation and support program. If a local or regional board of education and the professional development and evaluation committee are unable to mutually agree on the adoption of such model teacher evaluation and support program, then such board of education shall adopt and implement a teacher evaluation and support program developed by such board of education, provided such teacher evaluation and support program is consistent with the guidelines adopted by the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. Each local and regional board of education may commence implementation of the teacher



evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to this subsection in accordance with a teacher evaluation and support program implementation plan adopted pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.

(c) (1) On or before July 1, 2012, the State Board of Education shall adopt, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council established pursuant to section 10-151d, as amended by this act, guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program. Such guidelines shall include, but not be limited to, (A) the use of four performance evaluations designators: Exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard; (B) the use of multiple indicators of student academic growth and development in teacher evaluations; (C) methods for assessing student academic growth and development; (D) a consideration of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school information system, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-10a, that may influence teacher performance ratings, including, but not limited to, student characteristics, student attendance and student mobility; (E) minimum requirements for teacher evaluation instruments and procedures, including scoring systems to determine exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard ratings; (F) the development and implementation of periodic training programs regarding the teacher evaluation and support program to be offered by the local or regional board of education or regional educational service center for the school district to teachers who are employed by such local or regional board of education and whose performance is being evaluated and to administrators who are employed by such local or regional board of education and who are conducting performance evaluations; (G) the provision of professional development services based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process; (H) the creation of individual teacher improvement and remediation plans for teachers whose performance is developing or below standard, designed in consultation with such teacher and his or her exclusive bargaining representative for certified teachers chosen pursuant to section 10-153b, and that (i) identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies, (ii) indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued, and (iii) include indicators of success including a summative rating of proficient or better immediately at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan; (I) opportunities for career development and professional growth; and (J) a validation procedure to audit evaluation ratings of exemplary or below standard by the department or a third-party entity approved by the department.

(2) The State Board of Education shall, following the completion of the teacher evaluation and support pilot program, pursuant to section 10-151f, as amended by this act, and the submission of the study of such pilot program, pursuant to section 10-151g, as amended by this act, review and may revise, as necessary, the guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program and the model teacher evaluation and support program adopted under this subsection.

(d) A local or regional board of education may phase in full implementation of the teacher evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to subsection (b) of this section during the school years commencing July 1, 2013, and July 1, 2014, pursuant to a teacher evaluation and support program implementation plan adopted by the State Board of Education, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council, not later than July 1, 2013. The Commissioner of Education may waive the provisions of subsection (b) of this section and the implementation plan provisions of this subsection for any local or regional board of education that has expressed an intent, not later than July 1, 2013, to adopt a teacher evaluation program for which such board requests a waiver in accordance with this subsection.



Sec. 2. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 10-220a of the general statutes are repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective from passage):

(a) Each local or regional board of education shall provide an in-service training program for its teachers, administrators and pupil personnel who hold the initial educator, provisional educator or professional educator certificate. Such program shall provide such teachers, administrators and pupil personnel with information on (1) the nature and the relationship of drugs, as defined in subdivision (17) of section 21a-240, and alcohol to health and personality development, and procedures for discouraging their abuse, (2) health and mental health risk reduction education which includes, but need not be limited to, the prevention of risk-taking behavior by children and the relationship of such behavior to substance abuse, pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV-infection and AIDS, as defined in section 19a-581, violence, teen dating violence, domestic violence, child abuse and youth suicide, (3) the growth and development of exceptional children, including handicapped and gifted and talented children and children who may require special education, including, but not limited to, children with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder or learning disabilities, and methods for identifying, planning for and working effectively with special needs children in a regular classroom, including, but not limited to, implementation of student individualized education programs, (4) school violence prevention, conflict resolution, the prevention of and response to youth suicide and the identification and prevention of and response to bullying, as defined in subsection (a) of section 10-222d, except that those boards of education that implement any evidence-based model approach that is approved by the Department of Education and is consistent with subsection (d) of section 10-145a, sections 10-222d, 10-222g and 10-222h, subsection (g) of section 10-233c and sections 1 and 3 of public act 08-160, shall not be required to provide in-service training on the identification and prevention of and response to bullying, (5) cardiopulmonary resuscitation and other emergency lifesaving procedures, (6) computer and other information technology as applied to student learning and classroom instruction, communications and data management, (7) the teaching of the language arts, reading and reading readiness for teachers in grades kindergarten to three, inclusive, (8) second language acquisition in districts required to provide a program of bilingual education pursuant to section 10-17f, (9) the requirements and obligations of a mandated reporter. Each local and regional board of education may allow any paraprofessional or noncertified employee to participate, on a voluntary basis, in any in-service training program provided pursuant to this section, and (10) the teacher evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-151b, as amended by this act. The State Board of Education, within available appropriations and utilizing available materials, shall assist and encourage local and regional boards of education to include: (A) Holocaust and genocide education and awareness; (B) the historical events surrounding the Great Famine in Ireland; (C) African-American history; (D) Puerto Rican history; (E) Native American history; (F) personal financial management; (G) domestic violence and teen dating violence; and (H) topics approved by the state board upon the request of local or regional boards of education as part of in-service training programs pursuant to this subsection.

(b) Not later than a date prescribed by the commissioner, each local and regional board of education shall establish a professional development and evaluation committee consisting of certified employees, and such other school personnel as the board deems appropriate, including representatives selected by the exclusive bargaining representative for such employees chosen pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-153. The duties of such committees shall include, but not be limited to, participation in the



development or adoption of a teacher evaluation and support program for the district, pursuant to section 10-151b, as amended by this act, and the development, evaluation and annual updating of a comprehensive local professional development plan for certified employees of the district. Such plan shall: (1) Be directly related to the educational goals prepared by the local or regional board of education pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-220, (2) on and after July 1, 2011, be developed with full consideration of the priorities and needs related to student outcomes as determined by the State Board of Education, and (3) provide for the ongoing and systematic assessment and improvement of both teacher evaluation and professional development of the professional staff members of each such board, including personnel management and evaluation training or experience for administrators, shall be related to regular and special student needs and may include provisions concerning career incentives and parent involvement. The State Board of Education shall develop guidelines to assist local and regional boards of education in determining the objectives of the plans and in coordinating staff development activities with student needs and school programs.

Sec. 3. Section 10-151d of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective from passage):

(a) There is established a Performance Evaluation Advisory Council within the Department of Education. Membership of the council shall consist of: (1) The Commissioner of Education and the president of the Board of Regents for Higher Education, or their designees, (2) one representative from each of the following associations, designated by the association, the Connecticut Association of Boards of Education, the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents, the Connecticut Federation of School Administrators, the Connecticut Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers-Connecticut, and (3) persons selected by the Commissioner of Education who shall include, but not be limited to, teachers, persons with expertise in performance evaluation processes and systems, and any other person the commissioner deems appropriate. (b) The council shall be responsible for (1) assisting the State Board of Education in the development [and implementation of the] of (A) guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program, and (B) a model teacher evaluation and support program, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-151b, as amended by this act, (2) the data collection and evaluation support system, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-10a, and (3) assisting the State Board of Education in the development of a teacher evaluation and support program implementation plan, pursuant to subsection (e) of section 10-151b, as amended by this act. The council shall meet at least quarterly.

Sec. 4. Subsection (d) of section 10-151 of the general statutes, as amended by section 57 of public act 12-116, is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective July 1, 2014):

(d) The contract of employment of a teacher who has attained tenure shall be continued from school year to school year, except that it may be terminated at any time for one or more of the following reasons: (1) Inefficiency, incompetence or ineffectiveness, provided, if a teacher is notified on or after July 1, 2014, that termination is under consideration due to incompetence or ineffectiveness, the determination of incompetence or ineffectiveness is based on evaluation of the teacher using teacher evaluation guidelines established pursuant to section 10-151b, as amended by this act; (2) insubordination against reasonable rules of the board of education; (3) moral misconduct; (4) disability,



as shown by competent medical evidence; (5) elimination of the position to which the teacher was appointed or loss of a position to another teacher, if no other position exists to which such teacher may be appointed if qualified, provided such teacher, if qualified, shall be appointed to a position held by a teacher who has not attained tenure, and provided further that determination of the individual contract or contracts of employment to be terminated shall be made in accordance with either (A) a provision for a layoff procedure agreed upon by the board of education and the exclusive employees' representative organization, or (B) in the absence of such agreement, a written policy of the board of education; or (6) other due and sufficient cause. Nothing in this section or in any other section of the general statutes or of any special act shall preclude a board of education from making an agreement with an exclusive bargaining representative which contains a recall provision. Prior to terminating a contract, the superintendent shall give the teacher concerned a written notice that termination of such teacher's contract is under consideration and give such teacher a statement of the reasons for such consideration of termination. Not later than ten calendar days after receipt of written notice by the superintendent that contract termination is under consideration, such teacher may file with the local or regional board of education a written request for a hearing. A board of education may designate a subcommittee of three or more board members to conduct hearings and submit written findings and recommendations to the board for final disposition in the case of teachers whose contracts are terminated. Such hearing shall commence not later than fifteen calendar days after receipt of such request, unless the parties mutually agree to an extension, not to exceed fifteen calendar days (A) before the board of education or a subcommittee of the board, or (B) if indicated in such request or if designated by the board before an impartial hearing officer chosen by the teacher and the superintendent. If the parties are unable to agree upon the choice of a hearing officer not later than five calendar days after the decision to use a hearing officer, the hearing officer shall be selected with the assistance of the American Arbitration Association using its expedited selection process and in accordance with its rules for selection of a neutral arbitrator in grievance arbitration. If the hearing officer is not selected with the assistance of such association after five days, the hearing shall be held before the board of education or a subcommittee of the board. When the reason for termination is incompetence or ineffectiveness, the hearing shall (i) address the question of whether the performance evaluation ratings of the teacher were determined in good faith in accordance with the program adopted by the local or regional board of education pursuant to section 10-151b, as amended by this act, and were reasonable in light of the evidence presented, and (ii) be limited to twelve total hours of evidence and testimony, with each side allowed not more than six hours to present evidence and testimony except the board, subcommittee of the board or impartial hearing officer may extend the time period for evidence and testimony at the hearing when good cause is shown. Not later than forty-five calendar days after receipt of the request for a hearing, the subcommittee of the board or hearing officer, unless the parties mutually agree to an extension not to exceed fifteen calendar days, shall submit written findings and a recommendation to the board of education as to the disposition of the charges against the teacher and shall send a copy of such findings and recommendation to the teacher. The board of education shall give the teacher concerned its written decision not later than fifteen calendar days of receipt of the written recommendation of the subcommittee or hearing officer. Each party shall share equally the fee of the hearing officer and all other costs incidental to the hearing. If the hearing is before the board of education, the board shall render its decision not later than fifteen calendar days after the close of such hearing and shall send a copy of its decision to the teacher. The hearing shall be public if the teacher so requests or the board, subcommittee or hearing officer so designates. The teacher concerned shall have the right to appear with counsel at the hearing, whether public or private. A copy of a transcript of the proceedings of the hearing shall be furnished by the board of education, upon written request by the teacher within fifteen days after the board's decision, provided the teacher shall assume the cost of any



such copy. Nothing herein contained shall deprive a board of education or superintendent of the power to suspend a teacher from duty immediately when serious misconduct is charged without prejudice to the rights of the teacher as otherwise provided in this section.

Sec. 5. Subsection (b) of section 10-148a of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective from passage):

(b) Local and regional boards of education shall offer professional development activities to certified employees as part of the plan developed pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-220a, as amended by this act, or for any individual certified employee. Such professional development activities may be made available by a board of education directly, through a regional educational service center or cooperative arrangement with another board of education or through arrangements with any professional development provider approved by the Commissioner of Education. Such professional development activities shall (1) improve the integration of reading instruction, literacy and numeracy enhancement, and cultural awareness into instructional practice, (2) include strategies to improve English language learner instruction into instructional practice, (3) be determined by each board of education with the advice and assistance of the teachers employed by such board, including representatives of the exclusive bargaining unit for such teachers pursuant to section 10-153b, and on and after July 1, 2012, in full consideration of priorities and needs related to student outcomes as determined by the State Board of Education, (4) use the results and findings of teacher and administrator performance evaluations, conducted pursuant to section 10-151b, as amended by this act, to improve teacher and administrator practice and provide professional growth, and (5) include training in the implementation of student individualized education programs and the communication of individualized education program procedures to parents or guardians of students who require special education and related services for certified employees with an endorsement in special education who hold a position requiring such an endorsement. Professional development completed by superintendents of schools and administrators, as defined in section 10-144e, shall include at least fifteen hours of training in the evaluation and support of teachers under the teacher and administrator evaluation and support program, adopted pursuant to [subdivision (2) of] subsection (b) of section 10-151b, as amended by this act, during each five-year period. The time and location for the provision of such activities shall be in accordance with either an agreement between the board of education and the exclusive bargaining unit pursuant to section 10-153b or, in the absence of such agreement or to the extent such agreement does not provide for the time and location of all such activities, in accordance with a determination by the board of education.

Sec. 6. Subsection (b) of section 10-151f of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective from passage):

(b) The teacher evaluation and support pilot program described in subdivision (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall (1) assess and evaluate the implementation of a teacher evaluation and support program adopted by a local or regional board of education pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-151b, as amended by this act, that is in compliance with the guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program or the model teacher evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-151b, as amended by this act, (2) identify district needs for technical assistance and support in implementing such teacher evaluation and support program, (3) provide training to administrators in how to conduct performance evaluations under the teacher evaluation and



support program, (4) provide orientation to teachers being evaluated under the teacher evaluation and support program, (5) include a validation process for performance evaluations to be conducted by the Department of Education, or the department's designee, and (6) provide funding for the administration of the teacher evaluation and support program developed by the local or regional board of education.

Sec. 7. Subsection (b) of section 10-151g of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective from passage):

(b) Upon completion of such study, but not later than January 1, 2014, the Neag School of Education at The University of Connecticut shall (1) submit to the State Board of Education such study and any Recommendations concerning revisions to the guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program [guidelines] or model teacher evaluation and support program adopted by the State Board of Education pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-151b, as amended by this act, and (2) submit such study and any such recommendations to the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to education, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a.

Sec. 8. Section 10-151h of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective from passage):

(a) Upon the implementation of the teacher evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-151b, as amended by this act, each local and regional board of education shall conduct training programs for all evaluators and orientation for all teachers employed by such board relating to the provisions of such teacher evaluation and support program adopted by such board of education. Such training shall provide instruction to evaluators in how to conduct proper performance evaluations prior to conducting an evaluation under the teacher evaluation and support program. Such orientation shall be completed by each teacher before a teacher receives an evaluation under the teacher evaluation and support program. For purposes of this section, the term "teacher" shall include each professional employee of a board of education, below the rank of superintendent, who holds a certificate or permit issued by the State Board of Education.

(b) For the school year commencing July 1, 2014, and each school year thereafter, each local and regional board of education shall (1) conduct the training programs and orientation described in subsection (a) of this section at least biennially to all evaluators and teachers employed by such board, (2) conduct such training programs for all new evaluators prior to any evaluations conducted by such evaluators, and (3) provide such orientation to all new teachers hired by such board before such teachers receive an evaluation.

Sec. 9. Section 10-151i of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (Effective from passage):

On July 1, 2014, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner of Education shall randomly select, within available appropriations, at least ten teacher evaluation and support programs adopted pursuant to section 10-151b, as amended by this act, to be subject to a comprehensive audit conducted by the Department of Education. The department shall submit the results of such audits to the joint standing



committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to education, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a.

Section III. Common Core of Teaching: Domain 6: Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership

Teachers maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration with others, and leadership by:

6.1 Continually engaging in reflection, self-evaluation and professional development to enhance their understandings of content, pedagogical skills, resources and the impact of their actions on student learning;

6.2 Seeking professional development opportunities to enhance skills related to teaching and meeting the needs of all students;

6.3 Collaborating with colleagues, administrators, students and their families to develop and sustain a positive school climate;

6.4 Collaborating with colleagues and administrators to examine student learning data, instructional strategies, curricula, and organizational structures¹⁶ to support continuous school and district improvement;

6.5 Guiding and coaching paraprofessionals and collaborating with colleagues, administrators, and special services staff to monitor the impact of instructional or behavioral support and interventions;

6.6 Proactively communicating in culturally respectful and sensitive ways with families in order to ensure their ongoing awareness of student progress and encourage opportunities to support their child's learning;

6.7 Understanding the legal rights of students with disabilities and their families within the intervention, referral, and individualized education plan process;

6.8 Understanding how one's race, gender and culture affect professional interactions with students, families and colleagues;

6.9 Using communication technology in a professional and ethical manner;

6.10 Collaborating with colleagues, administrators, and families in the development of individualized student success plans to address goal setting, personal and academic development, post-secondary and career exploration, and/or capstone projects; and

6.11 Conducting themselves as professionals in accordance with the Connecticut's Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators.

(a) Preamble

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

Section IV. Example of a Matrix Rating System

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

