When teachers succeed, students succeed.

Research has proven that no school-level factor matters more to students’ success than high-quality teachers and leaders.
To support teachers...

...we need to define effective practice.

...we need accurate, useful information about teachers’ strengths and areas in need of development.

...we need to provide on-going opportunities for growth throughout the career continuum through effective professional learning and other types of support.

...we must develop systems for meaningful recognition of accomplishment throughout the career continuum.
Educator Evaluation Design Principles

- Based on multiple standards-based measures of performance
- Promote both professional judgment and consistency
- Foster professional dialogue about student learning
- Aligned to effective, evaluation-based professional learning, coaching, and feedback to support teacher growth and development
- Ensure feasibility of implementation
# Guidelines and State Model

## Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (Core Requirements)

- Adopted by the State Board of Education on 6/27/12
- Applies to both teachers and administrators
- Outlines the categories/standards to which all plans in Connecticut must adhere

## SEED State Model

- Applies to both teachers and administrators
- Is a specific example of the Guidelines available for Connecticut districts to adopt
Teacher Evaluation Categories

- **Student Growth and Development**: 45%
- **Peer or Parent Feedback**: 10%
- **Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice**: 40%
- **Whole School Student Learning OR Student Feedback**: 5%
Teacher Evaluation Categories

Student Growth and Development 45%

Peer or Parent Feedback 10%

Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice 40%

Outcome Rating

Annual Teacher Rating

Practice Rating
Administrator Evaluation Categories

Admin. Rating

Student Learning 45%

Leadership Practice 40%

Stakeholder Feedback 10%

OUTCOME RATING

ANNUAL ADMIN. RATING

PRACTICE RATING

CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Teacher Evaluation Process

Goal-Setting & Planning
- Orientation on process
- Teacher reflection and goal-setting
- Goal-setting conference

By November 15, 2012

Mid-Year Check-in
- Review goals and performance to date
- Mid-year conferences

January/February 2013

End-of-Year Review
- Teacher self-assessment
- Scoring
- End-of-year conference

By June 30, 2013*

*If state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating, a final rating may be revised by September 15 when state test data are available.
Administrator Evaluation Process

- **May**
  - Preliminary summative assessments (to be finalized in Aug)

- **April**
  - Self-assessment

- **July**
  - Orientation and context setting

- **January**
  - Mid-year formative review

- **August**
  - Goal-setting and plan development

- **Sept-Dec**
  - Plan implementation and evidence collection
# Levels of Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Substantially exceeding indicators of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Meeting indicators of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Meeting some indicators of performance but not others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
<td>Not meeting indicators of performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system.
Support & Development

What is it?

- Evaluation-Based Professional Learning
- Improvement & Remediation Plan
- Career Development & Growth

What does it look like?

- Linked to outcomes of evaluation
  - Student learning
  - Observation of professional practice (aligned with CCSS instructional shifts)
  - Results of stakeholder feedback
- Can occur at multiple points during the year
- Linked to levels of performance
10 districts/consortia of districts:

- Bethany
- Branford
- Bridgeport
- CREC
- Columbia, Eastford, Franklin & Sterling
- Litchfield & Region 6
- Norwalk
- Waterford
- Windham
- Windsor

- Piloting the state model, as well as district-developed models
- Some districts will pilot Peer Assistance models
Neag Study on the Core Requirements

• The Neag School of Education at The University of Connecticut shall submit to the State Board of Education, not later than January 1, 2014, an implementation study and any recommendations concerning validation of the teacher evaluation and support program core requirements. The results of the study will help determine any changes needed to the Connecticut Guidelines (Core Requirements).

• Should pilot districts identify promising practices within the Core Requirements, to implement during the pilot that vary from the established guidelines, those practices must be approved by the State Department of Education in consultation with PEAC (Performance Evaluation Advisory Council) and be incorporated into the scope of the Neag study.
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