

East Hartford Public Schools

Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Plan SY 2015-2016


EHPS VISION

Schools that are the
Pride of our Community



EHPS MISSION

To deliver a high quality
learning experience for
EVERY CHILD, EVERY DAY.




East Hartford Public Schools is committed to a policy of equal opportunity/affirmative action for all qualified persons. The district does not discriminate in any employment practice, education program, or educational activity on the basis of race, color, religious creed, sex, age, national origin, ancestry, marital status, sexual orientation, disability (including, but not limited to, mental retardation, past or present history of mental disability, physical disability or learning disability), genetic information, or any other basis prohibited by Connecticut state and/or federal nondiscrimination laws. East Hartford Public Schools does not unlawfully discriminate in employment. Inquiries regarding the district's nondiscrimination policies should be directed to the Director of Human Resources, East Hartford Board of Education, 1110 Main Street, East Hartford, Connecticut 06108, 860-622-5129.

**East Hartford Public Schools' Professional Development
and Educator Evaluation (PD/TEval) Committee Members 2015-2016**

Names	Title	Organization Represented
Nathan D. Quesnel	Superintendent	East Hartford Public Schools
Cynthia Ritchie	Assistant Superintendent, Elementary	East Hartford Public Schools
Anne Marie Mancini	Assistant Superintendent, Secondary	East Hartford Public Schools
Christopher T. Wethje	Director of Human Resources	East Hartford Public Schools
Marcia Huddy	Supervisor of Program Development and Assessment	East Hartford Public Schools
A.J. LaPlant	Teacher, Social Studies	East Hartford High School
Annie K. Irvine	Teacher, Grade 3 and EHEA Vice President	Langford Elementary School and East Hartford Education Association (EHEA)
Christopher S. Sparks	Teacher, English	East Hartford High School
Jessica Bartolini	School Psychologist	East Hartford Middle School
Laura A. White	Supervisor of Fine & Performing Arts, K-12 and EHEASU Vice President	East Hartford Public Schools and East Hartford Educational Administrative and Supervisory Unit (EHEASU)
Lesley A. Morgan-Thompson	Principal, Elementary	O'Brien STEM Academy
Marcia Ferreira	Math Coach and EHEA President	Goodwin Elementary School and East Hartford Education Association (EHEA)
Michelle Marion	Assistant Principal	East Hartford High School
Pamela Schachter	District Literacy Consultant, K-8	East Hartford Public Schools
Robert Monte	Teacher, Art	Mayberry Elementary School
Teddy Sablon-Tauris	Teacher, Special Education	East Hartford High School

DISTRICT VISION:

The mission of East Hartford Public Schools is to deliver a high quality learning experience for Every Child, Every Day.



DISTRICT CORE BELIEFS: WE BELIEVE...

<i>Expectations Matter:</i>	We believe our expectations set the bar for performance throughout all district levels. We expect all children to reach their fullest potential as learners and achieve career or college readiness. We achieve our expectations through a commitment to goal setting, high level adult performance, relentless support and continual adherence to system wide accountability.
<i>Effort Matters:</i>	We believe that as leaders, our effort sets the tone, concept and work ethic of the district. We demonstrate effort through our daily actions, our willingness to solve problems and our relentless commitment to excellence.
<i>Competence Matters:</i>	We believe as leaders, our personal level of expertise is a relative concept that must continually grow and improve. We are committed to personal growth, to challenging our areas of current weakness and to emphasizing our current areas of comfort and strength. We model for our district what it means to be life-long, committed and growing learners.
<i>Solutions Matter:</i>	We believe as leaders, our approach to all challenges must be a solution based mindset. We demonstrate this approach by addressing all challenges with optimism, creativity and an insistence that a solution is available to us. We model this approach to our district by refusing to complain, by refusing to give up and by always being willing to take another look.
<i>Relationships Matter:</i>	We believe that the relationships we share with each other, within our departments and within the district make the difference in getting the results we want. We model strong relationships based on honesty, loyalty and a commitment to working together.
<i>Results Matter:</i>	We believe that our success as a team and our success as individuals are measured by tangible results. We demonstrate this belief by knowing our current level of performance, setting realistic goals and holding ourselves accountable on a regular basis to these goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

East Hartford Public School’s Vision and Core Beliefs.....	4
SECTION I: INTRODUCTION.....	6
Purpose and Rationale of the Evaluation System.....	7
Core Design Principles	7
SECTION II: MODEL OVERVIEW	10
Student outcomes.....	10
Educator Practice.....	11
SECTION III: EDUCATOR EVALUATION PROCESS	13
Educator Evaluation Process Timeline.....	13
Educator Evaluation Process Steps.....	15
Observation Process	19
Educator Evaluation Scoring Process.....	22
Determination of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness	28
SECTION IV: IMPROVEMENT AND REMEDIATION PLANS.....	30
SECTION V: DISPUTE-RESOLUTION PROCESS	34
SECTION VI: CONCLUSION	35
Appendix A: Educator Practice Domains (CCT 2014)	
Appendix B: Service Providers Domains (CCT 2014)	
Appendix C: Template for Setting SMART Goals—IAGDs for SLOs	
Appendix D: East Hartford Public Schools’ Parent Survey	
Appendix E: Connecticut’s Measures of Student Academic Learning	
Appendix F: SPI Scoring and Sample Ratings	
Appendix G: Evaluation-Based Professional Learning	
Appendix H: TalentEd Forms	
Appendix I: East Hartford’s Professional Development Staff Survey Results (Spring, 2015)	

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

East Hartford Public Schools believes that a quality educator is the single most influential school-related power in a student's life. In accordance with this belief, this professional development and evaluation plan centers on the core principles of accountability and support in the growth and development of all district staff.

This East Hartford Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Plan was developed in 2012-2013 through a year-long process of collaboration between and among educators from all levels, including building level administrators and central office administration, who focused on providing an avenue for professional growth and accountability that would lead to improved student achievement. Initially informed by the Connecticut System of Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED) and the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, the committee concentrated on developing a plan that is, first and foremost, fair, that celebrates great teaching, that provides system-wide accountability and that details systems for support as needed. After the first year of implementation, and in recognition that a plan of this magnitude continues to be refined and improved, the committee met to review and clarify important areas in response to deeper understanding of the process and acknowledgement of new flexibilities provided by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE). It is the hope that this document will continue to serve as a guiding standard for all educators in the years to come. Understanding that a major goal of the educational process is to develop the capacity of the students to become successful, life-long learners, this plan focuses on the professional growth and development of educators as learners and implementers of educational strategies to support all students.

The East Hartford Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Plan contains several key elements designed to underscore and operationalize the concepts of accountable professional growth. Educator professional development and evaluation are two of the key elements in the development of an effective system that supports teaching and learning. In an effort to enhance a strong alignment between professional development and educator practice, the evaluation model described in this plan outlines the steps East Hartford Public Schools will take in collaboration with district educators to enact this system, including professional learning, evaluation of practice, assessment of student achievement, and educator support and improvement.

This evaluation plan was first implemented in East Hartford Public Schools during the 2013-2014 school year. Both the East Hartford Public Schools and the East Hartford Education Association (EHEA) collaboratively reserve the right to make adjustments, as needed, to improve the educator evaluation process. Any modifications to the evaluation model will be shared with East Hartford Board of Education. East Hartford Public Schools also reserves the right to make changes after reviewing the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) updated revisions as released publicly for this purpose. As this document outlines an updated model for the evaluation and development of educators in East Hartford, East Hartford Public Schools acknowledges its use of Connecticut's SEED, developed by a diverse group of educators in June 2012 which focuses on best practice research from around the country and on previous iterations of East Hartford's Professional Development and Evaluation Plan.

Purpose and Rationale of the Evaluation System

The revised professional development and evaluation system is based on the belief that “when educators succeed, students succeed.” Research has proven that no school-level factor matters more to students’ success than high-quality educators. To support educators, it is important to define excellent practice and results clearly, give accurate, useful information about educators’ strengths and development areas, and provide opportunities for growth and recognition. Therefore, educator evaluation and professional development are integrally linked. Recognizing educators as professionals and respecting the need for continued growth and development provides a basis for this model. The dual purpose of the new evaluation guidelines, the SEED model and East Hartford’s model is to evaluate educator performance fairly and accurately and to help each educator strengthen his/her practice to improve student learning through a collaborative process.

Core Design Principles

The following principles guide the design of the East Hartford model:

- *Consider multiple, standards-based measures of performance*
An evaluation system that uses multiple sources of information and evidence results in a fair, accurate and comprehensive picture of an educator’s performance. The new model defines four categories of educator effectiveness:
 - Student learning (45%)
 - School-wide student learning (5%)
 - Educator performance and practice (40%)
 - Parent feedback (10%)

These categories are grounded in research-based, national standards: the Common Core State Standards, as well as Connecticut’s standards for educators: The Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT); the Connecticut Framework K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards; Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium’s Connecticut state assessments; and locally-developed curriculum standards.

- *Promote both professional judgment and consistency*
Assessing an educator’s professional practice requires evaluators to use constant professional judgment. No rubric or formula, however detailed, can capture all of the nuances in how educators interact with students, and synthesizing multiple sources of information into performance ratings is inherently more complex than checklists or numerical averages. At the same time, educators’ ratings should depend on their performance, not on their evaluators’ biases. Accordingly, the model aims to minimize the variance between school leaders’ evaluations of classroom practice and support fairness and consistency within and across schools.
- *Ensure fairness and accuracy: evaluator training, monitoring and auditing*
All evaluators are required to complete training on the evaluation model. To that end, East Hartford Public Schools will provide an orientation to the professional development plan and the evaluation process at the beginning of each school year. East Hartford Public Schools will also provide administrators with training opportunities and tools to support district administrators and evaluators in implementing the Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Plan across the schools. Evaluator orientation, support training and calibration

practice may be provided by a RESC, the CSDE, an outside consultant or the district to ensure that evaluators are trained in conducting educator evaluations with fairness and accuracy. The district will be required to submit the number of educators at each rating level for all educators on an annual basis. The CSDE may select districts at random annually to review evaluation evidence files for a minimum of two educators rated exemplary and two educators rated below standard.

- *Foster dialogue about student learning*
This model hinges on improving the professional conversation between and among educators and administrators who are their evaluators. The dialogue in this new model occurs more frequently and focuses on what students are learning and what educators and their administrators can do to support teaching and learning.
- *Define effectiveness and ineffectiveness*
Using multiple indicators serves to clarify the meaning of effectiveness or ineffectiveness in East Hartford Public Schools. This determination is made utilizing a pattern of observations and/or summative ratings derived from the multiple indicators outlined in the evaluation system. In addition, the East Hartford Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Plan provides educators with the support and opportunity for improvement when observed practice or summative rating is deemed *developing* or *below standard*.
- *Encourage aligned professional development, coaching and feedback to support teacher growth*
Evaluation, alone, cannot hope to improve teaching practice and student learning. However, when paired with effective, relevant and timely feedback and/or support, the evaluation process has the potential to help move educators along the path to exemplary practice. Non-tenured and tenured educators alike deserve detailed, constructive feedback and professional development tailored to the individual needs of their classrooms and students. This new model promotes a shared language of excellence to which professional development, coaching and feedback can align to improve practice. The East Hartford Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Plan, in accordance with this principle, provides educators with support and opportunity for improvement when observed or summative practice as rated is deemed *developing* or *below standard*.
- *Provide opportunities for career development and growth*
Rewarding exemplary performance, identified through the evaluation process, with opportunities for career development and professional growth is a critical step in both building confidence in the evaluation system itself and in building the capacity of all educators. East Hartford Public Schools encourages the development of educator leadership as a means of career development and professional growth opportunities. (See Appendix for more detailed information)
- *Allow for primary and complementary evaluators, as needed*
The primary evaluator for all educators will be the administrator to whom they report and who will be responsible for the overall evaluation process, including assigning summative ratings. In East Hartford Public Schools, complementary evaluators must be certified administrators serving under the 092 certificate. Complementary evaluators may assist primary evaluators by

conducting observations, collecting additional evidence, reviewing student learning objectives (SLOs) and providing additional feedback. A complementary evaluator should share his/her feedback with the primary evaluator as it is collected and shared with educators. All evaluators must be fully trained as evaluators in order to be authorized to serve in either role.

- *Ensure feasibility of implementation*

Enacting this model of professional development and evaluation is hard work. Educators will need to develop new skills and think differently about how they manage and prioritize their time and resources. This model aims to balance high expectations with flexibility for the time and capacity considerations required to implement this model effectively and with fidelity. East Hartford educators and administrators, working together, will enable the district to progress in its goal of promoting excellence in teaching and learning – leading to student growth and achievement. Furthermore, effective implementation of this professional development and evaluation system is connected to a strong alignment between and among the District Improvement Plan, the individual School Improvement Plans, Department Improvement Plans, where appropriate, educator goals and student outcomes.

SECTION II: MODEL OVERVIEW


The East Hartford Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Plan contains two key categories divided into four elements designed to support professional growth and educator practice. Understanding the complexity of the craft of teaching and learning, East Hartford Public Schools believes that the summative rating of an educator should reflect the myriad tasks and influences that the educator has related to student learning. Capturing this belief, the East Hartford Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Plan uses multiple indicators to assess educator effectiveness. These key categories and elements are identified and weighted as listed below:

Category I: Student Outcomes

- Student Growth and Development, which accounts for 45%, and
- Whole School Student Learning, which accounts for 5%.

Category II: Educator Practice

- Educator Performance and Practice, which accounts for 40%, and
- Parent Feedback, which accounts for 10%.



Category I: Student Outcomes

The Student Outcomes category captures the educator's impact on students. This category is measured through both the student growth and development and whole-school student learning elements. Every educator is in the profession to help children learn and grow, and educators already think carefully about what knowledge, skills and talents they are responsible for nurturing in their students each year. As a part of this evaluation process, educators will document those aspirations and anchor them in data.

Student Outcomes includes two elements:

- Student growth and development, which counts for 45%, and
- Whole-school student learning which counts for 5% of the total evaluation rating.

Element #1: Student Growth and Development (45%)

The development of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and their corresponding Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs) that define how the SLO will be measured forms the heart of this first element of student outcomes related indicators.

Each educator's students, individually and as a group, are different from other educators' students, even in the same grade level or subject at the same school. For student growth and development to be measured for educator evaluation purposes, it is imperative to use a method that takes each educator's assignment, students and context into account. This goal-setting process, called **Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)** is the approach for measuring student growth during the school year.

The SLOs are broad goals for student learning based upon identified needs in the District Improvement Plan (DIP), School Improvement Plan (SIP) and/or department goals. They should each address a central purpose of the educator's assignment and pertain to a large proportion of his/her students. Each SLO should reflect high expectations for student learning - defined as ambitious, but attainable - and should be aligned to relevant state, national (e.g., common core), or district standards for the grade level or course. Depending on the educator's assignment, the SLO might aim for content mastery (more likely at the secondary level) or it might aim for skill development (more likely at the elementary level or in arts classes).

The **Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs)** provide the evidence of achievement of the SLOs. One half (22.5%) of the IAGDs 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. For the other half (22.5%) of the IAGDs, there may be a maximum of one additional standardized indicator and a minimum of one non-standardized indicator. (See definitions of standardized and non-standardized indicators on page 17.)

Element #2: Whole-School Student Learning (5%)

The whole-school student learning indicator will be used to determine this fourth element of the plan.

An educator's indicator rating for Whole School Student Learning shall be equal to the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the principal's evaluation rating at that school. For most schools, this will be based on the School Performance Index (SPI), which correlates to the whole-school student learning indicator on an administrator's evaluation. (See **Appendix F** for more information.)

NOTE: If the whole-school student learning indicator rating is not available when the summative rating is calculated, or if the educator is not assigned to a building, then the student growth and development score will be weighted 50% and the whole-school student learning indicator will be weighted 0% . For an educator who is assigned to multiple buildings, the SPI of the predominant assignment may be used. (See Summative Educator Evaluation Scoring).

Category II: Educator Practice

The Educator Practice category of the educator evaluation model measures the educator's knowledge of a complex set of skills and competencies and how these are applied in an educator's practice. It is comprised of two elements:

- Educator Performance and Practice, which counts for 40%, and
- Parent Feedback, which counts for 10%.

Element #3: Educator Performance and Practice (40%)

The Educator Performance and Practice element of the model is a comprehensive review of teaching practice against a rubric of practice, based on multiple observations. It comprises 40% of the summative rating. As described in the Evaluation Process Steps section following, educators develop one to three practice and performance goals that are aligned to the appropriate Connecticut CCT determined by the educator's assignment. These become a personalized focus area for each educator. They could also provide a focus for observations and for feedback conversations. Following observations, evaluators provide educators with specific feedback to identify educator development needs and tailor support to those needs.

Element #4: Parent Feedback (10%)

Parent engagement in the education of their children is a critical factor in student success. East Hartford Public Schools seeks to enlist parents as partners in the educational process. Feedback from parents will be used to help determine the remaining 10% of the Educator Practice category of the evaluation plan.

Parent surveys are conducted at the school level annually. The purpose of aggregating data at the school level is to ensure adequate response rates from parents. Surveys are shared with School Governance Councils to elicit feedback and suggestions for questions and focus areas. Surveys are confidential and survey responses are not tied to parents' names. The parent survey is administered every spring and trends are analyzed from year-to-year. In order to ensure fairness, reliability, validity and usefulness, the district will select the CSDE- recommended survey or professionally developed survey from an approved vendor. **Appendix D** contains information on the parent survey that will be used to collect parent feedback.

SECTION III: EDUCATOR EVALUATION PROCESS

Educator Evaluation Process Timeline

The annual evaluation process between an educator and an evaluator is anchored by three performance conversations at the beginning, middle and end of the year. The purpose of these conversations is to clarify expectations for the evaluation process, provide comprehensive feedback to each educator on his/her performance, set development goals and identify development opportunities. These conversations are collaborative and require reflection and preparation by both the educator and the evaluator in order to be productive and meaningful.



Planning and Goal-Setting:

Timeframe: must be completed by **October 15**

1. *Orientation* – To begin the evaluation process, evaluators meet with educators, in a group or individually, to discuss the evaluation process and their roles and responsibilities within it. In this meeting, they will discuss any school or district priorities that should be reflected in educator practice goals and student learning objectives (SLOs), and they will commit to set time aside for the types of collaboration required by the evaluation process. For an educator hired after the start of the school year, the evaluator will provide an orientation to this process within a reasonable period of time.
2. *Educator Reflection and Goal Development* – The educator examines student data, prior year evaluation and survey results and the appropriate CCT Domains to draft a proposed performance and practice goal(s), a parent feedback goal and student learning objectives (SLOs). A whole-school student learning indicator rounds out the evaluation process for the school year. The educator may collaborate in grade-level or subject-matter teams to support the goal-setting process. Educators should refer to the appropriate rubrics, including the Service Providers’ area rubrics if applicable, to select their areas of focus in alignment with their roles and responsibilities. (See **Appendices B-D**).
3. *Goal-Setting Conference* – The educator and the evaluator meet to discuss the educator’s proposed goals and objectives in order to arrive at mutual agreement about them. The educator collects evidence about his/her practice and the evaluator collects evidence about the educator’s practice to support the review. All educators must receive a summative rating. Therefore, educators who leave mid-year on a leave of absence, including a maternity leave, or mid-year hires will work with their evaluator to develop goals accordingly. Note that while observations

may occur at any time, the required minimum formal observations will not occur until after such time as the goal setting conference between the educator and the evaluator has occurred. Further, the required minimum informal observations and/or reviews of practice that count toward the final summative rating will not occur until after September 15th of each school year.

Mid-Year Check-In:

Timeframe: must be completed **by February 15**

1. *Reflection and Preparation* – The educator and the evaluator collect and reflect on evidence to date about the educator’s practice and student learning in preparation for the check-in.
2. *Mid-Year Conference* – The educator and the evaluator complete at least one mid-year check-in conference during which they review progress on educator practice goals, student learning objectives (SLOs), IAGDs, parent feedback goals and performance on each to date. The mid-year conference is an important point for reviewing results for the first half of the year, for addressing concerns, and for planning for the rest of the year. If needed, educators and evaluators can mutually agree to revisions on the strategies or approaches used and/or mid-year adjustment of SLOs/IAGDs to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignment). They should also discuss actions that the educator can take and supports the evaluator can provide to promote educator growth.
3. *Mid-Year Progress Report* – For non-tenured educators, evaluators will select and date the statement that reflects the educator’s potential contract renewal status based on evidence to date. This progress report must be submitted to Human Resources by **February 15th**.

End-of-Year Summative Review:

Timeframe: April and May; Summative review meeting with educator and evaluator must be completed **by June 1st**- documents must be submitted to Human Resources **by June 15th**.

1. *Educator Self-Assessment* – The educator reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the evaluator. This self-assessment should focus specifically on the areas for development established in the goal-setting conference.
2. *Scoring* – The evaluator reviews submitted evidence, self-assessments and observation data to generate category and focus area ratings. The category ratings generate the final, summative rating which shall not be subject to change even if the state test data becomes available later. More detail on summative ratings is available in Section III.
3. *End-of-Year Conference* – The educator and the evaluator meet to discuss all evidence collected to date and to discuss category ratings as described above by **June 1st**. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating, generates a summary report of the evaluation and submits it to Human Resources by **June 15th**. The Connecticut State Department of Education Educator Evaluation Guidelines state: “If state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating, a final rating may be revised before **September 15th**.” It is not required to revise a final rating. Such ratings will not be revised in East Hartford.

Educator Evaluation Process Steps

The annual educator evaluation process consists of multiple steps designed to set clear guidelines and clear expectations for supporting and assessing teaching and learning. This section is designed to walk the educator and evaluator through each step and thereby serves as a process guide.

Goal Setting Process/Conference

Setting ambitious, yet attainable, goals is a cornerstone process in the professional development and evaluation plan. As with all quality goals, these goals should be based on relevant data, include specific measures and be actionable for staff. The goal-setting conference for identifying the overall Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and aligned Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD), as well as goals for educator practice, shall include the steps listed below, which will apply to ALL certified educators, including those in non-classroom positions. (For those educators in non-classroom positions, refer to **Appendix C** for guidance in setting SLOs and IAGDs related to a specific role.) The following table provides a quick reference guide to the category, the minimum number required and brief descriptions for each step in the process. Following the table, each step is described in more detail.

Table of Requirements for Educator Performance and Goal Setting			
Category	Number	Descriptor	Page Reference
SLO	1 – 4	An approach for determining student growth targets as measured through IAGDs	See pages 16-18 & Appendix C
IAGD	At least 1 per SLO; At least 2 if only 1 SLO	The specific evidence, with a quantitative target, that demonstrates if the SLO was met	See pages 16-18 & Appendix C
Practice and Performance	1-3	An approach for selecting areas of focus from the practice and performance domains	See page 19 & Appendix A
Parent Feedback	1	An approach for setting an improvement target related to identified areas of need as indicated by parent feedback	See page 19

1. Prior to the meeting, the educator examines available and applicable student data, prior year evaluation and survey results, his/her primary role and responsibilities and the appropriate Educator or Service Providers CCT Domains to draft proposed goals in alignment to District Improvement Plan (DIP), School Improvement Plan (SIP) and department goals.
2. Recognizing the importance of alignment among district, school, department and educator goals, the educator and evaluator will hold a goal setting meeting that will consist of a professional and respectful collaboration regarding district, school and individual growth goals. Such SLOs must be set in alignment with the DIP, SIP and department goals as developed through mutual agreement with the educator and evaluator.

In addition, the educator and evaluator will mutually agree on the data set, group of students/sub-group or caseloads that will be used to measure student learning growth. If mutual agreement cannot be reached, the goals will be mediated through the Dispute Resolution Process.

3. The educator and evaluator should identify the assessment, data or product to be used as the IAGD for measuring growth; the timeline for instruction and measurement; how the 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 will need to support the areas targeted. Professional development opportunities include, but are not limited to the following:
 - Observation or Mentoring of Peers (within building or across district)
 - Professional Learning Communities
 - Professional Reading/Literature
 - Educator-led workshops
 - Data-Team Meetings related to goal
 - Book Clubs
 - Supplemental Support
 - Webinars/online tutorials
 - Professional conferences
 - Documentation of student progress toward goals (lesson planning, data disaggregation and analysis, portfolio work)

Setting SLOs and IAGDs

The development of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and their corresponding Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs) will support educators in using a planning cycle to set, monitor and assess student growth and development. To create their SLOs, educators will follow these four steps:

Step 1: Select Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)

A **Student Learning Objective (SLO)** is a goal for student learning based on the baseline data and targets for improvement identified through analysis of student need. Each educator will write 1- 4 SLOs. It is highly recommended that teachers consider more than one SLO to provide multiple opportunities to demonstrate growth. Educators whose students take a standardized assessment will create one SLO based on standardized indicators, which must include state assessment data, if applicable, and one SLO based on a minimum of one non-standardized indicator and a maximum of one additional standardized indicator. All other educators will develop their SLOs based on non-standardized indicators. If an educator opts to write only one SLO, that SLO must have at least two IAGDs – a standardized indicator and a non-standardized indicator as described previously. For educators in state-tested grades/subjects, the Educator Evaluation Guidelines require that 22.5% of an educator’s rating must come from state assessment data as well as district interim assessments. Other standardized assessment data may be used to input a rating for the educator while waiting for state test data if unavailable prior to the June 15th deadline for submission to the Human Resources office. According to the Educator Evaluation Guidelines, if test results may have a significant impact on a final rating, a final rating may be revised before September 15th, however, it is not required by the guidelines to revise the rating, and such revisions will not occur in East Hartford Public Schools.

Educators are encouraged to collaborate with grade-level and/or subject-matter colleagues in the creation of SLOs. Educators with similar assignments may have identical SLOs although they will be individually accountable for their own students’ results. See **Appendix C** for sample SLOs and links to further guidance by content area and role for the development of SLOs and IAGDs.

Step 2: Select Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs)

An **Indicator of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD)** is the specific evidence, with a quantitative target, that will demonstrate whether the objective was met. An IAGD should be fair, reliable, valid and useful, as defined in the Connecticut Educator Guidelines. Each SLO must include at least one indicator. It is strongly recommended that educators consider multiple SLOs and/or IAGDs to provide multiple measurements for demonstrating attainment of the SLO.

Each indicator should make clear (1) what evidence will be examined, (2) what level of performance is targeted, and (3) what proportion of students is projected to achieve the targeted performance level. Indicators can also address student subgroups, such as high or low-performing and/or ELL students. It is through the examination of student data that educators will determine what level of performance to target for which students. (See **Template for Setting SMART Goals in Appendix C**).

Since indicator targets are calibrated for the educator's particular students, educators with similar assignments may use the same evidence for their indicators, but they would be unlikely to have identical targets. For example, all 2nd grade educators might use the same reading assessment in their IAGD, but the performance target and/or the proportion of students expected to achieve proficiency would likely vary among 2nd grade educators.

Taken together, an SLO's indicators (IAGDs), if achieved, would provide evidence that the objective was met. For purposes of setting IAGDs, the Educator Guidelines provide the following definitions of standardized and non-standardized measurements:

Standardized assessments (measurement) are characterized by the following attributes:

- Administered and scored in a consistent – or “standard” – manner;
- Aligned to a set of academic or performance “standards, such as those developed state-wide or through assessment consortia;
- Broadly-administered (nation- or statewide, district, school or department-wide); and
- Often administered only once a year, such as AP or SAT-9 exams, Trade Certification exams and Standardized Vocational ED exams, although some standardized assessments are administered two or three times per year, such as DRA2, STAR, DIBELS.

Non-standardized Indicators (measurement) include, but are not limited to the following:

- Performances rated against a rubric (such as a music performance)
- Performance assessments or tasks rated against a rubric (such as constructed projects, student oral or written work)
- Portfolios of student work rated against a rubric
- Curriculum-based assessments, including those constructed by a teacher or team of teachers
- Periodic assessments that document student growth over time (such as formative assessments, diagnostic assessments, district benchmark assessments)
- Other indicators (such as teacher-developed tests, student written work/constructed project, dipsticks, progress monitoring and district pre-/post- assessments)

Step 3: Provide Additional Information

During the goal-setting process, educators and evaluators may document the following:

- the rationale for the objective, including relevant standards;
- any important technical information about the indicator evidence (like timing or scoring plans);
- the baseline data that was used to set each IAGD;
- interim assessments the educator plans to use to gauge students’ progress toward the SLO during the school year (optional); and
- any training or support the educator thinks would help improve the likelihood of meeting the SLO (optional).

Step 4: Submit SLOs to Evaluator

While educators and evaluators confer during the goal-setting process to select mutually agreed-upon SLOs, ultimately, the evaluator must formally approve all SLO proposals.

The evaluator will examine each SLO relative to three criteria. If they do not meet one or more criteria, the evaluator will provide written comments and discuss his/her feedback with the educator during the fall Goal-Setting Conference. SLOs that do not meet the criteria must be revised and resubmitted to the evaluator within five student school days. The SLO criteria are indicated in the chart below:

SLO Criteria		
Priority of Content	Quality of Indicators	Rigor of Objective/Indicators
Objective is deeply relevant to educator’s assignment and addresses a large proportion of his/her students.	Indicators provide specific, measurable evidence. The indicators provide evidence about students’ progress over the school year or semester during which they are with the educator.	Objective and indicator(s) are ambitious, but attainable.

Once SLOs are formally approved, educators should monitor their students’ progress toward the objectives. They can, for example, examine student work products, administer interim assessments, and track students’ accomplishments and struggles. Educators can share their interim findings with colleagues during collaborative time, and they can keep their evaluator apprised of progress.

If an educator’s assignment changes or if his/her student population shifts significantly, the SLOs and the corresponding IAGD, if appropriate, can be adjusted during the Mid-Year Conference between the educator and the evaluator(s).

At the end of the school year, the educator should collect the evidence required by the indicators and submit it to his/her evaluator. Along with the evidence, educators will complete and submit a self-assessment which asks educators to reflect on the SLO outcomes by stating their overall assessment of whether the SLO was met and a concise summary of evidence for each IAGD.

Educator Performance and Practice Goal-Setting

As previously mentioned in the model overview, educators develop one to three practice and performance goals that are aligned to the Connecticut CCT. These goals provide a focus for the

observations and for the feedback conversations. Educators should refer to the appropriate rubric, including Service Providers' rubrics, to assist in determining areas for concentration.

At the start of the year, each educator will work with his or her evaluator to develop practice and performance goal(s). These goals will be set, along with SLOs and IAGDs, at the goal-setting conference described above. All goals should have a clear link to student achievement and should move the educators toward *proficient* or *exemplary* on the Connecticut CCT. Furthermore, these goals should be designed to support district and school goals. Schools may decide to create a school-wide goal aligned to a particular component that all educators will include as one of their goals. Although performance and practice goals are not explicitly rated as part of the Educator Performance and Practice category, progress on goals will be reflected in the scoring of Educator Performance and Practice evidence that includes all educator domains.

Setting a Parent Feedback Goal

As previously indicated, parent surveys will be conducted at the whole-school, meaning parent feedback will be aggregated at the school level to ensure adequate response rates from parents. The parent survey is administered annually and trends are analyzed from year-to-year.

1. Determining School-Level Parent Goals

Educators and evaluators should review the parent survey results at the beginning of the school year to identify areas of need and set general parent engagement goals based on the survey results. The school level goals identified in the SIP should inform this process.

2. Selecting a Parent Engagement Goal and Improvement Targets

After school-level goals have been set, educators will determine through consultation and mutual agreement with their evaluators, **one** related goal they would like to pursue as part of their evaluation. Possible goals include improving communication with parents, helping parents become more effective in support of homework, improving parent-educator conferences, etc.

Educators will also set improvement targets related to the goal they select. For instance, if the goal is to improve parent communication, an improvement target could be specific to sending more regular correspondence to parents which might be sending bi-weekly updates to parents or developing a new website for their class. Part of the evaluator's job is to ensure (1) the goal is related to the overall school improvement parent goals, and (2) that the improvement targets are aligned and attainable.

Observation Process

The East Hartford Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Plan reflects the belief that multiple snapshots of practice provide a more accurate picture of teacher performance. For this evaluation plan, observations are categorized into separate distinctions of practice. These observations provide an evaluator and educator with various levels of observational analysis, feedback and ability to gather a preponderance of evidence toward a summative performance rating

Observation Definitions

Observations are categorized by length, purpose and relationship to the evaluation process. The following list defines the observation types used by East Hartford evaluators:

- **Classroom Visits:** Classroom visits by an evaluator are most likely unannounced and are not followed up by written feedback. Classroom visits provide an evaluator with an opportunity to be a visible presence within the school and develop a general sense for daily practice. Classroom visits vary in length and frequency and may be followed up by oral or written coaching feedback from the evaluator.

** Please note that while feedback from a classroom visit may not be used to develop a summative rating, a classroom visit may evolve into an informal observation if the evaluator stays for the required minimum of 20 minutes and follows up with written feedback as described below.*

- **Informal Observations/Reviews of Practice:** Informal observations are unannounced performance evaluations that will provide the educator with appropriate commendations or recommendations regarding practice. These commendations/recommendations should be influenced by the evaluation rubric. Informal evaluations are at least 20 minutes in length and may include a post-conference (always if requested by the educator). They are followed by written feedback that includes a holistic rating based on the domains observed within 5 student school days.

Non-classroom observations or reviews of practice include, but are not limited to observation of data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring of other educators, review of lesson plans or other teaching artifacts as provided by an educator. For Service Providers, examples of non-classroom observations may include, but are not limited to observing Service Provider staff working with small groups of students, working with adults, providing professional development, working with families, participation in team meetings or participation in Planning and Placement Team meetings. Reviews of practice may be followed up by oral or written feedback from the evaluator, but written feedback will be required if the review of practice serves as a formal or informal observation or is a factor in the educator's summative rating.

- **Formal Observations:** Formal observations are announced performance evaluations that are guided by the evaluation rubric. Formal observations must last at least 30 minutes, include a pre-conference (that will be scheduled with 3 student school days' advance notice to the educator), and be followed by a post-observation conference (that will be scheduled and conducted within 10 student school days following the formal observation), which includes both written and oral feedback. A pre-conference can be held with a group of educators, where appropriate. Educators are required to provide the pre-conference form to the evaluators at least one day before the scheduled pre-observation conference. The educator may request written feedback and rating prior to the post-observation conference to inform the discussion.

Observation Frequency/Assignment

An evaluator reserves the right to conduct any type of observation at any point to observe educator performance, but no more than one formal or informal observation should be conducted for the same educator on the same day. For certain subject areas and for reviews of practice, informal and/or formal observations may occur outside of the traditional classroom setting. Because some Service Providers 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 for rating practice and performance at the beginning of the year. In order to inform the on-going conversation between educator and evaluator and provide sufficient time for both educator and evaluator to determine professional growth or support needs, at least one of the indicated observations must occur prior to the February 15th mid-year

check-in report deadline. The following table documents the minimum requirements for educator observations based on seniority or rating.

Educator Category	Minimum Requirements	
	Formal	Informal
Non Tenured Educator: Year 1 & 2	3 formal observations	No minimum required
Non Tenured Educator: Year 3 & 4 rated proficient or exemplary	2 formal observations	1 informal observations
Fast Track Educator: an educator entering East Hartford Public Schools from another district where tenure was previously achieved.	3 formal observations	No minimum required
Tenured Educator rated <i>Below Standard</i> or <i>Developing</i>	3 formal observations	No minimum required
Tenured Educator rated <i>Proficient</i> or <i>Exemplary</i>	1 formal observation	1 review of practice/informal observation

*** Please note: For educators entering the district outside the start of the school year or leaving/returning from a leave of absence, all efforts will be made to maintain the frequency of observations. The number of observations may be adjusted, if necessary, based on the start date of the educator through a discussion with the educator, evaluator, Assistant Superintendent and Director of Human Resources.*

Post-Conferences

Post-conferences provide a forum for reflecting on the observation against the Connecticut CCT Domains and for generating action steps that will lead to the educator's improvement. Following a formal observation, a post conference will be scheduled and conducted within 10 student school days following the formal observation. A good post-conference:

- begins with an opportunity for the educator to share his/her self-assessment of the lesson observed;
- cites objective evidence to paint a clear picture for both the educator and the evaluator about the educator's successes, what improvements will be made, and where future observations may focus;
- involves written and oral feedback from the evaluator; and
- occurs in a timely fashion.

Classroom observations provide the most evidence for certain domains of the Connecticut CCT, but both pre-and post-observation conferences provide the opportunity for discussion of all domains, including practice outside of classroom instruction (e.g., lesson plans, reflections on teaching).

Feedback

The goal of feedback is to help educators grow as educators and become more effective with each of their students. With this in mind, evaluators should be clear and direct, presenting their comments in a way that is supportive and constructive. Feedback must be provided within 5 student school days of any observation that serves as part of the summative evaluation scoring process (and prior to a post conference) and should include the following as appropriate to the type of observation:

- specific evidence and ratings, where appropriate, on observed components of the Connecticut CCT;
- prioritized commendations and recommendations for development actions;

- next steps and supports the educator can pursue to improve his/her practice; and
- a timeframe for follow up.

Signature Flow

The evaluation process provides an opportunity for evaluators and educators to review professional goals and professional growth in educator practice. In order for the process to occur in a smooth and timely fashion, educator signatures on appropriate forms must be submitted within 10 student school days of its review on any formal, informal or review of practice observation form. Signature only indicates awareness of the contents of the form. It does not signify agreement. If a teacher chooses, he/she may submit a written, electronic response to his/her evaluator, within 10 school days. In the case of error or other needed change, forms can be re-opened at the request of the evaluator for corrections to be made.

Educator Evaluation Scoring Process

Understanding the complexity of the craft of teaching and learning, East Hartford Public Schools believes that the summative rating of an educator should reflect the myriad tasks and influences that the educator has related to student learning. Capturing this belief, the East Hartford Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Plan uses two key categories aggregated into four elements that provide the measures to assess educator effectiveness and determine an educator’s summative rating:

- Student Growth and Development, which accounts for 45%
- Whole School Student Learning, which accounts for 5%
- Educator Performance and Practice, which accounts for 40%
- Parent Feedback, which accounts for 10%

SLO/IAGD Scoring (45%)

At the end of the school year, the educator should collect the evidence required by their indicators and submit it to their evaluator. Along with the evidence, educators will complete and submit a self-assessment, which asks educators to reflect on the SLO/IAGD outcomes by stating their overall assessment of whether the SLO was met and a concise summary of evidence for each IAGD.

Evaluators will review the evidence and the educator’s self-assessment and assign one of four ratings to each SLO: Exceeded (4 points), Met (3 points), Partially Met (2 points), or Did Not Meet (1 point). These ratings are defined in the chart below:

Exceeded (4)	All or most students met or substantially exceeded the target(s) contained in the indicator(s).
Met (3)	Most students met the target(s) contained in the indicators within a few points on either side of the target(s).
Partially Met (2)	Many students met the target(s) but a notable percentage missed the target by more than a few points. However, taken as a whole, significant progress toward the goal was made.
Did Not Meet (1)	A few students met the target(s) but a substantial percentage of students did not. Little progress toward the goal was made.

For SLOs with more than one indicator, the evaluator may score each indicator separately and then, average those scores for the SLO score, or he/she can look at the results as a body of evidence regarding the accomplishment of the student learning objective and score the SLO holistically. The final student growth and development rating for an educator is the average of their SLO scores. For example, if one SLO was Partially Met, for 2 points, and the other SLO was Met, for 3 points, the student growth and development rating would be 2.5 $[(2+3)/2]$. The individual SLO ratings and the student growth and development rating will be shared and discussed with educators during the End-of-Year Conference.

***NOTE: For SLOs that include an indicator based on state standardized tests, results may not be available in time to score the SLO prior to the June 15th deadline. In this instance, if evidence for other indicators in the SLO is available, the evaluator can score the SLO on that basis. Or, if state tests are the basis for all indicators, then the educator's student growth and development rating will be based only on the results of the SLO(s) based on non-standardized indicators.*

Whole School Student Learning Indicator Scoring (5%)

The whole-school student learning indicator will be used to determine the scoring of this fourth category of the plan. An educator's indicator rating shall be equal to the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the principal's evaluation rating at that school. For most schools, this will be based on the School Performance Index (SPI) (**See Appendix F**).

***NOTE: If the whole-school student learning indicator rating is not available when the summative rating is calculated, or if the educator is not assigned to a building, then the student growth and development score will be weighted 50% and the whole-school student learning indicator will be weighted 0%. For an educator who is assigned to multiple buildings, the SPI of the predominant (60% or higher) assignment may be used. (See Summative Educator Evaluation Scoring)*

Educator Performance and Practice Scoring (40%)

The heart of the Educator Practice Category is determined through both the rating of individual performances and the development of a summative, year-end rating informed by a preponderance of the evidence collected throughout the year. The scoring process is delineated below:

Individual Observation Ratings

Throughout the year, evaluators are required to provide an overall rating for each formal and informal observation. During observations, evaluators should take evidence-based, scripted notes, capturing specific instances of what the educator and students said and did in the classroom. Evidence-based notes are factual (e.g., the educator asks: Which events precipitated the fall of Rome?) and not judgmental (e.g., the educator asks good questions). Once the evidence has been recorded, the evaluator can align the evidence with the appropriate component(s) on the rubric and then make a judgment about which performance level the evidence supports. This judgment, including suggestions and/or supports for next steps is presented to the educator as part of the post-observation conference.

Summative Observation of Educator Performance and Practice Rating

At the end of the year, primary evaluators must determine a final educator performance and practice rating and discuss this rating with educators during the End-of-Year Conference. The final educator performance and practice rating will be calculated by the evaluator as described with examples below:

1. Evaluator reviews evidence collected through observations and reviews of practice (e.g., team meetings, conferences) and uses professional judgment to determine component ratings for each of the Connecticut CCT domain components.

By the end of the year, evaluators should have collected a variety of evidence on educator practice from the year’s observations and interactions. Evaluators then analyze the consistency, trends, and significance of the evidence to determine a rating for each of the components. Some questions to consider while analyzing the evidence include the following:

Consistency: What rating have I seen relatively uniform, homogenous evidence for throughout the semester? Does the evidence paint a clear, unambiguous picture of the educator’s performance in this area?

Trends: Have I seen improvement over time that overshadows earlier observation outcomes? Have I seen regression or setbacks over time that overshadows earlier observation outcomes?

Significance: Is some data more valid than others? (Do I have notes or ratings from “meatier” lessons or interactions where I was able to better assess this aspect of performance?)

Once a rating has been determined, it is then translated to a 1-4 score. *Below Standard* = 1 and *Exemplary* = 4. See example below for Domain 1:

Domain 1	Rating	Evaluator’s Score
1a	<i>Developing</i>	2
1b	<i>Proficient</i>	3
1c	<i>Proficient</i>	3

2. Evaluator (or technology) averages components within each domain to a tenth of a decimal to calculate domain-level scores of 1.0-4.0. See sample below calculated using four domains:

Domain	Averaged Score
1	3.0
2	2.7
3	2.3
4	3.0

3. Evaluator (or technology) applies domain weights to domain scores to calculate an overall Observation of Educator Performance and Practice rating of 1.0-4.0

Each of the domain ratings is equally weighed and summed to form one overall rating. Strong instruction and a positive classroom environment are major factors in improving student outcomes.

Steps 2 and 3 can be performed by district administrators and/or using tools/technology that can calculate the averages for the evaluator.

The summative Educator Performance and Practice category rating and the component ratings will be shared and discussed with educators during the End-of-Year Conference. This process can also be followed in advance of the Mid-Year Conference to discuss progress toward Educator Performance and Practice goals/outcomes.

Parent Feedback Scoring (10%)

The Parent Feedback rating should reflect the degree to which an educator successfully reaches his/her parent goal and improvement targets. There are two ways an educator can measure and demonstrate progress on their growth targets. Educators can (1) measure how successfully they implement a strategy to address an area of need and/or (2) they can collect evidence directly from parents to measure parent-level indicators they generate. This parent feedback rating shall be based on four performance levels. Rating calculations are accomplished through a review of evidence provided by the educator and application of the following scale:

Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Exceeded the goal	Met the goal	Partially met the goal	Did not meet the goal

Summative Scoring

The individual summative educator evaluation rating will be based on the four elements of performance, grouped into the two major focus categories resulting in two measures of performance identified as Student Outcomes Related Indicators and Educator Practice Related Indicators.

Every educator will receive one of four performance ratings, as defined below, as a summative rating:

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 rating will be determined using the following steps:

1. Calculate an Educator Practice Related Indicators score by combining the observation of educator performance and practice score and the parent feedback score
2. Calculate a Student Outcomes Related Indicators score by combining the student growth and development score and whole-school student learning indicator
3. Use Summative Matrix to determine Summative Rating

Each step is illustrated below:

1. Calculate an Educator Practice Related Indicators rating by combining the observation of educator performance and practice score and the parent feedback score.

The observation of educator performance and practice counts for 40% of the total rating and parent feedback counts for 10% of the total rating. Multiply these weights by the category

scores to get the category points, rounding to a whole number where necessary. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

Category	Score (1-4)	Weight	Points (score x weight)
Observation of Educator Performance and Practice	2.8	40	112
Parent Feedback	3	10	30
TOTAL EDUCATOR PRACTICE RELATED INDICATORS POINTS			142

Rating Table

Educator Practice Indicators Points	Educator Practice Indicators Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-124	Developing
125-174	Proficient
175-200	Exemplary

- Calculate a Student Outcomes Related Indicators rating by combining the student growth and development score and whole-school student learning indicator score. The student growth and development category counts for 45% of the total rating, and the whole-school student learning indicator category counts for 5% of the total rating. Multiply these weights by the category scores to get the focus area points. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

Category	Score (1-4)	Weight	Points (score x weight)
Student Growth and Development (SLOs)	3.5	45	158
Whole School Student Learning Indicator	3	5	15
TOTAL STUDENT OUTCOMES RELATED INDICATORS POINTS			173

Rating Table

Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points	Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-124	Developing
125-174	Proficient
175-200	Exemplary

- Use the Summative Matrix to determine Summative Rating as shown on the chart and described below:

Identify the rating for each focus area and follow the respective column and row to the center of the table. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. For the example provided, the

Educator Practice Related Indicators rating is *proficient* and the Student Outcomes Related Indicators rating is *proficient*. The summative rating is therefore *proficient*. If the two focus areas are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of *exemplary* for Educator Practice and a rating of *below standard* for Student Outcomes), then the evaluator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to make a summative rating. Such information gathering may require looking at reviews of practice, student data, determining if significant changes may have occurred in student population, or other such pieces of information impacting student growth and development. If, after such review, a revision in the educator’s SLOs or IAGDs becomes necessary, the educator and evaluator shall meet to determine such changes incorporating the Assistant Superintendent and/or Director of Human Resources in such meeting as appropriate. A summative rating must be given for all educators. The Summative Rating Matrix is shown below.

Summative Rating Matrix

		Educator Practice Related Indicators Rating <i>(Educator Performance and Practice 40% and Parent Feedback 10%)</i>			
		Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating <i>(Student Growth and Development (SLO) 45% and Whole School Student Learning 5%)</i>	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	Gather Further information	Below Standard
	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
	Developing	Proficient	Gather Further information	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	Gather Further information	Gather Further information	Below Standard	Below Standard

Adjustment of Summative Rating Summative ratings must be completed for all educators and submitted to Human Resources by June 15^h of a given school year. Should state standardized test data not be available at the time of a final rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available as noted above. An educator’s rating will not be amended positively or negatively as a result of late standardized test data, nor will a revised rating be reflected in the evaluation in the educator’s personnel file although the state Educator Evaluation Guidelines indicate that the ratings may be revised prior to September 15th if the state assessment data may have a significant impact on the final rating.

Educator Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness Determination Process


Categorical and summative scoring processes guide evaluators in determining the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of educators. The following details and figures offer several examples/scenarios that reflect the defined process to determine effectiveness and ineffectiveness during the year and over the course of multiple years, as appropriate, for non-tenured and tenured educators.

*** Please note that these figures and descriptions are meant to be examples, and as such, may not describe all of the possible nuances in specific, individual situations.*

Non-Tenured Educators


Non-tenured educators shall generally be deemed effective, and therefore, eligible for tenure, if said educator receives at least two sequential summative ratings of proficient or exemplary, which should be earned in the third and fourth year of a non-tenured educator’s career. See Fig. 1 below.

Fig. 1



A *below standard* summative rating may be permitted, but only in the first year of a non-tenured educator’s career, assuming a pattern of growth of at least *developing* in year two and two sequential *proficient* ratings in years three and four. The Superintendent may offer a contract to any educator he/she deems effective at the end of year four. See Fig. 2 below.


Fig.2



***Please note: A non-tenured educator is not guaranteed a continued position with a below standard rating even in the first year. The Superintendent may choose not to renew a non-tenured educator’s contract at any point in time if said educator receives a rating of developing or below standard. This clause would be enacted based on the determination that the said educator does not possess the potential for excellence.*

In the case of a “fast-track” non-tenured, but formerly tenured educator, defined as an educator entering East Hartford Public Schools from another district at which tenure was previously achieved and who was employed by a district within the previous five years, the Superintendent may non-renew the educator should it be anticipated that either a *below standard* or *developing* summative rating will be assigned in the first year of service based on observed performance - based on the determination that said educator does not possess the potential for excellence. See Fig. 3.


Fig. 3



Tenured Educators


A tenured educator shall generally be deemed effective if said educator maintains a summative rating of *proficient* or *exemplary*. A tenured educator shall generally be deemed ineffective if said educator receives two sequential *developing* or *below standard* ratings. Immediately after, Informal Support will be put into place, followed by Guided Support and Supervisory Review, if deemed necessary. At the end of the support phase process, a recommendation for continued employment or termination will be made to the Superintendent. See Fig. 4 below.

Fig. 4



A tenured educator shall also generally be deemed ineffective if said educator receives at least two sequential *below standard* observation ratings throughout the year or a final *below standard* year end rating. After the first *below standard* observation rating, informal support will be provided. At the culmination of this process that includes informal support, Guided Support and Supervisory Review, a recommendation for termination will be made to the Superintendent. See Fig. 5 below.

Fig.5



**Please note that two evaluators must evaluate an educator through either formal or informal observations to ensure calibration of the developing or below standard observation. Also note that the situations above ending in termination presume that the said educator has not made adequate progress after the provision of informal and/or formal support.*

SECTION IV: IMPROVEMENT AND REMEDIATION PLANS

The East Hartford Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Plan provides tenured educators with the support and opportunity for improvement when observed or summative practice is deemed *developing* or *below standard*. If, after the provision of informal support, a tenured educator has not been rated *proficient* as described previously, formal support will be provided.

Informal Support

If an educator's observational performance is rated by either formal or informal observations as *developing* or *below standard*, this performance may signal the need for the administrator and educator to implement an informal support process. Informal support may be provided to both non-tenured and tenured educators, as appropriate, but must be provided to a tenured educator prior to placing the educator on Guided Support. The informal support plan should be developed in collaboration with the educator. Support may include the following:

- resources, support and other strategies to be provided to address documented, observed deficiencies, and
- a timeline for implementing such resources, support and other strategies.

Guided Support

The Guided Support Phase of the East Hartford Evaluation Plan is designed for tenured educators who have not demonstrated proficiency in implementing the district's curriculum and standards, instructional practices, assessment procedures, classroom management strategies, and /or professional goals. This phase will focus on those specific areas where the educator has not demonstrated proficiency, recognizing that for the educator to be successful in meeting the expectations of the district, strong support must be provided.

***Please note that if an observed educator performance identifies significant or severe concerns pertaining to student safety or educator ethical deficiencies, the said educator will move directly to guided support or disciplinary action leading to termination.*

For an educator to move to Guided Support, the following conditions must be met:

- A pattern (more than one) of observations, formal and/or informal, reveals the educator's observational performance as either *developing* or *below standard*. One of these evaluations must be conducted by a complementary evaluator to ensure calibration on the performance evaluation.
- Evidence of informal support, based on identified deficiencies, provided by the evaluator as described above.

Once an educator is placed in this Guided Support Phase, an assistance plan will be developed to address the specific areas of concern. Educators who enter this phase will need to demonstrate measurable progress in meeting the goals defined and outlined in the assistance plan within a specified period of time. Additionally, educators must receive an overall rating of *proficient* in observed performance in order to return to the regular evaluation plan process.

Due to the serious implications of the Guided Support process, the East Hartford Education Association (EHEA) will be invited to participate in the Guided Support meetings. All phases of the

Guided Support process will be monitored by the Assistant Superintendent and the Director of Human Resources. The Guided Support process will be limited to implementation of a single cycle. The Superintendent of Schools will be informed of all Guided Support procedures. The evaluator will provide bi-weekly written reports, which include copies of all formal observation reports, to the Superintendent as part of this process.

The Assistant Superintendent of Schools will participate in the conference to establish the Action Plan and will receive copies of all documents and summaries of all conferences. The following procedures and timetables will be regarded as district guidelines:

Guided Support Phase Timetable	Procedure
<p>At any time during the evaluation cycle following a pattern of <i>developing</i> or <i>below standard</i> observations and evidence of informal support</p>	<p>Evaluator will document that the educator is having ongoing, serious difficulty in meeting expectations in implementing the district’s curriculum and standards, instructional practices, assessment procedures, classroom management strategies or professional responsibilities. The evaluator will provide documentation of support provided in response to each area of concern.</p> <p>A Guided Support team, consisting of the educator, the evaluator, an EHEA representative and the Assistant Superintendent will meet at the initial meeting, to review the Guided Support implementation plan. Appropriate documentation will be reviewed and an action plan with a timeline of 60 days will be developed. This plan will include, but not be limited to, assistance from other sources, such as a principal, department head, curriculum supervisor, or peer mentor. Peer observation or professional development, including workshops, may also be warranted. A clearly defined improvement plan will be developed which will also identify specific areas of support. The pattern of observations identified below will serve to monitor the educator’s progress as the support plan is implemented.</p> <p>The Assistant Superintendent and the Director of Human Resources will monitor the process.</p>
<p>By the 10th school day</p>	<p>The evaluator will conduct a formal observation with a pre- and post-conference using the appropriate documents.</p>
<p>By the 30th school day</p>	<p>The evaluator will conduct a 2nd formal observation with a pre- and post-conference using the appropriate documents.</p>
<p>By the 45th school day</p>	<p>The evaluator will conduct a 3rd formal observation with a pre- and post-conference using the appropriate documents.</p>
<p>By the 60th school day</p>	<p>The Guided Support team will meet to address compliance with the action plan and to determine if appropriate progress has been made. If the educator has not addressed the area(s) of deficiency or demonstrated the needed improvement, a determination must be made for placement on Supervisory Review.</p>

Educators must receive an overall rating of *proficient* in observed performance during the Guided Support timeline in order to return to the regular evaluation plan cycle. When the timeline has expired, the evaluator will complete a final evaluation report which includes a recommendation to return the educator to the general evaluation plan as identified by the rating on the charts above or to place the tenured educator on the Supervisory Review Phase of the Educator Evaluation Plan. A copy of the final report, including copies of observation reports, will be sent to the Superintendent of Schools.

Supervisory Review

Based on evidence gathered during the Guided Support Phase of the Educator Evaluation Plan, an evaluator may determine that there has been insufficient improvement in an educator’s performance following the additional assistance given to help the educator meet the expectations of the district. The evaluator will notify the Superintendent of Schools that the educator is being recommended for Supervisory Review. Placement on Supervisory Review will be determined by the Superintendent.

Because of the serious implications of the Supervisory Review process, the East Hartford Education Association may participate in the Supervisory Review meetings. All phases of the Supervisory Review process will be monitored by the Assistant Superintendent and the Director of Human Resources. The Superintendent of Schools will be informed of all Supervisory Review procedures. The evaluator will provide bi-weekly written reports, which include copies of all formal observation reports, to the Superintendent as part of this process.

The following procedures and timetables will be regarded as district guidelines:

Supervisory Review Timetable	Procedure
At time of placement	<p>The evaluator will hold an initial placement conference with the educator to complete the steps identified below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify specific area(s) of concern 2. Identify improvement necessary to be returned to evaluation cycle 3. Review and define timelines <p>A summary of this meeting will be sent to the Superintendent of Schools, Assistant Superintendent and the Director of Human Resources. The pattern of observations identified below will serve to monitor the educator’s progress as the support plan is implemented.</p> <p>The Assistant Superintendent and the Director of Human Resources will monitor this process.</p>
By the 10 th school day following placement:	Evaluator will conduct at least one formal observation with a pre-and post-conference and review the progress toward resolving specific area(s) of concern.
By the 20 th school day following placement:	Evaluator will conduct at least a second formal observation with a pre-and post-conference and review the progress toward resolving specific area(s) of concern.
By the 30 th school day following placement:	Evaluator will conduct at least a third formal observation with a pre-and post-conference and review the progress toward

	resolving specific area(s) of concern.
By the 40 th school day following placement	Evaluator will conduct at least a fourth formal observation with a pre-and post-conference and review the progress toward resolving specific area(s) of concern.
By the 50 th school day following placement	Evaluator will conduct at least a fifth formal observation with a pre-and post-conference and review the progress toward resolving specific area(s) of concern.
Prior to the 60 th school day following placement:	Evaluator will submit a summary report to the Superintendent of Schools and recommend removal from Supervisory Review or termination.

Educators must receive an overall rating of *proficient* during the Guided Support phase in order to return to the regular evaluation plan process as outlined above. Within one week of the submission of the report to the Superintendent, the educator will be notified in writing of the decision of the Superintendent based on the evaluator’s recommendations. If a decision for continued employment is rendered, the educator will return to the appropriate phase of the evaluation cycle as identified by the rating on the charts above. If a decision for termination is rendered, the Superintendent will present the name of the educator to the Board of Education.

Under no circumstances will an educator remain on Supervisory Review for more than one cycle.

Copies of all written reports will be shared among the educator, evaluator, Director of Human Resources, Assistant Superintendent and Superintendent. Each person may attach written comments to any reports or other written materials.

SECTION V: DISPUTE-RESOLUTION PROCESS

During the initial goal setting process for SLOs, IAGDs, educator practice goals and parent feedback goals related to the district climate survey at the beginning of the year, at the mid-year conference discussion of SLOs and IAGDs, or at the end of year summative rating review, it is possible that an evaluator and an educator being evaluated may not agree on one or more of the following:

- Mutually acceptable professional growth goals related to the appropriate CCT Domains
- Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) including percentage growth measures in the Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs), the evaluative measures, baseline, selection of students, and data to be used;
- the parent feedback goals related to the district climate survey; or
- the final summative evaluation rating;

If agreement cannot be reached between an educator and an evaluator, a building level resolution to this disagreement should be sought from the building level administration, including the principal if the principal is not the primary evaluator, as appropriate, prior to engaging in the Dispute Resolution Process. Should the need remain, the educator and evaluator will notify the Human Resources office that the Dispute Resolution Process will be required to resolve the issue.

A panel of four, composed of two administration representatives, which may include, but are not limited to central office staff, such as the Director of Human Resources, Assistant Superintendent or designee, and an administrator, and two union representatives, which may include, but are not limited to a PD/TEval committee member and the union president or designee, shall resolve disputes where the evaluator and educator cannot agree on objectives/goals, the evaluation period, feedback on performance and practice, or final summative rating. This process shall occur in the course of the work day. No member of the panel shall be from the school originating the conflict. The dispute resolution process shall not apply to the Guided Support or Supervisory Review processes.

The following procedural guidelines apply to the dispute resolution process:

- If an educator and evaluator cannot agree, they will submit the following materials to the Assistant Superintendent and/or Director of Human Resources within 7 school days after the declaration of the conflict:
 - A mutually written, signed and dated statement outlining the areas of agreement and disagreement signed by both parties; or
 - Two separately written, signed and dated statements presenting the individual positions of agreement and disagreement by each party.
- The recipient of the statement(s) will request that the Dispute Resolution Panel meet within 5 school days after receipt of the materials.
- The panel may request additional information in writing or by interview for the purpose of clarifying the issues presented in the written documentation.
- The panel may resolve the issue by selecting either position or by creating a compromise.
- The panel will render a decision and rationale in writing within 5 school days of its initial meeting. The decision is final and binding for both parties. If the panel cannot reach a unanimous resolution, the conflict will be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools for the final, binding resolution.

SECTION VI: CONCLUSION

When administrators and educators work together with the interest of students in mind, the result is a fair, comprehensive plan that will provide the tools for professional growth, development and support. The mission of the East Hartford Public Schools focuses on partnerships to support the growth and success of every student. This plan promotes a partnership between administrators and educators that was evidenced in the positive collaboration among the committee members that resulted in this document. Educators from all levels, both administrators and teachers, shared open communication around the common goal of promoting excellence through professional development and professional accountability and will continue to promote future collaboration.

The on-going implementation of this plan will include an annual orientation for new educators, as well as an annual review of the evaluation process for current educators, in order to assure that educators and administrators continue to work together collaboratively on student achievement and professional growth. This program will include opportunities to use professional development days, early release days, and school, team and grade level meeting time for educators and administrators to develop and refine goals, create group and individual professional growth and development plans, and deepen a common understanding of effective instruction through shared experiences, such as Instructional Rounds, and calibration sessions.


Appendix A: Educator Practice Domains (CCT 2014)

The Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT) standards serve as the basis for Domains for Educator Evaluation and Support, which represents the most important skills and knowledge that educators need to successfully educate every one of their students. This set of standards is organized into six domains, each with several components, integrated into five areas for evaluating educator practice. (See the following pages and SEED website: <http://www.connecticutseed.org/>)

A link to the CCT Smart Card and Rubric is shown below:

- **CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014:**
[http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching-May 2014.pdf](http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/CCT_Rubric_for_Effective_Teaching-May_2014.pdf)

CCT RUBRIC FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING 2014 – AT A GLANCE



Appendix B: Service Providers Domains (CCT 2014)

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) has created additional rubrics based on the Educator Practice Domains for use in evaluating non-classroom based educator practice. There are specific rubrics for classroom educators and non-classroom educators as provided. A link to the CT SEED website for the Service Providers' Smart Card is shown below:

http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/SERVICE_PROVIDERS_CCT_SMARTCARD_9-19-13.pdf

A link to the CT SEED website for the full SERVICE PROVIDERS rubric is shown below:

http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/SERVICE_PROVIDERS_CCT_Rubric_9-19-13.pdf

For clarification on the roles and responsibilities for Student Educator Support Specialists (SERVICE PROVIDERS) and to see sample SLOs or IAGDs connected to different SERVICE PROVIDERS roles, refer to the links below:

SERVICE PROVIDERS Personnel	Links to Roles & Responsibilities with Sample SLOs & IAGDs
Special Education/Resource Teacher	http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Special_Education_Teacher_SERVICE_PROVIDERS_9-19-13.pdf
School Psychologist	http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/School_Psychologist_SERVICE_PROVIDERS_9-19-13.pdf
Social Worker	http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/School_Social_Worker_SERVICE_PROVIDERS_9-19-13.pdf
Guidance/School Counselor	http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Comprehensive_School_Counselors_SERVICE_PROVIDERS_DRAFT_white_paper_9-19-13.pdf
Nurse	http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/School_Nurses_SERVICE_PROVIDERS_-9-19-13.pdf
Speech and Language Pathologist	http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Speech_Language_Pathologist_SERVICE_PROVIDERS_9-19-13.pdf
Occupational/Physical Therapist	
Literacy/Math Coach/Literacy Coordinator	http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Math_and_ELA_Coach_SERVICE_PROVIDERS_9-19-13.pdf

Library Media Specialist	http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Library_Media_Specialists_SERVICE_PROVIDERS_12-13-13.pdf
Transition Coordinator	http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Transition_Coordinator_SERVICE_PROVIDERS_9-19-13.pdf
Technology Coach	
ELL/World Language Teacher	http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/ELL_World_Lang_SERVICE_PROVIDERS_1-3-14.pdf

CCT Instrument for Observation of SERVICE PROVIDERS Performance and Practice

The CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2014 – AT A GLANCE

Evidence Generally Collected Through Observations	Evidence Generally Collected Through Non-Classroom/Reviews of Practice
<p>Domain 1 Learning Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning <i>Service providers promote student engagement, independence and interdependence in learning and facilitate a positive learning community by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1a. Promoting a positive learning environment that is respectful and equitable. 1b. Promoting developmentally appropriate standards of behavior that support a productive learning environment for all students. 1c. Maximizing service delivery by effectively managing routines and transitions. 	<p>Domain 2 Planning for Active Learning <i>Service providers plan prevention/intervention to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2a. Planning prevention/intervention that is aligned with standards, builds on students' prior knowledge and provides for appropriate level of challenge for all students. 2b. Planning prevention/intervention to actively engage students in the content. 2c. Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to monitor student progress.
<p>Domain 3 Service Delivery <i>Service providers implement prevention/intervention to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3a. Implementing service delivery for learning. 3b. Leading students to construct meaning and apply new learning through the use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies. 3c. Assessing student learning, providing feedback to students and adjusting service delivery. 	<p>Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities and Leadership <i>Service providers maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration and leadership by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4a. Engaging in continuous professional learning to impact service delivery and student learning. 4b. Collaborating to develop and sustain a professional learning environment to support student learning. 4c. Working with colleagues, students and families to develop and sustain a positive school climate that supports student learning.

Appendix C: Template for Setting SMART Goals – IAGDs for SLOs

The SMART goal-setting process ensures that every goal is measurable and clear. This process is beneficial in establishing IAGDs that create attainable measures for SLOs. The advantages of the SMART goal-setting process are listed below:

- Provides a structured approach to a complex task;
- Gives a clear framework for creating meaningful and achievable goals;
- Accommodates all kinds of goals;
- Is easy to teach others how to develop;
- Helps to define goals in terms that can be widely understood; and
- Requires thinking through the implementation as well as the outcome.

The characteristics of SMART goals are:

- **Specific and Strategic**
 - The goal should be well defined enough that anyone with limited knowledge of your intent should understand what is to be accomplished.
- **Measurable**
 - Goals need to be linked to some form of a common measure that can be used as a way to track progress toward achieving the goal.
- **Aligned and Attainable**
 - The goal must strike the right balance between being attainable and aligned to standards but lofty enough to impact the desired change.
- **Results-Oriented**
 - All goals should be stated as an outcome or result.
- **Time-Bound**
 - The time frame for achieving the goal must be clear and realistic.

SMART goals Dos and Don'ts

DO:

Create a plan
Start small
Write it down
Be specific
Track your progress
Celebrate your success
Ask for support sooner than later
Make commitments

DON'T:

Expect to accomplish without effort
Focus on too much at once
Forget to make a deadline
Deal in absolutes
Expect perfection
Keep your goal on a shelf
Beat yourself up over shortcomings
Try to accomplish it alone
Forget that you CAN DO IT!

See tables on the following pages for sample SLOs and IAGDs as well as links to the CT SEED website for additional samples by subject/category.

Sample SLOs

Educator Category	Student Learning Objective
8th Grade Science	My students will master critical concepts of science inquiry.
High School Visual Arts	My students will demonstrate proficiency in applying the five principles of drawing.

Below are some examples of indicators that might be applied to the previous SLO examples:

Sample SLO with Standardized IAGD(s)

Educator Category	Student Learning Objective	Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (<i>at least one is required</i>)
8th Grade Science	My students will master critical concepts of science inquiry.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 78% of my students will score at the proficient or higher level on the science CMT in March 2014. 85% of my students will score at the proficient level on the district inquiry CBA.

Sample SLO with Non-Standardized IAGD(s)

Educator Category	Student Learning Objective	Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (<i>at least one is required</i>)
8 th Grade Science	My students will master critical concepts of science inquiry.	1. My students will design an experiment that incorporates the key principles of science inquiry. 90% will score a 3 or 4 on a scoring rubric focused on the key elements of science inquiry.
High School Visual Arts	My students will demonstrate proficiency in applying the five principles of drawing.	1. 85% of students will attain a 3 or 4 in at least 4 of 5 categories on the principles of drawing rubric designed by visual arts educators in our district.

Additional SLO samples: http://www.connecticutseed.org/?page_id=2017#samples

Teacher SLO Development Guide: http://www.connecticutseed.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/SLO_checklist_simple_rubric.doc

Appendix D: East Hartford Public Schools' Parent Survey

Appendix E: Connecticut’s Measures of Student Academic Learning

Measure	Definition
School Performance Index (SPI)	The SPI is a measure of student achievement on Connecticut’s standardized assessments – the Smarter Balanced (SB) Test, beginning 2014-15, CMT (science) and CAPT science). For each subject tested – mathematics, reading, writing and science – Connecticut reports performance for five achievement levels: Below Basic (BB), Basic (B), Proficient (P), Goal (G) and Advanced (A). For each student, the state calculates an Individual Performance Index (IPI), which represents performance across all tested subjects. The SPI is a compilation of the IPIs for all students in a school. The result is an index score ranging from 0 to 100, where 0 indicates that all students scored at the Below Basic level across all subjects and 100 indicates that all students scored at the Goal or Advanced level.
Smarter Balanced Test	The SB test is the standard content areas assessment administered to students in grades 3-8 and 11. Students are assessed in the content areas of reading, mathematics and writing in each of these grades.
Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) Science	The CMT Science is the standard content area assessments administered to students in Grades 5 and 8.
Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT) Science	The CAPT Science is the standard content area assessment administered to students in Grade 10.
Subgroups	ELLs, students with disabilities, black students, Hispanic students and students eligible for free or reduced price lunch.

Appendix F: SPI Scoring and Sample Ratings

Scoring:

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

	Target (4)	Target (3)	Target (2)	Target (1)
SPI Progress	>125% of target progress	100-125% of target progress	50-99% of target progress	<50% of target progress
Subgroup SPI Progress	Meets performance targets for all subgroups that have SPI <88 OR all subgroups have SPI > 88 OR The school does not have any subgroups of sufficient size	Meets performance targets for 50% or more of subgroups that have SPI <88	Meets performance targets for at least one sub-group that has SPI <88	Does not meet performance target for any subgroup that has SPI <88
SPI Rating	89-100	77-88	64-76	< 64
SPI Rating for Subgroups	The gap between the “all students” group and each subgroup is <10 SPI points or all subgroups have SPI > 88 OR The school has no subgroups	The gap between the “all students” group and 50% or more of subgroups is <10 SPI points	The gap between the “all students” group and at least one subgroup is >10 SPI points.	The gap between the “all students” group and all subgroups is >10 SPI points.

Step 2: Scores are weighted to emphasize improvement in schools below the State’s SPI target of 88 and to emphasize subgroup progress and performance in schools above the target. The weights are presented in the table below:

	SPI >88	SPI between 88 and 64	SPI <64
School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year	10%	50%	50%
SPI progress for student subgroups	40%	50%	50%
SPI rating	10%	0%	0%
SPI rating for student subgroups	40%	0%	0%

*For schools with no subgroups: 50% on SPI progress, 50% on SPI rating

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

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
>3.5	Between 2.5 and 3.5	Between 1.5 and 2.4	Less than 1.5

Sample Ratings:

A SCHOOL WITH AN SPI GREATER THAN 88:

Measure	Score Description	Score	Weight	Summary Score
School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year	No target because of high performance	4	0.1	0.4
SPI progress for student subgroups	Meets target for 3 of 4 subgroups	3	0.4	1.2
SPI rating	90	4	0.1	0.4
SPI rating for student subgroups	Gap between the “all students” group and one subgroup is 12	2	0.4	0.8
Score:				2.8
Rating:				Proficient

A SCHOOL WITH AN SPI BETWEEN 88 AND 64:

Measure	Raw Score	Scale Score	Weight	Summary Score
School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year	Meets target	3	0.5	1.5
SPI progress for student subgroups	Meets target for 4 out of 5 subgroups	3	0.5	1.5
SPI rating	75	2	0	0
SPI rating for student subgroups	Gap between the “all students” group and all subgroups is <10	4	0	0
Score:				3
Rating:				Proficient

A SCHOOL WITH AN SPI < 64:

Measure	Raw Score	Scale Score	Weight	Summary Score
School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year	Meets target	3	0.5	1.5
SPI progress for student subgroups	Meets target for 2 of 3 subgroups	3	0.5	1.5
SPI rating	60	1	0	0
SPI rating for student subgroups	Gap between the “all students” group and one subgroup is 11	1	0	0
Score:				3
Rating:				Proficient

Appendix G: Evaluation-Based Professional Learning


Professional learning supports the continuous growth and development of educators and leads to improvements in student achievement. Understanding the connection between professional growth and educator practice, every educator will identify his/her professional learning needs in mutual agreement with his/her evaluator. This Professional Development/TEval (PD/TEval) Plan will serve as the foundation for ongoing, honest conversations about the educator's practice and impact on student outcomes, allow educators to set clear goals for future performance, and outline the supports needed to meet those goals. The professional learning opportunities identified for each educator must be based on the individual strengths and needs identified through the evaluation process. The process may also reveal areas of common needs among educators which can then be addressed with school-wide professional development opportunities.

The district's PD/TEval Committee is intended to ensure the alignment of professional development to educator practice needs and district, school and department goals. Membership in the committee includes district and school level administrators and educators, as well as representatives from the appropriate exclusive bargaining unit, as required by statute. The committee will meet to discuss the needs of educators as a whole and individually as described below:

1. The PD/TEval Committee will explore professional learning opportunities to target district level, school level, and individual/team level professional development needs. Based on data collected, the PD/TEval Committee will make recommendations regarding distribution of available professional development time and resources to address all 3 tiers of professional development needs:
 - District level professional development
 - School level professional development
 - Individual/team level professional development

The PD/TEval Committee will identify evaluation and development needs, taking into account hours needed for educators to work on goals directly related to their evaluation plan. The committee will develop an annual plan based on input from building principals, department heads/supervisors certified staff, and central administration that takes into account school-based, district-based and individual educator professional growth needs. This plan also takes career growth and teacher leadership opportunities into account. See Fig. 1 below:



Fig 1: Timeline/Cycle of the Professional Development Annual Process




2. Based on the allocated hours for school and individual needs, administrators will work with the PD/TEval Committee to determine how to distribute the time required for educators to participate in both school and individual professional learning opportunities. Administrators can also use data from the growth plans and school improvement plans to develop school-wide professional development opportunities to address areas of common need. Part of the professional development schedule will also include sharing educator evaluation materials, discussion of the evaluation process and an opportunity to discuss the materials and expectations in order to ensure understanding as educators seek to develop their Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and their Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs).
3. Exemplary and proficient educators, as determined by the East Hartford PD/TEval Plan, will be invited to create proposals for approval by the PD/TEval Committee to implement for peers at district or school-based professional development Service Providers on a designated “Day of Choice” or for other opportunities as appropriate. Furthermore, such teachers may be invited to serve as coaches or mentors for other educators for implementation or improvement support. Such opportunities enhance career growth opportunities for teacher leaders in alignment with district and school improvement plans.

Appendix H: TalentEd Forms


Appendix I: East Hartford’s Professional Development Staff Survey Results (Spring, 2015)



Professional Development is worth my time to attend.




Professional Development increased my effectiveness with students.





Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan



EAST HARTFORD BOARD OF EDUCATION

Bryan R. Hall, Chairman

Tyron V. Harris, Secretary

Shelby Brown

Christopher M. Gentile

Marilyn S. Pet

Dorese Roberts

Tom Rup

Valerie B. Scheer

Stephanie K. Watkins

SUPERINTENDENT

Nathan D. Quesnel

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS

Anne Marie Mancini

Cynthia Ritchie

EAST HARTFORD ADMINISTRATIVE EVALUATION DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Nathan D. Quesnel, Superintendent of Schools

Cynthia Ritchie, Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Schools

Anne Marie Mancini, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Schools

Gregory T. Fox, Thomas S. O'Connell Elementary School, Principal

Tod J. Kenney, Secondary Supervisor of Mathematics

Joseph H. LeRoy, East Hartford High School, Assistant Principal

Michelle Marion, East Hartford High School, Assistant Principal

Craig M. Outhouse, Synergy Alternative High School, Principal

Jennifer Hills-Papetti, Gov. W. Pitkin Elementary School, Principal


Christopher T. Wethje, Director of Human Resources

Laura A. White, K-12 Supervisor of Fine & Performing Arts

Aligned to the State of Connecticut Department of Education, East Hartford Public Schools is committed to a policy of equal opportunity/affirmative action for all qualified persons. East Hartford Public Schools does not discriminate in any employment practice, education program, or educational activity on the basis of race, color, religious creed, sex, age, national origin, ancestry, marital status, sexual orientation, disability (including, but not limited to, mental retardation, past or present history of mental disability, physical disability or learning disability), genetic information, or any other basis prohibited by Connecticut state and/or federal nondiscrimination laws. East Hartford Public Schools does not unlawfully discriminate in employment and licensing against qualified persons with a prior criminal conviction. Inquiries regarding the East Hartford Public Schools' nondiscrimination policies should be directed to East Hartford Public Schools (EHPS) Human Resources Department.

DISTRICT VISION:

The mission of East Hartford Public Schools is to deliver a high quality learning experience for *EVERY CHILD, EVERY DAY.*



DISTRICT CORE BELIEFS: WE BELIEVE

<i>Expectations Matter:</i>	We believe our expectations set the bar for performance throughout all district levels. We expect all children to reach their fullest potential as learners and achieve career or college readiness. We achieve our expectations through a commitment to goal setting, high level adult performance, relentless support and continual adherence to system wide accountability.
<i>Effort Matters:</i>	We believe as leaders, our effort sets the tone, concept and work ethic of the district. We demonstrate effort through our daily actions, our willingness to solve problems and our relentless commitment to excellence.
<i>Competence Matters:</i>	We believe as leaders, our personal level of expertise is a relative concept that must continually grow and improve. We are committed to personal growth, to challenging our areas of current weakness and to emphasizing our current areas of comfort and strength. We model for our district what it means to be life long, committed and growing learners.
<i>Solutions Matter:</i>	We believe as leaders, our approach to all challenges must be a solution based mindset. We demonstrate this approach by addressing all challenges with optimism, creativity and an insistence that a solution is available to us. We model this approach to our district by refusing to complain, by refusing to give up and by always being willing to take another look.
<i>Relationships Matter:</i>	We believe that the relationships we share with each other, within our departments and within the district make the difference in getting the results we want. We model strong relationships based on honesty, loyalty and a commitment to working together.
<i>Results Matter:</i>	We believe that our success as a team and our success as individuals are measured by tangible results. We demonstrate this belief by knowing our current level of performance, setting realistic goals and holding ourselves accountable on a regular basis to these goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DISTRICT VISION	4
DISTRICT CORE BELIEFS: WE BELIEVE	4
SECTION I: INTRODUCTION TO THE ADMINISTRATION EVALUATION MODEL	7
Executive Summary	8
Core Design Principles	9
SECTION II: KEY ELEMENTS OF THE MODEL	10
Evaluation-Based Professional Learning	10
Career Development and Professional Growth	10
Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing	10
Administrator Evaluation Process and Timeline	11
Goal Setting Process/Conference	12
Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness:	13
SECTION III: OVERVIEW OF THE MODEL: THE FOUR CATEGORIES OF ADMINISTRATOR EFFECTIVENESS	16
The Model's Four Categories	16
Category #1: Leadership practice	17
Performance Expectations	17
Weighting Determination Process Steps	18
Rating System for Leadership Practice	18
Category #2: Stakeholder Feedback	19
Stakeholders Defined	19
Category #3: Student Learning	19
Descriptors of State Measures of Academic Learning	20
Locally-Determined Measures	20
SLO Selection Process Steps	22
Category #4: Teacher Effectiveness	25
SECTION IV: THE ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION PROCESS	26
Overview of the Process	26
School year: Plan implementation and evidence collection	26
Step 1: Orientation and Context-Setting	26
Step 2: Goal-Setting and Plan Development	27
Step 3: Plan Implementation and Evidence Collection Observations	30
Observation Frequency/Assignment	30

Step 4: Feedback.....	31
Step 5: Mid-Year Formative Review.....	31
Step 6: Self-Assessment.....	32
Step 7: Summative Review and Rating.....	32
SECTION V: DETERMINING SUMMATIVE RATING	33
Determining Summative Ratings.....	34
Leadership Practice Indicator Evaluation Guide.....	36
Survey Administration Process Steps.....	36
Stakeholder Feedback Summative Rating Process Steps.....	37
Student Learning Rating Calculation Process Steps.....	38
SECTION VI: IMPROVEMENT AND REMEDIATION PLANS.....	41
Supervisory Review	41
SECTION VII: DISPUTE-RESOLUTION PROCESS	43
Dispute Resolution Process	43
SECTION VIII: CONCLUSION.....	43
SECTION IX: APPENDICES.....	45
Appendix A: The Role of the Professional Development/Teacher Evaluation Committee.....	46
Appendix B: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.....	45
Appendix C: Connecticut Administrator Evaluation/Sample Summative Rating Form.....	51
Appendix D: Survey Selection for Stakeholder Feedback.....	55
Appendix E: Connecticut’s Measures of Student Academic Learning.....	58
Appendix F: Sample State Assessment Ratings	59
Appendix G: The Relationship between SPI and SLO	60
Appendix H: Leader Evaluation Rubric.....	61
Appendix I: Examples of Evidence for Leader Evaluation Rubric.....	83
ADDENDUM: 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 SCHOOL YEAR	88



SECTION I: INTRODUCTION TO THE ADMINISTRATION EVALUATION MODEL

"All leadership is influence"
-Anonymous

East Hartford Public Schools believes that a quality leader is the single most influential force in the development of high quality schools. In accordance with this belief, this evaluation plan centers on the core principles of accountability and support in the growth and development of all district administrators.

This East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan was developed through a year-long process of collaboration between and among building administrators and central office administration. Informed by the Connecticut SEED (System for Educator Evaluation and Development) template during the 2012-13 academic year, this committee was focused on developing a plan that is, first and foremost, fair, celebrates great leadership, provides system-wide accountability and that details systems for support as needed. While the committee acknowledges that this document will continue to be refined and improved through implementation, it is the hope that it will serve as a guiding standard for all administrators in the years to come. Understanding that a major goal of the educational process is to develop the capacity of the students to become successful life-long learners, this plan focuses on the growth and development of administrators as learners and implementers of educational strategies to support teachers and students.

The East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation plan contains several key elements designed to underscore and operationalize the concepts of accountable professional growth. Administrator professional development and evaluation are two of the key elements in the development of an effective system that supports school improvement. In an effort to enhance a strong alignment between professional development and leadership practice, the evaluation model described in this plan outlines the steps East Hartford Public Schools will take in collaboration with district administrators to enact this system, including professional learning, evaluation of practice, assessment of student achievement, and administrator support and improvement.

East Hartford Public Schools and the East Hartford Educational Administrative and Supervisory Unit (EHEASU) collaboratively reserve the right to make adjustments, as needed, to improve the administrator evaluation process. Any modifications to the evaluation model will be shared with the East Hartford Board of Education. East Hartford Public Schools will make changes only after reviewing the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) updated revisions.

Executive Summary

This handbook outlines the district model for the evaluation of district administrators in East Hartford. It provides the reader with the plan, process guide and the tools to facilitate the evaluative process. In addition, the appendices provide examples, rubrics and various documents that may also assist in the process. A robust administrator evaluation system is a powerful means to develop a shared understanding of leadership effectiveness for all East Hartford administrators. The East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan defines administrator effectiveness in the following terms:

- administrator practice (the actions taken by administrators that have been shown to impact key aspects of school life);
- the results that come from leadership (teacher effectiveness and student achievement); and
- the perceptions of the administrators’ leadership among key stakeholders in their community.

East Hartford’s model describes four levels of performance for administrators and focuses on the practices and outcomes of **Proficient** administrators. These administrators can be characterized as proficient due to their success in three areas: leadership practice, stakeholder feedback, and results specifically noted by:

Leadership Practice	Stakeholder Feedback	Results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting expectations as an instructional leader (Performance Expectation #2) • Meeting expectations in at least three additional Performance Expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting one target related to stakeholder feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting state accountability growth targets on tests of core academic subjects • Meeting and making progress on a minimum of two student learning objectives (SLO) aligned to school and district priorities • Having more than 60% of teachers proficient on the student growth portion of their evaluation

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

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

The model was adapted from the Connecticut’s System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED) that was presented to local districts for school year 2012-2013 from the

CSDE. It is built on both research on principal evaluation and the practice of states across the country and within Connecticut. The model meets all of the requirements for the evaluation of practicing 092 certificate holders outlined in the Connecticut General Statutes and Connecticut State Board of Education regulations.

Core Design Principles

The East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan contains four core design principles that will serve as founding cornerstones for all evaluative practice throughout the district.

- 1. Focus on what matters most:** The plan specifies four areas of administrator performance as important to evaluation – student learning (45%), administrator practice (40%), stakeholder feedback (10%), and teacher effectiveness (5%). Since the first two categories make up 85% of an administrator’s evaluation, the bulk of the model design focuses on specifying these two categories. In addition, some aspects of administrator practice – most notably instructional leadership – have a bigger influence on student success, and therefore, demand increased focus and weight in the evaluation model.
- 2. Emphasize growth over time:** The evaluation of an individual’s performance should primarily be about their improvement from an established starting point. This applies to their professional practice focus areas and the outcomes they are striving to reach. Attaining high levels of performance matters – and for some administrators, maintaining high results is a critical aspect of their work – but the model should encourage administrators to pay attention to continually improving their practice.
- 3. Leave room for judgment:** In the quest for accuracy of ratings, there is a tendency to focus exclusively on the numbers. However, of equal importance to getting better results is the professional conversation between an administrator and his/her supervisor that can be accomplished through a well-designed and well-executed evaluation system which includes a dispute resolution protocol (agreed upon between East Hartford Public Schools and the EHEASU). So, the model requires evaluators to observe the practice of administrators enough to make informed judgments about the quality and efficacy of practice.
- 4. Consider implementation at least as much as design:** East Hartford Public Schools will continually review the evaluation plan and implementation to consider revisions to the timelines, processes, and protocols based on outcomes, reports, and state recommendations.

SECTION II: KEY ELEMENTS OF THE MODEL

All who have accomplished great things have had a great aim, have fixed their gaze on a goal which was high, one which sometimes seemed impossible.

- Orison Swett Marden

The East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan contains several key elements designed to support professional growth and educator practice. These key elements are summarized individually below while some are described in greater detail throughout the document.

Evaluation-Based Professional Learning

Professional learning supports the growth and development of administrators and leads to improvements in teacher effectiveness. Understanding the connection between professional growth and administrator practice, every administrator will be identifying his/her professional learning needs in mutual agreement between the administrator and his/her evaluator. This professional development plan will serve as the foundation for ongoing, honest conversations about the administrator's practice and impact on teacher and student outcomes, allow administrators to set clear goals for future performance, and outline the supports needed to meet those goals. The professional learning opportunities identified for each administrator must be based on the individual strengths and needs identified through the evaluation process. The process may also reveal areas of common needs among administrators which can then be addressed with district-wide professional development opportunities. The district Professional Development/Teacher Evaluation Committee will meet to discuss the needs of administrators as a whole and individually as described below:

Career Development and Professional Growth

Rewarding exemplary performance identified through the evaluation process with opportunities for career development and professional growth is a critical step in both building confidence in the evaluation system itself and in building the capacity of all administrators. East Hartford Public Schools encourages the development of administrator leadership as a means of career development and professional growth opportunities.

Examples of such opportunities include, but are not limited to, observation of peers; mentoring early-career administrators; participating in development of administrator improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is *developing* or *below standard*; leading Professional Learning Communities; differentiated career pathways; and focused professional development based on goals for continuous growth and development.

Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing

All evaluators are required to complete training on the evaluation model. East Hartford Public Schools will provide administrators with training opportunities and tools throughout the year to support district administrators and evaluators in implementing the Professional Development and Educator Evaluation Plan across the schools. Initial training and on-going support training


and calibration will be provided by a RESC, the CSDE, an outside consultant or the district to ensure that evaluators are trained in conducting administrator evaluations.

Administrator Evaluation Process and Timeline

The annual evaluation process between an administrator and an evaluator is anchored by three performance conversations at the beginning, middle and end of the year. The purpose of these conversations is to clarify expectations for the evaluation process, provide comprehensive feedback to each administrator on his/her performance, set development goals and identify development opportunities. These conversations are collaborative and require reflection and preparation by both the evaluator and the administrator in order to be productive and meaningful. Fig. 1 displays the timeline below:

Please note this time cycle is subject to the release of state level data and the administrative work calendar. If necessary, this timeline can be adjusted through mutual agreement between the administration and the members of the EHEASU.

Figure 1: Plan implementation and evidence collection



Goal Setting Process/Conference

Setting ambitious, yet attainable, goals is a cornerstone process of the evaluation plan for school administrators. As with all quality goals, these goals should be based on relevant data, include specific measures and be actionable for staff. The goal-setting conference for identifying the overall Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and aligned Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD), as well as goals for administrator practice, shall include the steps listed below, which will apply to ALL practicing administrators. The following table provides a quick reference guide to the category, minimum number required and brief description for each step in the process:

Category	Number	Descriptor
SLO	2 (minimum)	An approach for determining student growth targets that will be measured through IAGDs
IAGD	At least 1 matched to each SLO	The specific evidence, with a quantitative target, that will demonstrate if the SLO was met
Stakeholder Feedback	1	An approach for setting an improvement target related to identified areas of need as indicated by parent feedback

1. Prior to the meeting, the administrator examines available and applicable school data, prior year evaluation and survey results, and the Connecticut School Leadership Standards to draft proposed goals in alignment to District Improvement Plan (DIP) and School Improvement Plan (SIP).
2. Recognizing the importance of alignment between district, school, department and educator goals, the evaluator and administrator will hold a goal setting meeting that will consist of a professional and respectful collaboration regarding district, school and individual growth goals. With respect to this understanding, one of the administrator's goals and corresponding IAGD(s) may be required at the discretion of the evaluator in the category of student learning set through a mutually agreeable process. For this SLO and its corresponding IAGD, the evidence collected and the assessment selection are set by the evaluator in accordance with the district/school improvement plan. The targeted performance level and proportion of students projected to achieve the targeted performance level must be individually determined specifically to match the school/department needs through mutual agreement between the evaluator and administrator.

In addition, the administrator and evaluator will mutually agree on the goals and on the data set that will be used to measure student learning growth. If mutual agreement cannot be reached, the goals will be mediated through the dispute resolution process as described in Section VII.

3. The administrator and evaluator will mutually determine if the indicator will apply to the individual administrator, a team of administrators, a grade level, the whole school, or a cohort of specialists with common needs from throughout the district.

4. The administrator and evaluator should identify the unique characteristics of the population of students which would impact student growth (i.e. high absenteeism, highly mobile population in school, etc.) as part of the goal-setting process. These details should also be reviewed and discussed at the mid-year conference.
5. The administrator and evaluator should identify the assessment, data or product to be used 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 assistance the administrator desires.


Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

Effectiveness or ineffectiveness is determined utilizing a pattern of observations and/or summative ratings derived from multiple indicators in the evaluation system. This system defines effectiveness in East Hartford Public Schools. In addition, the East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan provides administrators with the support and opportunity for improvement when observed practice or summative rating is deemed *developing* or *below standard*.

Non-Tenured Administrators


Non-tenured administrators shall generally be deemed effective if said administrator receives at least two sequential *proficient* ratings, at least two of which should be earned in the third and fourth year of a non-tenured administrator’s career. See Fig. 2:

Figure 2: Non-Tenured Administrator Preferred Path Timeline



A *below standard* rating may be permitted but only in the first year of a non-tenured administrator’s career, assuming a pattern of growth of at least *developing* in year two and two sequential *proficient* ratings in years three and four. The superintendent may offer a contract to any administrator he/she deems effective at the end of year four. See Fig. 3.


Figure 3: Non-Tenured Administrator showing growth



**Please note: A non-tenured administrator is not guaranteed a continued position with a below standard rating even in the first year. The superintendent may choose not to renew a non-tenured administrator's contract at any point in time if said administrator receives a rating of developing or below standard. This clause would be enacted based on the determination that the said administrator does not possess the potential for excellence.*

In the case of a “Fast-Track” formerly tenured administrator, defined as an administrator entering East Hartford Public Schools from another Connecticut district where tenure was previously achieved and who was employed by a Connecticut district within the previous five years, the superintendent may non-renew the administrator should it be anticipated that a *below standard* or *developing* rating will be assigned in the first year of service based on observed performance. This clause would be enacted based on the determination that said administrator does not possess the potential for excellence in East Hartford Public Schools. See Fig. 4.

Figure 4: Non-Renewal of a “Fast-Track” Tenured Administrator



Educator Support Process

As a core principle, the East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan provides administrators with the support and opportunity for improvement when observed or summative rated practice is deemed developing or below standard. The following bullets summarize these supports.

- **Informal Support (Prior to Supervisory Review)**
 If an administrator's observational performance is rated as *developing* or *below standard*, this performance may signal the need for the evaluator and administrator to create an informal support process prior to placing the educator on Supervisory Review. The informal support should be developed in collaboration with the administrator and evaluator. Support may include the following:
 - resources, support and other strategies to be provided to address documented, observed deficiencies, and

- a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies

- **Supervisory Review**


Based on evidence gathered during observations and the Informal Support phase, an evaluator may determine that there is insufficient improvement in an administrator's performance following the additional assistance given to help the administrator meet the expectations of the district. The evaluator will notify the Superintendent of Schools that the administrator is being recommended for Supervisory Review. Placement on Supervisory Review will be determined by the Superintendent.

Tenured Administrators

A tenured administrator shall generally be deemed effective if said administrator maintains a summative rating of *proficient* or *exemplary*.

A tenured administrator shall generally be deemed ineffective if said administrator receives at least two sequential *developing* year end ratings. At the culmination of this process that includes informal support and Supervisory Review, a recommendation for continued employment or termination will be made to the superintendent. See Fig. 5.

Figure 5: Tenured Developing Administrator



A tenured administrator shall also generally be deemed ineffective if said administrator receives at least two sequential *below standard* observation ratings throughout the year or a final *below standard* year end rating. At the culmination of this process that includes informal support and Supervisory Review, a recommendation for termination will be made to the superintendent. See Fig. 6.

Figure 6: Tenured Below Standard Administrator



*Please note that all of the situations above ending in termination of a tenured administrator presume that the said administrator has not made adequate progress after the provision of informal and/or formal support.

SECTION III: OVERVIEW OF THE MODEL: THE FOUR CATEGORIES OF ADMINISTRATOR EFFECTIVENESS

Great leaders are almost always great simplifiers, who can cut through argument, debate and doubt to offer a solution everybody can understand.


- General Colin Powell

Recognizing the complexity of school, department and team leadership, the East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan uses multiple indicators to assess administrative effectiveness. These multiple indicators are weighted in categories as indicated in the graphic and as listed below. The following sections provide a detailed explanation and operational guidelines for each of the four measures used to determine an educator's summative rating. The form to complete this summative rating is included in **Appendix B**.

The four categories of measures as previously identified are listed below:

- Leadership Practice 40%,
- Stakeholder Feedback 10%,
- Student Learning 45%, and
- Teacher Effectiveness 5%

The Model's Four Categories




Category #1: Leadership practice (40%)

The core measurement of an administrator's effectiveness as designed by the East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan is based on the observational data collected regarding leadership practice.

Leadership practice is described in the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards, adopted by the Connecticut State Board of Education in June of 2012, which use the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards as their foundation and define effective administrative practice through six performance expectations (**Appendix B**). These weightings should be aligned with the roles and responsibilities for all practicing administrators. The below figure provides a visual representation:

Figure 1: Leadership Practice – Six Performance Expectations



Performance Expectations:

- 1. Vision, Mission and Goals:** *Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, a strong organizational mission, and high expectations for student performance.*
- 2. Teaching and Learning:** *Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by monitoring and continuously improving teaching and learning.*

- 3. Organizational Systems and Safety:** *Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by managing organizational systems and resources for a safe, high-performing learning environment.*
- 4. Families and Stakeholders:** *Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by collaborating with families and stakeholders to respond to diverse community interests and needs and to mobilize community resources.*
- 5. Ethics and Integrity:** *Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by being ethical and acting with integrity.*
- 6. The Education System:** *Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students and advocate for their students, faculty and staff needs by influencing systems of political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts affecting education.*

Weighting Determination Process Steps:

All six of these performance expectations contribute to successful schools, but research shows that some have a bigger impact than others. In particular, improving teaching and learning is at the core of what effective educational leaders do. As such, **Performance Expectation 2 (Teaching and Learning)** comprises half of the leadership practice rating and the other five performance expectations are equally weighted for the evaluation of all administrators except assistant principals. The weightings for assistant principals will be equally distributed among the six Performance Expectation categories.

Rating System for Leadership Practice:

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

Rating	Description
Exemplary(4)	The Exemplary Level focuses on the concepts of developing capacity for action and leadership beyond the individual leader. Collaboration and involvement from a wide range of staff, students and stakeholders is prioritized as appropriate in distinguishing Exemplary performance from Proficient performance.
Proficient (3)	The rubric is anchored at the Proficient Level using the indicator language from the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The specific indicator language is highlighted in bold at the Proficient level.
Developing (2)	The Developing Level focuses on leaders with a general knowledge of leadership practices but most of those practices do not necessarily lead to positive results.
Below Standard (1)	The Below Standard Level focuses on a limited understanding of leadership practices and general inaction on the part of the leader.

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.

Category #2: Stakeholder Feedback (10%)

In addition to observed leadership practice, stakeholder feedback or the “perceptions” of stakeholders of administrative practice also plays a role in the evaluative process. Through the inclusion of this indicator, the East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan clearly emphasizes the importance of the whole school community in administrator effectiveness.

All parent, student, and staff surveys will be administered with procedures that ensure individuals are comfortable answering honestly, without fear of retribution.

Stakeholders Defined:

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

In alignment with the adaptations proposed by the Connecticut State Department of Education, the following guidelines for stakeholder feedback are included for specific Central Office administrators:

- Director of Pupil Personnel Services and Special Education Supervisors (Special Education Leaders): stakeholders solicited for feedback will include parents and/or guardians of students who have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP).
- Supervisor of Program Development and Assessment (Curriculum Leader): stakeholder solicited for feedback will include teachers, assistant principals and/or principals. This may be collected through the district’s Professional Development survey.
- Director of Adult and Continuing Education (Adult Education Leader): stakeholders solicited for feedback will include teachers and students.

Category #3: Student learning (45%)

The Student Outcomes Related Indicators segment captures the administrator’s impact on teachers, and thus, on students. Every administrator is in the profession to help teachers and children learn and grow, and administrators already think carefully about what knowledge, skills and talents they are responsible for nurturing each year. As a part of evaluation process, administrators will document those aspirations and anchor them in data.

Student Outcomes Related Indicators includes two categories:

- performance and progress on the academic learning measures in the state’s accountability system for schools, and
- performance and growth on locally-determined measures.

Each of these measures will have a weight of 22.5%, and together they will account for 45% of the administrator's evaluation.

Descriptors of State Measures of Academic Learning:

Currently, the state's accountability system includes four measures of student academic learning:

1. School Performance Index (SPI) progress – changes from year to year in student achievement on Connecticut's standardized assessments
2. SPI progress for student subgroups – changes from year to year in student achievement for subgroups on Connecticut's standardized assessments
3. SPI rating – absolute measure of student achievement on Connecticut's standardized assessments
4. SPI rating for student subgroups – absolute measure of student achievement for subgroups on Connecticut's standardized assessments

See **Appendix E** for a complete definition of Connecticut's measures of student academic learning, including a definition of the SPI.

Locally-Determined Measures:

In addition to accountability measures calculated through the use of SPI/DPI, the administrator will also set locally determined goals that specifically target an area of focus or work.

Administrators establish a minimum of two student learning objectives (SLOs) on measures they select. In selecting measures, certain parameters apply:

- SLOs and corresponding IAGDs, one of which can be set by the evaluator, should be aligned to District, School, or Department Improvement Plans.
- All measures must align to Connecticut learning standards. In instances where there are no such standards that apply to a subject/grade level, the administrator must provide evidence of alignment to research-based learning standards.
- At least one of the measures must focus on student outcomes from subjects and/or grades not assessed on state-administered assessments.
- For administrators in high school, one measure must include the cohort graduation rate and the extended graduation rate, as defined in the State's approved application for flexibility under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. All projections 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 administrator evaluation.

Role	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3 (optional)
Elementary or Middle School Principal	Non-tested subjects or grades	Aligned to District Improvement Plan, School Improvement Plan, and Department Improvement Plan	
High School Principal	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement)		
Elementary or Middle School AP	Non-tested subjects or grades		
High School AP	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement)		
Central Office, Supervisor, or Department Head	Aligned to District Improvement Plan, School Improvement Plan, and Department Improvement Plan		

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

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

Below are a few examples of indicators, goals and SLOs:

Grade level	Student Learning Objective (SLO)	Indicator of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD)	Data
2nd Grade	Students making at least one year's worth of growth in reading	Among 2nd graders who stay in my school from September to May, 80% will make at least one year's growth in their reading skills.	STAR
Middle School Science	Student understanding of the science inquiry process	78% of students will attain at least the proficient or higher level on the CFA section concerning science inquiry.	7th grade CFA
High School	Credit accumulation	95% of students complete 10th grade with 10 credits.	Grades/ Transcript
Central Office Admin.	Students enrolled in identified grade levels making overall gains in reading	By June 2014, the percentage of grade 3, 4, and 5th students across the district reading at or above grade level will improve from 78% to 85%.	STAR

SLO Selection Process Steps:

The process for selecting measures and creating SLOs should strike a balance between alignment to district student learning priorities and a focus on the most significant school-level student learning needs. To do so, it is critical that the process unfold in this way (described for administrators):

1. The district establishes student learning priorities for a given school year based on available data. These may be a continuation for multi-year improvement strategies or a new priority that emerges from achievement data.
2. The administrator uses available data to craft an improvement plan for the school. This is done in collaboration with other stakeholders and includes a manageable set of clear student learning targets.
3. The administrator chooses student learning priorities for her/his own evaluation that are (a) aligned to district priorities (unless the school is already doing well against those priorities) and (b) aligned with the school improvement plan.
4. The administrator chooses measures that best assess the priorities and develops clear and measurable SLOs for the chosen assessments/indicators.
5. The administrator shares the SLOs with her/his evaluator, informing a conversation designed to ensure that:
 - The objectives are adequately ambitious.
 - There is adequate data that can be collected to make a fair judgment about whether the administrator met the established objectives.
 - The objectives are based on a review of student characteristics (e.g., mobility, attendance, demographic and learning characteristics) relevant to the assessment of the administrator against the objective.
 - The professional resources are appropriate to supporting the administrator in meeting the performance targets.
 - Please note that one SLO and corresponding IAGD may be set by the evaluator. For more specific details see section II.
6. The administrator and evaluator collect interim data on the SLOs to inform a mid-year conversation (which is an opportunity to assess progress and, as needed, adjust targets) and summative data to inform summative ratings.

In alignment with the adaptations proposed by the Connecticut State Department of Education, the following guidelines for developing indicators of student learning are included for specific Central Office administrators:

- Director of Pupil Personnel Services and Special Education Supervisor (Special Education Leaders)-
 - Standardized Measures (22.5%): based on subgroup of District Performance Index (DPI) or on special education subgroups on SPIs of schools served
 - Locally Determined Measures (22.5%): goals address a significant portion of special education students served.
- Supervisor of Professional Development and Assessment (Curriculum Leader)-
 - Standardized Measures (22.5%): based on subgroup of District Performance Index (DPI) or SPIs of schools served or subjects served
 - Locally Determined Measures (22.5%): goals address a significant portion of students served.

- Director of Adult and Continuing Education (Adult Education Leader)-
 - Standardized Measures (22.5%): target related to General Education Diploma (GED) attainment
 - Locally Determined Measures (22.5%): two goals measured by standardized or non-standardized measures

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

2 SLOs:

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Substantially exceeded 1 SLO and met 1 SLO	Met both SLOs Met 1 SLO and made at least substantial progress on the 2 nd SLO	Met 1 SLO and did not make substantial progress on the other	Met 0 SLOs

3 SLOs:

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Substantially exceeded on 2 SLOs and met 1 SLO ** If 2 SLOs are met, the administrator will gather additional data so that the evaluator can make a determination regarding the summative rating.	Met all three SLOs Met 2 SLOs and made at least substantial progress on the 3 rd	Met 1 SLO and made substantial progress on at least 1 other	Met 0 SLOs OR Met 1 SLO and did not make substantial progress on either of the other 2

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

		State Test Portion/Standardized SLO(s)			
		Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Locally Determined Measures/Non-Standardized SLO(s)	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	<i>Gather further information*</i>
	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient	Proficient	<i>Developing</i>
	Developing	Proficient	<i>Gather further information*</i>	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	<i>Gather further Information*</i>	<i>Gather further information*</i>	Below Standard	Below Standard

**Gather further Information: If the two focus areas are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of exemplary for the State Test Portion and a rating of below standard for Locally Determined Measures), then the administrator and evaluator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to make a summative rating. Such information gathering may require looking at school level data, determining if significant changes may have occurred in student population, or other such pieces of information impacting student growth and development. If, after such review, a revision in the administrator's SLOs or IAGDs becomes necessary, the educator and evaluator shall meet to determine such changes incorporating the Assistant Superintendent/Superintendent and/or Director of Human Resources in such meeting as appropriate.*

Category #4: Teacher Effectiveness (5%)

Improving teacher effectiveness is central to an administrator's role in driving improved student learning outcomes. The East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan measures the actions that administrators take to increase teacher effectiveness – from hiring and placement to ongoing professional development to feedback on performance and assesses the outcomes of all of that work.

As part of Connecticut's teacher evaluation state model, teachers are assessed in part on their accomplishment of SLOs. This is the basis for assessing administrators' contribution to teacher effectiveness outcomes.

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 principals.

In alignment with the adaptations proposed by the Connecticut State Department of Education, the following guidelines for determining teacher effectiveness have been included for specific Central Office administrators:

- Director of Pupil Personnel Services and Special Education Supervisors (Special Education Leaders): Based on student learning goal/objective attainment of composite special education teachers.
- Supervisor of Program Development and Assessment (Curriculum Leader): Based on student learning/goal objective attainment of principals, assistant principals, and instructional supervisors served.
- Director of Adult and Continuing Education (Adult Education Leader): Based on student learning goals/objective attainment of SLOs of adult education teachers.

In order to maintain a strong focus on teachers setting ambitious SLOs for their evaluation, it is imperative that administrator evaluators discuss with the administrators their strategies in working with teachers to set SLOs. Without attention to this issue, there is a substantial risk of administrators not encouraging teachers to set ambitious SLOs.

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

SECTION IV: THE ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION PROCESS

*The goal of an effective leader is to recondition your team to be solution focused rather than problem focused.
- Jim Rohn*

This section describes the process by which administrators and their evaluators collect evidence about practice and results over the course of a year, culminating with a final rating and recommendations for continued improvement. The East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan describes an annual cycle for administrators and evaluators to follow, and this sequence of events lends well to a meaningful and achievable process. To ensure a quality evaluation process, the East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan focuses on the following principles through the plan:

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

Overview of the Process

Each administrator participates in the evaluation process as a cycle of continuous improvement. The cycle is the centerpiece of state guidelines designed to have all educators play a more active, engaged role in their professional growth and development. For every administrator, evaluation begins with goal-setting for the school year, setting the stage for implementation of a goal-driven plan. The cycle continues with a Mid-Year Formative Review, followed by continued implementation. The latter part of the process offers administrators a chance to self-assess and reflect on progress to date, a step that informs the summative evaluation. Evidence from the summative evaluation and self-assessment become important sources of information for the administrator's subsequent goal setting, as the cycle continues into the subsequent year. Below is a review of Fig. 1 which was first introduced in section one of this document:

School year: Plan implementation and evidence collection

** If necessary, this timeline can be adjusted through mutual agreement between the administration and the members of the EHEASU.



Step 1: Orientation and Context-Setting (July-September)

Orientation on Process-

To begin the process, evaluators meet with administrators, in a group or individually, to discuss the evaluation process and their roles and responsibilities within it. In this meeting, they will discuss any school or district priorities that should be reflected in administrator practice goals and student learning objectives (SLOs), and they will commit to set time aside for the types of collaboration required by the evaluation process.

To prepare for this meeting, the administrator needs five things to be in place:

1. Student learning data is available for review by the administrator and the state has assigned the school a School Performance Index (SPI) rating.
2. Stakeholder survey data is available for review by the administrator.
3. The superintendent has communicated his/her student learning priorities for the year.
4. The administrator has developed an improvement (school or department) plan that includes student learning goals.
5. The evaluator has provided the administrator with this document in order to orient her/him to the evaluation process.

Administrator Reflection & Goal Setting-

Following the initial orientation meeting, the administrator examines the student data, prior year evaluation and survey results and the Connecticut School Leadership Standards to draft goals for the following indicators:

- Student Learning (locally determined measures/SLOs)
- Leadership Practice
- Stakeholder Feedback


Step 2: Goal-Setting and Plan Development (by October 15th)

Setting ambitious, yet appropriate, goals is a cornerstone process of the evaluation plan for school administrators. As with all quality goals, these goals should be based on relevant data, include specific measures and be actionable for staff. The goal-setting conference for identifying the overall Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and aligned Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD), as well as goals for administrator practice, shall include the steps listed below, which will apply to ALL practicing administrators.

The administrator and evaluator meet to discuss the proposed three student learning objectives and one or more survey targets, drawing on available data, the superintendent's priorities, their school improvement plan, and prior evaluation results (where applicable) in order to arrive at mutual agreement about them. They also determine two areas of focus for their practice. This is called "3-2-1 goal-setting."

The following table provides a quick reference guide to the category, minimum number required and brief description for each step in the process:

Figure 8: 3-2-1 Goal setting



Steps for Setting Goals-

Administrators should start with the outcomes they want to achieve. This includes setting **a minimum of two student learning objectives** and one or more targets related to stakeholder feedback.

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

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

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

The evaluator and administrator also discuss the appropriate resources and professional development needs to support the administrator in accomplishing the goals. Together, these components – the goals, the practice areas and the resources and supports – comprise an individual's evaluation plan.

The goal-setting form is to be completed by the administrator. The focus areas, goals, activities, outcomes, and time line will be reviewed and approved by the administrator's evaluator prior to the beginning work on the goals.

Here are some questions to consider in assessing whether an administrator's evaluation plan is likely to drive continuous improvement:

1. Are the goals clear and measurable, so that you will know whether you have achieved them?
2. Can you see a through-line from district priorities to the school improvement plan to the evaluation plan?
3. Do the practice focus areas address growth needs for the administrator? Is at least one of the focus areas addressing instructional leadership?

Step 3: Plan Implementation and Evidence Collection Observations

In coordination with the evaluator, the administrator must collect evidence about the leadership practice throughout the course of the year. The evaluator must engage in periodic, purposeful school visits to offer critical opportunities to observe, collect evidence, and analyze the work of the administrator. Visits to the administrator’s work site will provide invaluable insight into the school leader’s performance and offer opportunities for ongoing feedback and dialogue.

Unlike visiting a classroom to observe a teacher, school visits to observe administrator practice can vary significantly in length and setting. Evaluators shall plan their visits carefully to maximize the opportunity to gather evidence relevant to an administrator’s practice focus areas.

Besides the school visit requirement, this plan does not prescribe any evidence requirements. Rather, the plan relies on the professional judgment of the administrator and evaluator to determine appropriate sources of evidence and ways to collect evidence.

Observation Frequency/Assignment:

The following table documents the minimum requirements for administrator observations based on seniority and the previous year’s performance rating. Please note that an evaluator reserves the right to conduct an observation at any point to evaluate administrator leadership performance.

Administrator Category	Written Observations
Tenured administrator rated proficient or exemplary	Two written observations
Non Tenured administrator	Four written observations
Tenured administrator new to position	Four written observations
Tenured administrator at developing rating or below standard	Four written observations

The administrator’s evaluator may want to consult the following sources of evidence to collect information about the administrator in relation to their focus areas and goals:

Observational Practice:

- Observations of Administrator in daily practice
- Observations of Teacher Team Meetings
- Observations of Administrative/Leadership Team Meetings
- Observations of Classrooms where the Administrator is present
- Observations of Administrator led Professional Development or Faculty meetings

Evidence Opportunities:

- School/Department Improvement Plans
- Data Systems and Reports for Student Information
- Artifacts of Data Analysis and Plans for Response
- Professional development plans/presentations
- Communications to Parents and Community
- Conversations with staff
- Conversations with Students
- Conversations with Families

Step 4: Feedback

Central to this process is the role of the evaluator to provide meaningful feedback based on observed administrative practice. Feedback from the evaluator to the administrator provides the rich interaction of professional accountability that is designed to promote individual, and thereby system, growth. Evaluators must provide timely written feedback after each visit if the said visit constitutes a formal observation and will be used as a piece of the summative evaluation. Formal written feedback must be written and delivered through a post observation conference and aligned with the six performance expectations. This feedback may capture multiple layers of observations or evidence (listed above) and should indicate trends of practice. Please note that a single event may be a source of feedback from the evaluator depending on the context of the situation. The formal feedback must include a performance rating.

Step 5: Mid-Year Formative Review (March 8th)

By March 8th, the administrator and evaluator hold a Mid-Year Formative Conference with explicit discussion of progress toward student learning targets, as well as any areas of performance related to standards of performance and practice. The meeting is also an opportunity to surface any changes in the context (e.g., a large influx of new students) that could impact accomplishment of outcome goals; goals may be changed at this point. The following three things are encompassed in the Mid-Year Formative Review process:

1. *Reflection and Preparation* – The administrator and evaluator collect and reflect on evidence to date about the administrator’s practice and student learning in preparation for the check-in.
2. *Mid-Year Conference* – The administrator and evaluator complete at least one mid-year check-in conference during which they review progress on administrator practice goals, student learning objectives (SLOs) and performance on each to date. The mid-year conference is an important point in the year for addressing concerns and reviewing results for the first half of the year. Evaluators can deliver mid-year formative information on components of the evaluation framework for which evidence has been gathered and analyzed. If needed, administrators and evaluators can mutually agree to revisions on the strategies or approaches used and/or mid-year adjustment of SLOs to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignment). They also discuss actions that the administrator can take and supports the evaluator can provide to promote administrator growth in his/her development areas. This conference is critical in assuring that any issues impacting student results and administrator success in reaching his/her goals are addressed while there is still time to adjust the plan if appropriate.
3. *Mid-Year Progress Report* – By March 8th, the evaluator will complete a mid-year progress report for non-tenured administrators that reflects the administrator’s potential status based on evidence to date.

Step 6: Self-Assessment (Begin to collect data in April and submit no later than May 15th)

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

- needs to grow and improve practice on this element;
- has some strengths on this element but need to continue to grow and improve;
- is consistently effective on this element; or
- can empower others to be effective on this element.

The administrator should also review their focus areas and determine if they consider themselves on track or not. The administrator submits their self-assessment to their evaluator by May 15th.

**Please note that all indicators may not directly apply to an administrator's responsibilities, and as such, he/she may select a rating as "non-applicable" for an indicator. This may be determined through mutual discussion between the administrator and the evaluator.*

Step 7: Summative Review and Rating (by June 14th; due June 15th to Human Resources)

The administrator and evaluator meet in April or May to discuss the administrator's self-assessment and all evidence collected over the course of the year. The following steps are included during this step of the process:

1. *Administrator Self-Assessment* – The administrator reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the evaluator. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the goal-setting conference.
2. *Scoring* – The evaluator reviews submitted evidence, self-assessments and observation data to generate category and focus area ratings. The category ratings generate the final, summative rating which shall not be subject to change even if the state test data becomes available later.
3. *End-of-Year Conference* – The administrator and evaluator meet to discuss all evidence collected to date and to discuss category ratings by June 8th. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation to submit to Human Resources by June 15th.

**Please note that these dates set in this document have been set in accordance with best practice. The plan also acknowledges that certain circumstances may occur for these dates to be adjusted by mutual discussion between administrator and evaluator.*

While a formal rating follows this meeting, it is recommended that evaluators use the meeting as an opportunity to convey strengths, growth areas, and their probable rating. After the meeting, the evaluator assigns a rating based on all available evidence (see next section for rating methodology).

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

Summative ratings must be completed for all administrators by June 15th of a given school year and submitted to Human Resources by that date. Should state standardized test data not be available at the time of a final rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available.

SECTION V: DETERMINING THE SUMMATIVE RATING

East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan 5/1/15

“In any moment of decision, the best thing you can do is the right thing.”

-Theodore Roosevelt

The summative administrative evaluation rating is derived through the process of combining the multiple indicators of effectiveness. Each administrator shall annually receive a summative rating in one of four levels:

Rating	Descriptor
Exemplary (4)	Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
Proficient (3)	Meeting indicators of performance
Developing (2)	Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
Below Standard (1)	Not meeting indicators of performance

Proficient represents fully satisfactory performance. It is the rigorous standard expected for most experienced administrators.

In the absence of state testing results, ratings will be based on all available data and are made in the spring so that they can be used for any employment decisions as needed. Here are some guidelines to use in arriving at a summative rating:

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

Determining Summative Ratings:

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

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

The practice rating derives from an administrator's performance on the performance expectations of the leader evaluation rubric and the one stakeholder feedback target. As shown in the Summative Rating Form in **Appendix C**, evaluators record a rating for the performance expectations that generates an overall rating for leadership practice.

Arriving at a Leadership Practice Summative Rating:

Summative ratings for this component of the evaluation are based on the preponderance of evidence for each performance expectation in the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. Evaluators collect written evidence about and observe the administrators' leadership practice across the six performance expectations described in the rubric. Specific attention is paid to leadership performance areas identified as needing development.

**Please note that East Hartford Public Schools intends to review the new rubric developed by the CT State Department of Education before making a decision on which rubric (2013 or 2015) will be adopted and used by the district.*

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

1. The administrator and evaluator meet for a Goal-Setting Conference to identify focus areas for development of the administrator's leadership practice by October 15th.
2. The administrator collects evidence about his/her practice and the evaluator collects evidence about administrator practice with particular focus on the identified focus areas for development. Evaluators must conduct at least two school site observations for all administrators and must conduct at least four school site observations for administrators who are new to the district or position, or who have received ratings of *developing* or *below standard* the prior year. Examples would include, but are not limited to, an observation of the administrator facilitating a data team meeting, faculty meeting, PPT, student/parent meeting, or administrative team meeting.
3. The administrator and evaluator hold a mid-year check-in conference (no later than March 8th) with a focused discussion of progress toward proficiency and/or focus areas identified as needing development.
4. Near the end of the school year (May 15th), the administrator reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a summative **self-assessment** for review by the evaluator, identifying areas of strength and continued growth as well as progress on their focus areas.
5. The evaluator and the administrator meet, generally in May or early June, to discuss all evidence collected to date. Following the conference, the evaluator uses the preponderance of evidence to assign a summative rating of *exemplary*, *proficient*, *developing*, or *below standard* for each performance expectation. Then the evaluator assigns a total practice rating (from matrix) based on the criteria in the chart below and generates a summary report of the evaluation by June 14th. (Supported by the "Summative Rating Form," **Appendix B**).
6. All administrator evaluations should be completed and submitted to Human Resources by June 15th.

Leadership Practice Indicator Evaluation Guide:

Curriculum Focused Administrative roles (Principals, Department Heads/Supervisors and Central Office Administrators):

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
<i>Exemplary</i> on Teaching and Learning	At least <i>Proficient</i> on Teaching and Learning	At least <i>Developing</i> on Teaching and Learning	<i>Below Standard</i> on Teaching and Learning
<i>Exemplary</i> on at least 2 other performance expectations	At least <i>Proficient</i> 3 other performance expectations	<i>Developing</i> on 3 other performance expectations	or <i>Below Standard</i> on at least 3 other performance expectations
No rating below <i>Proficient</i> on any performance expectation	No rating below <i>Developing</i> on any performance expectation		

Assistant Principals:

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

**Leadership Practice Indicator Evaluation Guide may be adjusted to coincide with the roles /responsibilities of the specific administrative position.*

Survey Administration Process Steps:

Each year, staff, students, and parents in grades 3-12 will be surveyed across the district using a district approved survey (**Appendix D**). Trends will be considered across the district and schools. Year to year differences and response rates will be considered in the analysis. The district will ensure confidentiality and survey responses will NOT be tied to peoples’ names. Principals will use the baseline data from the previous year to set current year goals.

The district climate survey that has been adopted by the district data team (DDT) was developed Panorama Education. Panorama Education works with the nation's leading schools to provide data analytics and feedback surveys for students, teachers, and parents.

Administrators who are not building specific will still have survey results that reflect their leadership practice. Please note that for these non-building based leaders it may be appropriate to develop an individualized survey that best reflects their interaction and work with appropriate stakeholders. This survey should be reviewed and approved by the evaluator prior to implementation.

The survey instruments will be continually reviewed to ensure they are providing reliable and valid data.

Stakeholder Feedback Summative Rating Process Steps:

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

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

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

Select appropriate survey measures aligned to the Connecticut Leadership Standards

1. Review baseline data on selected measures which may require a fall administration of the survey in year one.
2. Identify and mutually agree with evaluator which stakeholder survey will be used in alignment with district/school goals.
3. Set 1 target for growth on selected measures (or performance on selected measures when growth is not feasible to assess or performance is already high).
4. Later in the school year, administer surveys to relevant stakeholders.
5. Aggregate data and determine whether the administrator achieved the established target.
6. Assign a rating using this scale:

Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Exceeded target	Met target or Nearly achieved target	Made substantial progress but did not meet target	Made little or no progress against target

Establishing what constitutes as “nearly achieved” is left to the discretion of the evaluator and the administrator being evaluated in the context of the target being set.

Example of Survey Applications:

School #1 has mid-range student performance results and is working diligently to improve out-comes for all students. As part of a district-wide initiative, the school administers a climate survey to teachers, students and family members. The results of this survey are applied broadly to inform school and district planning as well as administrator and teacher evaluations. Baseline data from the previous year’s survey show general high performance with a few significant gaps in areas aligned to the Connecticut Leadership Standards. The principal, district Superintendent and the school leadership team selected one area of focus – building expectations for student achievement – and the principal identified leadership actions related to this focus area which are aligned with the Leadership Standards. At the end of the year, survey results showed that, although improvement was made, the school failed to meet its target.

Measure and Target	Results (Target met?)
Percentage of teachers and family members agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement “Students are challenged to meet high expectations at the school” would increase from 71% to 77%.	No; results at the end of the year showed an increase of 3% to 74% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement.
Stakeholder Feedback Rating: “Developing”	

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

The outcomes rating is derived from the two student learning measures – state test results and student learning objectives – and teacher effectiveness outcomes. As shown in the Summative Rating Form in **Appendix B**, state reports provide an assessment rating and evaluators record a rating for the student learning objectives agreed to in the beginning of the year.

Student Learning Rating Calculation Process Steps:

Evaluation ratings for administrators on the aforementioned state measures are determined through a three step process. All projections related to the assignment of school accountability ratings (e.g., the minimum number of days a student must be enrolled in order for that student’s scores to be included in an accountability measure) shall apply to the use of state test data for administrator evaluation.

For any school/department that does not have tested grades/subjects (such as a K-2 school), the entire 45% of an administrator’s rating on student learning indicators is based on the locally-determined indicators described below.

For any administrator assigned to multiple schools throughout the district this rating should be conducted using the District Performance Index (DPI) or the SPI in accordance with the building of the majority of their assignment (>60%).

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

	Target (4)	Target (3)	Target (2)	Target (1)
--	------------	------------	------------	------------

SPI Progress	>125% of target progress	100-125% of target progress	50-99% of target progress	<50% of target progress
Subgroup SPI Progress	Meets performance targets for all subgroups that have SPI <88 OR all subgroups have SPI > 88 OR The school does not have any subgroups of sufficient size	Meets performance targets for 50% or more of sub-groups that have SPI <88	Meets performance targets for at least one sub-group that has SPI <88	Does not meet performance target for any subgroup that has SPI <88
SPI Rating	89-100	77-88	64-76	< 64
SPI Rating for Subgroups	The gap between the “all students” group and each subgroup is <10 SPI points OR all subgroups have SPI > 88 OR The school has no subgroups	The gap between the “all students” group and 50% or more of sub-groups is <10 SPI points	The gap between the “all students” group and at least one subgroup is >10 SPI points.	The gap between the “all students” group and all subgroups is >10 SPI points.

Step 2: Scores are weighted to emphasize improvement in schools below the State’s SPI target of 88 and to emphasize subgroup progress and performance in schools above the target. The weights are presented below:

	SPI >88	SPI between 88 and 64	SPI <64
School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year	10%	50%	50%
SPI progress for student subgroups	40%	50%	50%
SPI rating	10%	0%	0%
SPI rating for student subgroups	40%	0%	0%

*For schools with no subgroups, 50% on SPI progress, 50% on SPI rating

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

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
>3.4	Between 2.5 and 3.4	Between 1.5 and 2.4	Less than 1.5

See **Appendix E** for sample calculations of evaluation ratings for administrators in schools with different SPI ratings and levels of progress.

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

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

Summative Rating Matrix		Practice Related Indicators Rating			
		Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Outcomes Related Indicators Rating	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	<i>Gather further information*</i>
	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient	Proficient	<i>Developing</i>
	Developing	Proficient	<i>Gather further information*</i>	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	<i>Gather further Information*</i>	<i>Gather further information*</i>	Below Standard	Below Standard

* If the two focus areas are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of exemplary for the Practice Related Indicator and a rating of below standard for Outcomes Related Indicator), then the evaluator and administrator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to make a summative rating. Such information gathering may require looking at reviews of leadership practice, school data, determining if significant changes may have occurred in student population, or other such pieces of information impacting student growth and development. If, after such review, a revision in the administrator’s SLOs or IAGDs becomes necessary, the educator and evaluator shall meet to determine such changes incorporating the Assistant Superintendent/Superintendent and/or Director of Human Resources in such meeting as appropriate

** Please note that the percentage ratings assigned throughout this document are used to describe the level of influence an indicator has on the summative rating and not a mathematical computation.

SECTION VI: IMPROVEMENT AND REMEDIATION PLANS

A good manager is a man who isn't worried about his own career but rather the careers of those who work for him.
- Henry S. Burns

The East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan provides tenured administrators with the support and opportunity for improvement when observed or summative practice is deemed *developing* or *below standard*. If, after the provision of informal support, a tenured administrator has not been rated *proficient* as described in previous sections, formal support will be provided. The evaluator will notify the Superintendent of Schools that the administrator is being recommended for Supervisory Review. Placement on Supervisory Review will be determined by the Superintendent. This formal support is described in detail below.

Supervisory Review

The Supervisory Review Phase of the East Hartford Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan is designed for tenured administrators who have not demonstrated proficiency as indicated by the multiple indicators described throughout this plan including leadership practice and learning outcomes. This phase will focus on those specific areas where the administrator has not demonstrated proficiency, recognizing that for the administrator to be successful in meeting the expectations of the district, strong support must be provided.

For an administrator to move to Supervisory Review, the following conditions must be met:

- A pattern (more than one) of observations reveals the administrator's observational performance as either *developing* or *below standard*. One of these evaluations must be conducted by a secondary evaluator to ensure calibration on the performance evaluation.
** *Please note that if an observed administrator performance identifies significant or severe concerns pertaining to student safety or administrator ethical deficiencies, the said administrator will move directly to supervisory review or disciplinary action leading to termination.*

Once an administrator is placed in this Supervisory Review Phase, an assistance plan will be developed to address the specific areas of concern. Administrators who enter this phase will need to demonstrate measurable progress in meeting the goals defined and outlined in the assistance plan within a specified period of time. Additionally, administrators must receive an average rating of *proficient* in observed performance in order to return to the regular evaluation plan process.

Because of the serious implications of the Supervisory Review process, the East Hartford Educational Administrative & Supervisory Unit will participate in the Supervisory Review meetings. All phases of the Supervisory Review process will be monitored by the Assistant Superintendent and/or Superintendent (as appropriate depending upon who is the administrator's evaluator) and the Director of Human Resources. The Supervisory Review process will be limited to a single cycle. The Superintendent of Schools will be informed of all Supervisory Review procedures. The evaluator will provide bi-weekly written reports, which include copies of all formal observation reports, to the Superintendent as part of this process. The Superintendent will prepare the same if he/she is the primary evaluator of the administrator.

The Assistant Superintendent and/or Superintendent of Schools (as appropriate depending upon who is the administrator’s evaluator) will participate in the conference to establish the Action Plan and will receive copies of all documents and summaries of all conferences.

The following procedures and timetables will be regarded as district guidelines:

Supervisory Review Phase Timetable	Procedure
At any time during the evaluation cycle following one summative below standard rating, two summative developing standard ratings, or below standard or developing observations (see pages 13-15 for specific guidance)	<p>Evaluator will document that the administrator is having ongoing, serious difficulty in meeting expectations in implementing the district’s improvement plan, instructional practices, assessment procedures, or professional responsibilities. The evaluator will provide documentation of support provided in response to each area of concern.</p> <p>A Supervisory Review team consisting of the administrator, evaluator, EHEASU representative and Assistant Superintendent or Superintendent, as appropriate depending upon who is the administrator’s evaluator, will meet to review</p> <p>Supervisory Review- Appropriate documentation will be reviewed and an action plan with timeline of 60 days will be developed, which will include, but not be limited to, assistance from other sources such as principal, department head, curriculum supervisor, workshop, peer observation, or peer mentor. A clearly defined improvement plan will be developed.</p> <p>The Director of Human Resources and the Assistant Superintendent/Superintendent (as appropriate) will monitor the process.</p>
By the 10 th school day	The evaluator will conduct an observation with a post conference.
By the 30 th school day	The evaluator will conduct a 2 nd documented observation using the appropriate documents.
By the 45 th school day	The evaluator will conduct a 3 rd documented observation using the appropriate documents.
By the 60 th school day	The Supervisory Review team will meet to address compliance with the action plan and to determine if appropriate progress has been made. The Evaluator will submit a summary report to the Superintendent of Schools and recommend removal from Supervisory Review or termination if the administrator has not addressed the area(s) of deficiency or demonstrated the needed improvement.

Administrators must receive a summative rating of *proficient* in order to return to the regular evaluation plan process as outlined above. Within one calendar week of the submission of the report to the Superintendent, the administrator will be notified in writing of the decision of the Superintendent based on the evaluator’s recommendations. If a decision for continued employment is rendered, the administrator will return to the appropriate phase of the evaluation cycle as identified by the rating on the charts above. If a decision for termination is rendered, the Superintendent will present the name of the administrator to the Board of Education.

Under no circumstances will an administrator remain on Supervisory Review for longer than six school months.

Copies of all written reports will be shared among the administrator, evaluator, Director of Human Resources, Assistant Superintendent and Superintendent. Each person may attach written comments to any reports or other written materials.

SECTION VII: DISPUTE-RESOLUTION PROCESS

"Seek first to understand, then to be understood"

- Stephen R. Covey

In the course of determining SLOs, IAGDs and administrator practice goals, it is possible that an evaluator and an administrator being evaluated may not agree on one or more of the following:

- Mutually acceptable professional growth goals (SLOs) including percentage growth measures;
- the evaluative measures (IAGDs) including baseline, selection of students, data to be used; or
- the final summative evaluation rating.

A panel of four, composed of the Superintendent, Human Resources Director, and two union representatives, shall resolve disputes where the evaluator and administrator cannot agree on objectives/goals, the evaluation period, feedback on performance and practice, or final summative rating. No member of the panel shall be involved in the preceding evaluative process with the exception of the Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent. The dispute resolution process shall not apply to the Supervisory Review process.

Resolutions must be topic-specific and timely.

The following procedural guidelines apply to the dispute resolution process:

Dispute Resolution Process:

- If an administrator and evaluator cannot agree, they will present the following materials to the Superintendent and/or Human Resources Director within 7 school days after the declaration of the conflict:
 1. A mutually written, signed and dated statement outlining the areas of agreement and disagreement signed by both parties; or
 2. Two separately written, signed and dated statements presenting the individual positions of agreement and disagreement by each party.
- The recipient of the statement(s) will request that the Dispute Resolution Panel meet within 5 school days after receipt of the materials.
- The panel may request additional information in writing or by interview for the purpose of clarifying the issues presented in the written documentation.
- The panel may resolve the issue by selecting either position or by creating a compromise settlement.
- The panel will render a decision and rationale in writing within 5 school days of its initial meeting. The decision is final and binding on both parties. If the panel cannot reach a unanimous resolution, the conflict will be submitted to the Superintendent of Schools for a final, binding resolution.

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.

SECTION VIII: CONCLUSION

"The leaders who work most effectively, it seems to me, never say 'I'. And that's not because they have trained themselves not to say 'I'. They don't think 'I'. They think 'we'; they think 'team'. They understand their job to be to make the team function. They accept responsibility and don't sidestep it, but 'we' gets the credit.... This is what creates trust, what enables you to get the task done."

— Peter Drucker

When administrators and evaluators work together with the interests of students in mind, the result is a fair, comprehensive plan that will provide the tools and support needed for all students to succeed. The mission of the East Hartford Public Schools focuses on partnerships to support the growth potential of students. This plan promotes a partnership between administrators and evaluators that was evidenced in the positive collaboration among the committee members who developed this document. Administrators from all levels share the common goal of promoting excellence through professional development and professional accountability.

SECTION IX: APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: EVALUATION-BASED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING


Professional learning supports the continuous growth and development of educators and leads to improvements in student achievement. Understanding the connection between professional growth and educator practice, every educator will identify his/her professional learning needs in mutual agreement between the educator and his/her evaluator. This professional development plan will serve as the foundation for ongoing, honest conversations about the educator's practice and impact on student outcomes, allow educators to set clear goals for future performance, and outline the supports needed to meet those goals. The professional learning opportunities identified for each educator must be based on the individual strengths and needs identified through the evaluation process. The process may also reveal areas of common needs among educators which can then be addressed with school-wide professional development opportunities.

The district Professional Development (PD) Committee, which serves in conjunction with the Teacher Evaluation (TEVAL) Committee and shares members in common, is intended to ensure the alignment of professional development to educator practice needs and district, school and department goals. Membership in the committee includes district and school level administrators and educators, as well as representatives from the appropriate exclusive bargaining unit, as required by statute. The committee will meet to discuss the needs of educators as a whole and individually as described below:

1. The PD Committee will explore professional learning opportunities to target district level, school level, and individual/team level professional development needs. Based on data collected, the PD Committee will make recommendations regarding distribution of available professional development time and resources to address all 3 tiers of professional development needs:
 - District level professional development
 - School level professional development
 - Individual/team level professional development

The PD Committee will identify evaluation and development needs, taking into account hours needed for educators to work on goals directly related to their evaluation plan. The committee will develop an annual plan based on input from building principals, department heads/supervisors certified staff, and central administration that takes into account school-based, district-based and individual educator professional growth needs. This plan also takes career growth and teacher leadership opportunities into account. See Fig. 1 below:

Timeline/Cycle of the Professional Development Annual Process



- Based on the allocated hours for school and individual needs, administrators will work with the Professional Development/Teacher Evaluation Committee to determine how to distribute the time required for educators to participate in both school and individual professional learning opportunities. Administrators can also use data from the growth plans and school improvement plans to develop school-wide professional development opportunities to address areas of common need. Part of the professional development schedule will also include sharing educator evaluation materials, discussion of the evaluation process and an opportunity to discuss the materials and expectations in order to ensure understanding as educators seek to develop their

Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and their Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs).

3. Exemplary and proficient educators, as determined by the East Hartford Professional Development and Evaluation Plan, may be invited to create proposals for approval by the Professional Development/Teacher Evaluation (PD/TEVAL) Committee to implement for peers at district or school-based professional development sessions on a designated “Day of Choice” or for other opportunities as appropriate. Furthermore, such teachers may be invited to serve as coaches or mentors for other educators for implementation or improvement support. Such opportunities enhance career growth opportunities for teacher leaders in alignment with district and school improvement plans.

APPENDIX B: CONNECTICUT SCHOOL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 1: Vision, Mission, and Goals

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

Element A. High Expectations for All: Leaders ensure that the creation of the vision, mission and goals establish high expectations for all students and staff.

Element B. Shared Commitments to Implement the Vision, Mission, and Goals:

Leaders ensure that the process of implementing and sustaining the vision, mission, and goals is inclusive, building common understandings and commitment among all stakeholders.

Element C. Continuous Improvement toward the Vision, Mission, and Goals: Leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by consistently monitoring and refining the implementation of the vision, mission and goals.

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 2: Teaching and Learning

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

Element A. Strong Professional Culture: Leaders develop a strong professional culture which leads to quality instruction focused on student learning and the strengthening of professional competencies.

Element B. Curriculum and Instruction: Leaders understand and expect faculty to plan, implement, and evaluate standards-based curriculum and challenging instruction aligned with Connecticut and national standards.

Element C. Assessment and Accountability:

Leaders use assessments, data systems, and accountability strategies to improve achievement, monitor and evaluate progress, and close achievement gaps.

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 3: Organizational Systems and Safety

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

Element A. Welfare and Safety of Students, Faculty and Staff: Leaders ensure a safe environment by addressing real and potential challenges to the physical and emotional safety and security of students, faculty and staff.

Element B. Operational Systems: Leaders distribute responsibilities and supervise management structures and practices to improve teaching and learning.

Element C. Fiscal and Human Resources: Leaders establish an infrastructure for finance and personnel that operates in support of teaching and learning.

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 4: Families and Stakeholders

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

Element A. Collaboration with Families and Community Members: Leaders ensure the success of all students by collaborating with families and other stakeholders.

Element B. Community Interests and Needs: Leaders respond and contribute to community interests and needs to provide high quality education for students and their families.

Element C. Community Resources: Leaders access resources shared among schools, districts, and communities in conjunction with other organizations and agencies that provide critical resources for children and families.

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 5: Ethics and Integrity

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

Element A. Ethical and Legal Standards of the Profession: Leaders demonstrate ethical and legal behavior.

Element B. Personal Values and Beliefs: Leaders demonstrate a commitment to values, beliefs, and practices aligned with the vision, mission and goals for student learning.

Element C. High Standards for Self and Others: Leaders model and expect exemplary practices for personal and organizational performance, ensuring accountability for high standards of student learning.

PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION 6: The Education System

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

Element A. Professional Influence: Leaders improve the broader social, cultural economic, legal, and political, contexts of education for all students and families.

Element B. The Educational Policy Environment: Leaders uphold and contribute to policies and political support for excellence and equity in education.

Element C. Policy Engagement: Leaders engage policymakers to inform and improve education policy.

<http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2641&Q=333900&pp=12&n=1>

APPENDIX C: CONNECTICUT ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION/ SAMPLE SUMMATIVE RATING FORM

This summary rating form is to be completed by the evaluator after the final conference with the administrator. The evaluator will use the preponderance of evidence to assign a rating for each Performance Expectation. The evaluator will also determine progress against the three student learning outcomes and the stakeholder feedback target and assign ratings for each. All other elements are calculated based on these ratings and other relevant data.

Administrator Name

Evaluator's Name

School

LEADERSHIP PRACTICE RATING- 40%				
Performance Expectations and Elements	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Performance Expectation 1: Vision, Mission and Goals				
Performance Expectation 2: Teaching and Learning				
Performance Expectation 3: Organizational Systems and Safety				
Performance Expectation 4: Families and Stakeholders				
Performance Expectation 5: Ethics and Integrity				
Performance Expectation 6: Leadership Practice Rating				
	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Overall Leadership Practice Rating				
OVERALL STAKEHOLDER RATING - 10%				
	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
	Substantially Exceeded	Met	Made Substantial Progress	Did Not Make Substantial Progress
Stakeholder Feedback Rating				
COMPLETE THE OVERALL PRACTICE RATING BELOW - 50%				
	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
OVERALL PRACTICE RATING				

OUTCOME RATING—45%				
Student Learning	>3.5	2.5 – 3.5	1.5 - 2.4	<1.5
	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
State Assessment Rating (SPI)- 0% or 22.5%				
Student Learning Objectives- 22.5% or 45%	Substantially Exceeded	Met	Made Substantial Progress	Did Not Make Substantial Progress
SLO 1				
SLO 2				
SLO 3 (optional)				
	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Student Learning Objectives Rating				
STUDENT LEARNING RATING				
	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Overall Student Learning Rating				
TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS RATING- 5%				
	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Teacher Effectiveness				
COMPLETE THE OVERALL OUTCOMES RATING BELOW—50%				
	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
OVERALL OUTCOMES RATING				

SUMMATIVE RATING SCORING GUIDES

Stakeholder Feedback Guide (10%):

Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Substantial exceeding target	Met target	Made substantial progress but did	Made little or no progress against target

Teacher Effectiveness Guide (5%):

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

SLO Ratings Guide (22.5% or 0%):

2 SLOs:

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Substantially exceeded 1 SLO and met 1 SLO	Met both SLOs Met 1 SLO and made at least substantial progress on the 2 nd SLO	Met 1 SLO and did not make substantial progress on the other	Met 0 SLOs

3 SLOs:

Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Substantially exceeded on 2 SLOs and met 1 SLO ** If 2 SLOs are met, the administrator will gather additional data so that the evaluator can make a determination regarding the summative rating.	Met all three SLOs Met 2 SLOs and made at least substantial progress on the 3 rd	Met 1 SLO and made substantial progress on at least 1 other	Met 0 SLOs OR Met 1 SLO and did not make substantial progress on either of the other 2

Overall Student Learning Rating Matrix (22.5% or 45%):

		State Test Portion/Standardized SLO(s)			
		Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Locally Determined Measures/Non-Standardized SLO(s)	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	<i>Gather further information*</i>
	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient	Proficient	<i>Developing</i>
	Developing	Proficient	<i>Gather further information*</i>	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	<i>Gather further Information*</i>	<i>Gather further information*</i>	Below Standard	Below Standard

SUMMATIVE RATING MATRIX

Summative Rating Matrix		Practice Related Indicators Rating			
		Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Outcomes Related Indicators Rating	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	<i>Gather further information*</i>
	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient	Proficient	<i>Developing</i>
	Developing	Proficient	<i>Gather further information*</i>	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	<i>Gather further Information*</i>	<i>Gather further information*</i>	Below Standard	Below Standard

APPENDIX D: SURVEY SELECTION FOR STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK

1. How is your child get to and from school?

Bus Walks Parent Drop off/pick up

2. In my child's school, there are clear rules against physically hurting other people (for example, hitting, pushing, or tripping).

Yes Sometimes No

3. The adults at my child's school care about the students.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

4. This school has a positive and motivating culture/atmosphere.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

5. Students in my child's school respect each other's differences (for example, gender, race, culture, disability, sexual orientation, learning differences, etc.).

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

6. Parents/guardians feel welcome at my child's school.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

7. My child's teachers treat me with respect.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

8. I am well informed about the progress my child is making in his/her classes.

Yes Sometimes No

9. I feel comfortable discussing my child's needs with his/her teachers and/or other school staff.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

10. The school environment supports learning.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

11. How often do you interact with the teachers at this school?

Daily Weekly Monthly 12 times this year Never

12. I know how my child is doing in school before I get my child's report card.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

13. My child receives the attention he/she needs in the classroom.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

14. My child is learning what he/she needs to know in order to succeed in later grades and after high school.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

15. My child receives a quality education at their school.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

16. This school holds my child to high academic standards.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

17. The principal or assistant principal is available to parents and is willing to listen.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

18. Administrators (principal, assistant principal, department supervisors, etc.) have high expectations for students at this school.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

19. Administrators exhibit respect and professionalism among all members of the school community.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

20. This school is a safe place for my child.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

21. I have seen students in my child's school being physically hurt by other students more than once (for example, pushed, slapped, punched, or beaten up).

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

22. There are groups of students in this school who exclude others and make them feel bad for not being a part of the group.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

23. Students in my child's school will try to stop students from insulting or making fun of other students.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

24. I would recommend this school to a friend.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

25. At this school, facilities are clean and well-maintained.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

26. At least one adult at this school knows my child well.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree Neutral

27.

Place any additional comments/feedback for your child's school in the box below.

Panorama Education

<https://surveys.panoramaed.com/easthartford/demo/383/>

APPENDIX E: CONNECTICUT'S MEASURES OF STUDENT ACADEMIC LEARNING

Measure	Definition
School Performance Index (SPI)	The SPI is a measure of student achievement on Connecticut's standardized assessments – the CMT and CAPT. For each subject tested – mathematics, reading, writing and science – Connecticut reports performance for five achievement levels: Below Basic (BB), Basic (B), Proficient (P), Goal (G) and Advanced (A). For each student, the state calculates an Individual Performance Index (IPI), which represents performance across all tested subjects. The SPI is a compilation of the IPIs for all students in a school. The result is an index score ranging from 0 to 100, where 0 indicates that all students scored at the Below Basic level across all subjects and 100 indicates that all students scored at the Goal or Advanced level.
Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT)	The CMT is the standard assessment administered to students in the content area of science in grades 5 and 8.
Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT)	The CAPT is the standard assessment administered to students in grade 10 in the content area of science.
Smarter Balanced Assessment	The Smarter Balanced Assessment is administered to students in grades 3 through 8 and grade 11. Students are assessed in the content areas of English Language Arts and mathematics.
Subgroups	ELLs, students with disabilities, black students, Hispanic students and students eligible for free or reduced price lunch.

APPENDIX F: SAMPLE STATE ASSESSMENT RATINGS

A SCHOOL WITH AN SPI OF 88 OR GREATER:

Measure	Score Description	Score	Weight	Summary Score
School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year	No target because of high performance	4	0.1	0.4
SPI progress for student subgroups	Meets target for 3 of 4 subgroups	3	0.4	1.2
SPI rating	90	4	0.1	0.4
SPI rating for student subgroups	Gap between the “all students” group and one subgroup is 12	2	0.4	0.8
Score:				2.8
Rating				Proficient

A SCHOOL WITH AN SPI BETWEEN 88 AND 64:

Measure	Raw Score	Scale Score	Weight	Summary Score
School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year	Meets target	3	0.5	1.5
SPI progress for student subgroups	Meets target for 4 out of 5 subgroups	3	0.5	1.5
SPI rating	75	2	0	0
SPI rating for student subgroups	Gap between the “all students” group and all subgroups is <10	4	0	0
Score:				3
Rating				Proficient

A SCHOOL WITH AN SPI < 64:

Measure	Raw Score	Scale Score	Weight	Summary Score
School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year	Meets target	3	0.5	1.5
SPI progress for student subgroups	Meets target for 2 of 3 subgroups	3	0.5	1.5
SPI rating	60	1	0	0
SPI rating for student subgroups	Gap between the “all students” group and one subgroup is 11	1	0	0
Score:				3
Rating				Proficient

APPENDIX G: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SPI AND SLO (FOR TESTED GRADES AND SUBJECTS)

The table below provides an example of how to increase percent proficiency and SPI for a school with 100 students.

Desired Outcome	Necessary Achievement Results	Sample Aligned SLO
Increase percent Proficiency by 9%	9 students move from Basic or Below Basic to Proficient.	Increase reading proficiency in English Language Learners subgroup* by a minimum of 9% annually as measured by CMT.
Increase SPI by 3 points	9 students move from a lower performance level to a higher performance level.	Increase mathematics proficiency for every student in the Economically Disadvantaged students subgroup* by one or more proficiency levels as measured by CMT.

**This sample assumes the cohorts contain no fewer than 9 students.*

APPENDIX H: LEADER EVALUATION RUBRIC

Performance Expectation 1: Vision, Mission and Goals:

Education leader¹ ensure the success and achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, a strong organizational mission and staff² and high expectations for student performance.

Element A: High Expectations for All

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

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<i>1. Information & analysis shape vision, mission and goals</i>	relies on their own knowledge and assumptions to shape school-wide vision, mission and goals.	uses data to set goals for students shapes a vision and mission based on basic data and analysis.	uses varied sources of information and analyzes data about current practices and outcomes to shape a vision, mission and goals.	uses a wide-range of data to inform the development of and to collaboratively track progress toward achieving the vision, mission and goals.
<i>2. Alignment to policies</i>	does not align the school's vision, mission and goals to district, state or federal policies.	establishes school vision, mission and goals that are partially aligned to district priorities.	aligns the vision, mission and goals of the school to district, state and federal policies.	builds the capacity of all staff to ensure the vision, mission and goals are aligned to district, state and federal policies.
<i>3. Diverse perspectives, collaboration, and effective learning</i>	provides limited opportunities for stakeholder involvement in developing and implementing, the school's vision, mission and goals. creates a vision, mission and goals that set low expectations for students.	offers staff and other stakeholders some opportunities to participate in the development of the vision, mission and goals. develops a vision, mission and goals that set high expectations for most students.	incorporates diverse perspectives and collaborates with all stakeholders³ to develop a shared vision, mission and goals so that all students have equitable and effective learning opportunities.	collaboratively creates a shared vision of high expectations with all stakeholders ³ and builds staff capacity to implement a shared vision for high student achievement.

¹**Leader:** Connecticut School leaders who are employed under their intermediate administrator 092 certificate (e.g., curriculum coordinator, principal, assistant principal, department head and other educational supervisory positions)

²**Staff:** all educators and non-certified staff

³**Stakeholders:** a person, group or organization with an interest in education

Element B: Shared Commitments to Implement and Sustain the Vision, Mission and Goals

Leaders ensure that the process of implementing and sustaining the vision, mission and goals is inclusive, building common understandings and commitments among all stakeholders.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<i>1. Shared understandings guide decisions & evaluation of outcomes.</i>	tells selected staff and stakeholders about decision-making processes related to implementing and sustaining the vision, mission and goals.	develops understanding of the vision, mission and goals with staff and stakeholders. provides increased involvement for staff and other stakeholders in selecting and implementing effective improvement strategies and sustaining the vision, mission and goals.	develops shared understandings, commitments and responsibilities with the school community and other stakeholders for the vision, mission and goals to guide decisions and evaluate actions and outcomes.	engages and empowers staff and other stakeholders to take responsibility for selecting and implementing effective improvement strategies and sustaining progress toward the vision, mission and goals.
<i>2 and 3 combined– Communicates vision; Advocates for effective learning for all</i>	Is unaware of the need to communicate or advocate for the school's vision, mission and goals or for effective learning for all.	builds stakeholders' understanding and support for the vision, mission and goals. generates some support for equitable and effective learning opportunities for all students.	publicly advocates the vision, mission and goals so that the school community understands and supports equitable and effective learning opportunities for all students.	effectively articulates urgency to stakeholders to reach student goals and achieve the vision and mission. persuasively communicates the importance of equitable learning opportunities for all students and the impact on students and the community if these opportunities are not available.

Element C: Continuous Improvement toward the Vision, Mission and Goals

Leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by consistently monitoring and refining the implementation of the vision, mission and goals.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<i>1. Analyzes data to identify needs and gaps between outcomes and goals</i>	is unaware of the need to analyze data and information to assess progress toward student achievement goals and the vision and mission.	uses data to identify gaps between current outcomes and goals for some areas of school improvement.	uses data systems and other sources of information to identify strengths and needs of students, gaps between current outcomes and goals and areas for improvement.	collaboratively reviews and analyzes data and other information with staff and stakeholders to identify individual student needs and gaps to goals. works with faculty to collectively identify specific areas for improvement at the school, classroom and student level.
<i>2 and 3 combined— Uses data and collaborates to design, assess and change programs</i>	is unaware of the need to use data, research or best practice to inform and shape programs and activities.	uses some systems and processes for planning, prioritizing and managing change and inquires about the use of research and best practices to design programs to achieve the school's vision, mission and goals.	uses data, research and best practice to shape programs and activities and regularly assesses their effects. analyzes data and collaborates with stakeholders in planning and carrying out changes in programs and activities.	collaboratively develops and promotes comprehensive systems and processes to monitor progress and drive planning and prioritizing using data, research and best practices. engages all stakeholders in building and leading a school-wide continuous improvement cycle.
<i>3. Identifies and addresses barriers to achieving goals</i>	does not proactively identify barriers to achieving the vision, mission and goals, or does not address identified barriers.	manages barriers to the achievement of the school's vision, mission and goals on a situational level.	identifies and addresses barriers to achieving the vision, mission and goals	focuses conversations, initiatives and plans on minimizing barriers to improving student achievement and is unwavering in urging staff to maintain and improve their focus on student outcomes. uses challenges or barriers as opportunities to learn and to develop staff.
<i>4. Seeks and aligns resources</i>	is unaware of the need to seek or align resources necessary to sustain the school's vision, mission and goals.	aligns resources to some initiatives related to the school's vision, mission and goals.	seeks and aligns resources to achieve the vision, mission and goals.	builds capacity of the school and its staff to provide services that sustain the school's vision, mission and goals. prioritizes the allocation of resources to be consistent with the school's vision, mission and goals.

LEADER EVALUATION RUBRIC

Performance Expectation 2: Teaching and Learning

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

Element A: Strong Professional Culture

Leaders develop a strong professional culture which leads to quality instruction focused on student learning and the strengthening of professional competencies.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<i>1. Closes achievement gaps</i>	<p>is unaware of the achievement gap¹.</p> <p>is working toward improvement for only some students.</p>	<p>uses student outcome data to build their own awareness of achievement gaps.</p> <p>is developing a personal commitment to improvement for all students.</p>	<p>develops shared understanding and commitment to close achievement gaps¹ so that all students achieve at their highest levels.</p>	<p>regularly shares ongoing data on achievement gaps and works with faculty to identify and implement solutions.</p> <p>establishes a culture in which faculty members create classroom and student goals aligned with ensuring all students achieve at high levels.</p>
<i>2. Supports and Evaluates Professional Development</i>	<p>provides professional development that is misaligned with faculty and student needs.</p> <p>does not monitor classroom instruction for the implementation of professional development content.</p>	<p>provides professional development for staff that addresses some but not all needs for improvement.</p>	<p>supports and evaluates professional development to broaden faculty² teaching skills to meet the needs of all students</p>	<p>works with staff to provide job-embedded professional development and follow-up supports aligned to specific learning needs.</p> <p>collaborates with staff to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of professional development based on student outcomes.</p>

¹**Achievement gap** (attainment gap) refers to the disparity on a number of educational measures between performance groups of students, especially groups defined by gender, race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status. The gap can be observed on a variety of measures, including standardized test scores, grade point average, dropout rates, and college enrollment and completion rates.

²**Faculty:** certified school faculty

<p><i>3 and 4 combined – Fosters Inquiry and Collaboration for Improvement</i></p>	<p>establishes most strategies and directions without staff collaboration and is rarely open to new ideas and strategies.</p> <p>is uninvolved in faculty conversations to resolve student learning challenges.</p>	<p>models learning and seeks opportunities for personal growth.</p> <p>encourages staff collaboration and growth to improve teaching and learning.</p>	<p>seeks opportunities for personal and professional growth through continuous inquiry.</p> <p>fosters respect for diverse ideas and inspires others to collaborate to improve teaching and learning.</p>	<p>develops processes for continuous inquiry with all staff and inspires others to seek opportunities for personal and professional growth.</p> <p>builds a culture of candor, openness to new ideas, and collaboration to improve instruction with all staff.</p>
<p><i>5. Supports Teacher Reflection and Leadership</i></p>	<p>provides insufficient time and resources for teachers to work together on instructional improvement.</p> <p>provides few roles for teacher leadership and rarely encourages teachers to seek leadership opportunities.</p>	<p>recognizes the importance of teacher reflection and provides some opportunities for teachers to reflect on classroom practices and their leadership interests.</p>	<p>provides support, time and resources to engage faculty in reflective practice that leads to evaluating and improving instruction and in pursuing leadership opportunities.</p>	<p>provides time and resources for teacher collaboration and builds the capacity.</p> <p>of teachers to lead meetings focused on improving instruction.</p> <p>builds a strong instructional leadership team, builds the leadership capacity of promising staff, and distributes leadership opportunities among staff.</p>
<p><i>6. Provides Feedback to Improve Instruction</i></p>	<p>ineffectively uses data, assessments or evaluation methods to support feedback.</p> <p>does not consistently provide specific and constructive feedback or effectively monitor for changes in practice.</p>	<p>provides sporadic feedback based on data, assessments or evaluations.</p> <p>monitors some teachers' practice for improvements based on feedback.</p>	<p>provides timely, accurate, specific and ongoing feedback using data, assessments and evaluation methods that improve teaching and learning.</p>	<p>provides regular, timely and constructive feedback to all staff and monitors for implementation and improved practice.</p> <p>creates a culture of candid feedback and opportunities for staff to review each other's data and instructional practice and provide feedback to each other.</p>

Element B: Curriculum and Instruction

Leaders understand and expect faculty to plan, implement and evaluate standards-based curriculum and challenging instruction aligned with Connecticut and national standards.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<p><i>1 and 2 combined – Aligns Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment to Standards</i></p>	<p>is unaware of how to align curriculum with standards, instruction and assessments.</p>	<p>builds their own understanding of state and national standards.</p> <p>develops curriculum, instruction and assessment methods that are loosely aligned to standards.</p>	<p>develops a shared understanding of curriculum, instruction and alignment of standards-based instructional programs.</p> <p>ensures the development, implementation and evaluation of curriculum, instruction and assessment by aligning content standards, teaching, professional development and assessment methods.</p>	<p>builds the capacity of all staff to collaboratively develop, implement and evaluate curriculum and instruction that meet or exceed state and national standards.</p> <p>monitors and evaluates the alignment of all instructional processes.</p>
<p><i>3. Improves Instruction for the Diverse Needs of All Students</i></p>	<p>supports the use of instructional strategies that do not meet the diverse learning needs of students.</p>	<p>uses evidence-based instructional strategies and instructional practices that address the learning needs of some but not all student populations.</p>	<p>uses evidence-based strategies and instructional practices to improve learning for the diverse needs of all student populations¹.</p>	<p>builds the capacity of staff to collaboratively identify differentiated learning needs for student groups.</p> <p>works with staff to continuously adjust instructional practices and strategies to meet the needs of every student.</p>

¹Diverse student needs: students with disabilities, cultural and linguistic differences, characteristics of gifted and talented, varied socio-economic backgrounds, varied school readiness, or other factors affecting learning.

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
4. <i>Collaboratively Monitors and Adjusts Curriculum and Instruction</i>	<p>is unaware of how to analyze student progress using student work.</p> <p>supports the use of curriculum and instruction that fail to consistently meet the needs of all students.</p>	<p>analyzes student work and monitors student progress with occasional collaboration from staff.</p> <p>facilitates adjustments to curriculum and instruction that meet the needs of some but not all students.</p>	<p>develops collaborative processes to analyze student work, monitor student progress and adjust curriculum and instruction to meet the diverse needs of all students.</p>	<p>empowers faculty members to continuously monitor student progress and improve curriculum and instruction to meet the learning needs of every student.</p>
5. <i>Provides Resources and Training for Extended Learning</i>	<p>identifies only limited resources and supports for extending learning beyond the classroom.</p>	<p>promotes learning beyond the classroom provides inconsistent support and resources to faculty around extending learning opportunities.</p>	<p>provides faculty and students with access to instructional resources, training and technical support to extend learning beyond the classroom walls.</p>	<p>builds strong faculty commitment to extending learning beyond the classroom.</p> <p>collaborates with faculty to attain necessary resources and provide ongoing training and support for extended learning.</p>
6. <i>Supports the Success of Faculty and Students as Global Citizens¹</i>	<p>focuses only on established academic standards as goals for student and staff skills.</p> <p>provides limited support or development for staff or students associated with the dispositions for a global citizen.</p>	<p>supports some staff and students in developing their understanding of the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed for success as global citizens.</p>	<p>assists faculty and students to continually develop the knowledge, skills and dispositions to live and succeed as global citizens.</p>	<p>establishes structures for staff to continuously discuss the skill, knowledge and dispositions necessary for success as global citizens.</p> <p>faculty and students have multiple opportunities to develop global knowledge, skills and dispositions.</p>

¹**A Global Citizen** uses 21st century knowledge, skills and dispositions to communicate effectively, think creatively, respect diversity, gain an awareness and understandings of the wider world, appreciate different cultures and points of view and work to make the world a better place.

Element C: Assessment and Accountability

Leaders use assessments, data systems and accountability strategies to improve achievement, monitor and evaluate progress and close achievement gaps.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<i>1 and 2 combined- Uses Multiple Sources of Information¹ to Improve Instruction</i>	monitors limited sources of student information and staff evaluation data. does not connect information to school goals and/or instruction.	develops awareness and understanding among staff of a variety of assessments and sources of information on student progress and instruction. is learning to use multiple sources of information to identify areas for improvement.	uses district, state, national, and international assessments and multiple sources of information to analyze student performance, advance instructional accountability, and improve teaching and learning.	builds the capacity and accountability of staff to monitor multiple sources of information and a range of assessments for each student. empowers staff members to continuously use multiple sources of information to adjust instructional strategies and improve teaching and learning.
<i>3. Staff Evaluation</i>	conducts occasional classroom observations for some staff. does not connect evaluation results to professional development or school improvement goals.	completes evaluations for all staff according to stated requirements. uses some evaluation results to inform professional development.	implements district and state processes to conduct staff evaluations to strengthen teaching, learning and school improvement.	sets and monitors meaningful goals with each staff member, accurately differentiates ratings and provides additional evaluation activity and feedback for Developing or Below Standard teachers. develops and supports individual staff learning plans and school improvement goals based on evaluations.
<i>4. Communicates Progress</i>	provides limited information about student progress to faculty and families.	provides updates on student progress to faculty and families.	interprets data and communicates progress toward the vision, mission and goals for faculty and all other stakeholders.	builds the capacity of all staff to share ongoing progress updates with families and other staff members. consistently connects results to the vision, mission and goals of the school and frequently updates staff and families around progress and needs for improvement.

¹**Multiple sources of information:** Including but not limited to test scores, work samples, school climate data, teacher/family conferences and observations. Multiple assessments would include local, state, national, and international assessments.

LEADER EVALUATION RUBRIC

Performance Expectation 3: Organizational Systems and Safety

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

Element A: Welfare and Safety of Students, Faculty and Staff

Leaders ensure a safe environment by addressing real and potential challenges to the physical and emotional safety and security of students, faculty and staff.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
1. <i>Safety and security plan</i>	insufficiently plans for school safety.	develops a safety and security plan and monitors its implementation. creates minimal engagement with the community around safety plan.	develops, implements and evaluates a comprehensive safety and security plan in collaboration with district, community and public safety responders.	continuously engages the school community in the development, implementation and evaluation of a comprehensive safety and security plan.
2. <i>Positive school climate for learning</i>	is unaware of the link between school climate and student learning. acts alone in addressing school climate issues.	seeks input and discussion from school community members to build his/her own understanding of school climate. plans to develop a school climate focused on learning and social/emotional safety.	advocates for, creates and supports collaboration that fosters a positive school climate which promotes the learning and well-being of the school community.	supports ongoing collaboration from staff and community to review and strengthen a positive school climate. develops a school climate that supports and sustains learning, social/emotional safety and success for every member of the school community.
3. <i>Community norms for learning</i>	uses his/her own judgment to develop norms for behavior. does not consistently implement or monitor norms for accountable behavior.	develops and informs staff about community norms for accountable behavior. monitors for implementation of established norms.	involves families and the community in developing, implementing and monitoring guidelines and community norms for accountable behavior to ensure student learning.	builds ownership for all staff, community and students to develop and review community norms for accountable behavior. students, staff and parents all hold themselves and each other accountable for following the established norms.

Element B: Operational Systems

Leaders distribute responsibilities and supervise management structures and practices to improve teaching and learning.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<i>1 and 4 combined – Evaluate and Improve operational systems</i>	ineffectively monitors operational processes. makes minimal improvements to the operational system.	reviews existing processes and plans improvements to operational systems.	uses problem-solving skills and knowledge of operational planning to continuously evaluate and revise. processes to improve the operational system.	continuously evaluates and revises school processes. plans ahead for learning needs and proactively creates improved operational systems to support new instructional strategies.
<i>2. Safe physical plant</i>	maintains a physical plant that does not consistently meet guidelines and legal requirements for safety.	Approaching ensuring a safe physical plant according to local, state and federal guidelines and legal requirements for safety	ensures a safe physical plant according to local, state and federal guidelines and legal requirements for safety.	develops systems to maintain and improve the physical plant and rapidly resolve any identified safety.
<i>3. Data systems to inform practice</i>	uses existing data systems that provide inadequate information to inform practice.	monitors communication and data systems to provide support to practice.	facilitates the development of communication and data systems that assure the accurate and timely exchange of information to inform practice.	gathers regular input from faculty on new communications or data systems that could improve practice. seeks new capabilities and resources based on school community input.
<i>5. Equipment and technology for learning</i>	uses existing equipment and technology or technology that ineffectively supports teaching and learning.	identifies new equipment and technologies and/or maintains existing technology. is learning about how technology can support the learning environment.	oversees acquisition, maintenance and security of equipment and technologies that support the teaching and learning environment.	develops capacity among the school community to acquire, maintain and ensure security of equipment and technology and to use technology to improve instructional practices and enhance communication.

Element C: Fiscal and Human Resources

Leaders establish an infrastructure for finance and personnel that operates in support of teaching and learning.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<p><i>1 and 2 combined – Aligns resources to goals</i></p>	<p>operates a budget that does not align with district or state guidelines.</p> <p>allocates resources that are not aligned to school goals.</p>	<p>develops and operates a budget within fiscal guidelines.</p> <p>aligns resources to school goals and to strengthening professional practice.</p>	<p>develops and operates a budget within fiscal guidelines that aligns resources of school, district, state and federal regulations.</p> <p>seeks, secures and aligns resources to achieve vision, mission and goals to strengthen professional practice and improve student learning.</p>	<p>works with community to secure necessary funds to support school goals.</p> <p>aligns and reviews budgets on a regular basis to meet evolving needs for professional practice and to improve student learning.</p>
<p><i>3. Recruits and retains staff</i></p>	<p>uses hiring processes that involve few recruiting sources.</p> <p>provides limited support for early career teachers and has few strategies to retain teachers.</p>	<p>reviews and improves processes for recruiting and selecting staff.</p> <p>provides support to early career teachers but has limited strategies to develop and retain effective teachers.</p>	<p>implements practices to recruit, support and retain highly qualified staff.</p>	<p>involves all stakeholders in processes to recruit, select and support effective new staff.</p> <p>implements strategies and practices that successfully retain and develop effective staff in the school and district.</p>
<p><i>4. Conducts staff evaluations</i></p>	<p>does not consistently implement district/state evaluation processes.</p> <p>evaluation results are not used to improve teaching and learning.</p>	<p>prioritizes and completes staff evaluation processes.</p> <p>is beginning to connect evaluation process and results to professional learning.</p>	<p>conducts staff evaluation processes to improve and support teaching and learning, in keeping with district and state policies.</p>	<p>coordinates staff to conduct staff evaluation processes and differentiate evaluation process based on individual teacher performance.</p> <p>works with staff to connect evaluation processes to professional learning and instructional improvement.</p>

LEADER EVALUATION RUBRIC

Performance Expectation 4: Families and Stakeholders

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

Element A: Collaboration with Families and Community Members

Leaders ensure the success of all students by collaborating with families and stakeholders.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
1. <i>Accesses family and community resources</i>	is unaware of how to access resources or support from families and the community.	reaches out to the broader community to access resources and support. secures community resources that are not consistently aligned to student learning.	coordinates the resources of schools, family members and the community to improve student achievement.	consistently seeks and mobilizes family and community resources and support aligned to improving achievement for all students.
2. <i>Engages families in decisions</i>	provides limited opportunities for families to engage in educational decisions. does not ensure that families feel welcome in the school environment.	welcomes family involvement in some school decisions and events that support their children's education.	welcomes and engages all families in decision-making to support their children's education.	engages families consistently in understanding and contributing to decisions about school-wide and student-specific learning needs.
3. <i>Communicates with families and community</i>	uses limited strategies to communicate with families and community members. limits opportunities for families and community members to share input or concerns with the school.	shares information and progress with families. provides opportunities for families and community members to share input and concerns with the school.	uses a variety of strategies to engage in open communication with staff and families and community members.	uses a variety of strategies and builds the capacity of all staff to facilitate open and regular communication between the school and families and community members.

Element B: Community Interests and Needs

Leaders respond and contribute to community interests and needs to provide the best possible education for students and their families.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
1. <i>Communicates effectively</i>	ineffectively communicates with members of the school community.	communicates clearly with most people. seeks more opportunities to interact with stakeholders.	demonstrates the ability to understand, communicate with, and interact effectively with people.	communicates and interacts effectively with a wide range of stakeholders. builds the skills of staff to ensure clear two-way communication and understanding with all stakeholders.
2. <i>Understands and accommodates diverse¹ student and community conditions</i>	uses limited resources to understand diverse student needs. demonstrates limited knowledge of community conditions and dynamics.	collects information to understand diverse student and community conditions. provides some accommodations for diverse student and community conditions.	uses assessment strategies and research methods to understand and address the diverse needs of student and community conditions and dynamics.	uses assessment strategies and research with all staff to build understanding of diverse student and community conditions. collaborates with staff to meet the diverse needs of students and the community.
3. <i>Capitalizes on diversity</i>	demonstrates limited awareness of community diversity as an educational asset.	values community diversity. develops some connections between community diversity and educational programs.	capitalizes on the diversity of the community as an asset to strengthen education.	integrates community diversity into multiple aspects of the educational program to meet the learning needs of all students.
4. <i>Collaborates with community programs</i>	establishes limited collaboration with community programs. community programs address few student learning needs.	collaborates with community programs to meet some student learning needs.	collaborates with community programs serving students with diverse needs.	builds and regularly reviews and strengthens partnerships with community programs to meet the diverse needs of all students.
5. <i>Involves all stakeholders</i>	provides limited opportunities for stakeholder input. occasionally excludes or ignores competing perspectives.	elicits some stakeholder involvement and input. seeks occasional input from competing educational perspectives.	involves all stakeholders, including those with competing or conflicting educational perspectives.	builds a culture of ongoing open discussion for all stakeholders. actively seeks and values alternate viewpoints.

¹Diversity: including, but not limited to cultural, ethnic, racial, economic, linguistic, generational

Element C: Community Resources

Leaders maximize shared resources among schools, districts and communities in conjunction with other organizations and agencies that provide critical resources for children and families.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<p>1. <i>Collaborates with community agencies</i></p>	<p>works with community agencies when needed.</p> <p>provides limited access to community resources and services to children and families.</p>	<p>collaborates with some community agencies for health, social or other services.</p> <p>provides some access to resources and services to children and families.</p>	<p>collaborates with community agencies for health, social and other services that provide essential resources and services to children and families.</p>	<p>proactively identifies and prioritizes essential resources and services for children and families.</p> <p>collaborates with community agencies to provide prioritized services and consistently evaluates service quality.</p>
<p>2. <i>Develops relationships with community agencies</i></p>	<p>develops limited relationships with community agencies.</p> <p>community partnerships inconsistently meet the needs of the school community.</p>	<p>develops relationships with community organizations and agencies.</p> <p>evaluates some partnerships to ensure benefit to agencies and school community.</p>	<p>develops mutually – beneficial relationships with community organizations and agencies to share school and community resources.</p>	<p>develops ongoing relationships with community agencies aligned to school needs.</p> <p>assesses partnerships on a regular basis to ensure mutual benefit and shared resources for school and agency.</p>
<p>3. <i>Applies resources to meet the needs of children and families</i></p>	<p>does not consistently align resources to the educational needs of the school.</p>	<p>aligns resources to the educational needs of students.</p> <p>supports the educational needs of most families.</p>	<p>applies resources and funds to support the educational needs of all children and families.</p>	<p>identifies educational needs of students and families and aligns all resources to specific needs.</p>

LEADER EVALUATION RUBRIC

Performance Expectation 5: Ethics and Integrity

Education leaders ensure the success and well-being of all student and staff by modeling ethical behavior and integrity.

Element A: Ethical and Legal Standards of the Profession

Leaders demonstrate ethical and legal behavior.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
1. <i>Professional Responsibility</i>	does not consistently exhibit or promote professional responsibility in accordance with the Connecticut Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators.	Approaching exhibiting and promoting professional conduct in accordance with Connecticut’s Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators.	exhibits and promotes professional conduct in accordance with Connecticut’s Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators.	continuously communicates, clarifies and collaborates to ensure professional responsibilities for all educators.
2. <i>Ethics</i>	does not consistently demonstrate personal and professional ethical practices.	Approaching modeling personal and professional ethics, integrity, justice, and fairness and hold others to the same standards.	models personal and professional ethics, integrity, justice, and fairness and holds others to the same standards.	holds high expectations of themselves and staff to ensure educational professionalism, ethics, integrity, justice, and fairness.
3. <i>Equity and Social Justice¹</i>	does not consistently promote educational equity and social justice for students.	earns respect and is building professional influence to foster educational equity and social justice for all stakeholders.	uses professional influence and authority to foster and sustain educational equity and social justice for all students and staff.	removes barriers to high-quality education that derive from all sources of educational disadvantage or discrimination. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promotes social justice by ensuring all students have access to educational opportunities.
4. <i>Rights and Confidentiality</i>	does not consistently protect the rights of students, families and staff and/or maintain appropriate confidentiality.	Protects the rights of some but not all students, families, and staff and maintains confidentiality.	protects the rights of students, families and staff and maintains confidentiality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • builds a shared commitment to protecting the rights of all students and stakeholders. • maintains confidentiality, as appropriate.

¹**Social Justice:** recognizing the potential of all students and providing them with the opportunity to reach that potential regardless of ethnic origin, economic level, gender, sexual orientation, race, religion, etc. to ensure fairness and equity for all students.

Element B: Personal Values and Beliefs

Leaders demonstrate a commitment to values, beliefs and practices aligned with the vision, mission and goals for student learning.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<i>Respects the Dignity and Worth of Each Individual</i>	does not consistently treat everyone with respect.	approaching consistent demonstration of respect for dignity and worth of others	demonstrates respect for the inherent dignity and worth of each individual.	promotes the recognition of the dignity and worth of everyone.
<i>Models Respect for Diversity and Equitable Practices</i>	does not consistently demonstrate respect for diversity and equitable practices for all stakeholders.	approaching respect for the diversity and equitable practices for all stakeholders	models respect for diversity and equitable practices for all stakeholders.	builds a shared commitment to diversity and equitable practices for all stakeholders.
<i>Advocates for Mission, Vision and Goals</i>	does not consistently advocate for or act on commitments stated in the mission, vision and goals.	advocates for the vision, mission and goals.	advocates for and acts on commitments stated in the vision, mission and goals to provide equitable, appropriate and effective learning opportunities.	advocates and actively engages the participation and support of all stakeholders towards the vision, mission and goals to provide equitable, appropriate and effective learning opportunities.
<i>Ensures a Positive Learning Environment</i>	does not consistently address challenges or contribute to a positive learning environment.	addresses some challenges or engages others to ensure values and beliefs promote the school vision, mission and goals.	overcomes challenges and leads others to ensure that values and beliefs promote the school vision, mission and goals needed to ensure a positive learning environment.	skillfully anticipates and overcomes challenges and collaborates with others to ensure that values and beliefs promote the school vision, mission and goals needed to ensure a positive learning environment.

Element C: High Standards for Self and Others

Leaders model and expect exemplary practices for personal and organizational performance, ensuring accountability for high standards of student learning.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
1. <i>Lifelong Learning</i>	does not consistently engage in or seek personal professional learning opportunities.	recognizes the importance of personal learning needs. uses some research and best practices for professional growth.	models, reflects on and builds capacity for lifelong learning through an increased understanding of research and best practices.	models reflection and continuous growth by publicly sharing their own learning process based on research and best practices and its relationship to organizational improvement.
2. <i>Support of Professional Learning</i>	does not consistently support and use professional development to strengthen curriculum, instruction and assessment.	supports professional development that is primarily related to curriculum and instructional needs.	supports on-going professional learning and collaborative opportunities designed to strengthen curriculum, instruction and assessment.	supports and collaboratively uses differentiated professional development strategies to strengthen curriculum, instruction and assessment.
3. <i>Allocates Resources Equitably</i>	does not equitably use resources to sustain and strengthen organizational performance.	allocates resources which address some organizational needs.	allocates resources equitably to sustain a high level of organizational performance.	actively seeks and provides resources to equitably build, sustain and strengthen organizational performance.
4. <i>Promotes Appropriate Use of Technology</i>	demonstrates a limited understanding of technology and ethical implications for its use.	promotes the use of technology and has addressed some legal, social and ethical issues.	promotes understanding of the legal, social and ethical use of technology among all members of the school community.	is highly skilled at understanding, modeling and guiding the legal, social and ethical use of technology among all members of the school community.
5. <i>Inspires Student Success</i>	ineffectively builds trust, respect and communication to achieve expected levels of performance and student success.	promotes communication and is building trust and respect to strengthen school performance and student learning.	inspires and instills trust, mutual respect and honest communication to achieve optimal levels of performance and student success.	creates a collaborative learning community which inspires and instills trust, mutual respect and honest communication to sustain optimal levels of performance and student success.

LEADER EVALUATION RUBRIC

Performance Expectation 6: The Education System

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

Element A: Professional Influence

Leaders improve the broader, social, cultural, economic, legal and political contexts of education for all students and families.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<i>1. Promotes public discussion about educational laws, policies and regulations</i>	does not consistently follow current federal, state and local education laws, policies and regulations and has limited conversations about how they impact education.	follows current education legislation, seeks opportunities to engage in professional learning activities to understand issues and implications, and shares information with the school community.	promotes public discussion within the school community about federal, state and local laws, policies and regulations affecting education.	engages the entire school community in dialogue about educational issues that may lead to proactive change within and beyond his/her own school and district as appropriate.
<i>2. Builds relationships with stakeholders and policymakers</i>	takes few opportunities to engage stakeholders in educational issues.	identifies some issues that affect education and maintains a professional relationship with stakeholders and policymakers.	develops and maintains relationships with a range of stakeholders and policymakers to identify, understand, respond to, and influence issues that affect education.	actively engages local, regional and/or national stakeholders and policymakers through local community meetings and state or national organizations, using various modes of communication.
<i>3. Advocates for equity, access and adequacy of student and family resources</i>	has limited understanding and/or ineffectively uses resources for family services and support through community agencies.	is learning how to help students and families locate, acquire and access programs, services or resources to create equity.	advocates for equity, access and adequacy in providing for student and family needs using a variety of strategies to meet educational expectations.	empowers the school community to successfully and appropriately advocate for equal and adequate access to services and resources for all.

Element B: The Educational Policy Environment

Leaders uphold and contribute to policies and political support for excellence and equity in education.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
1. <i>Accurately communicates educational performance</i>	ineffectively communicates with members of the school community. does not fully understand growth, trends and implications for improvement.	reviews school growth measures and student data. conducts basic data analyses and communicates data about educational performance.	collects, analyzes, evaluates and accurately communicates data about educational performance in a clear and timely way.	engages the school community and stakeholders in analysis of school and student data that leads to identifying important indicators of school progress, greater understandings and implications for growth and refinements to the school or district’s mission, vision and goals.
2. <i>Improves public understanding of legislation, policy and laws</i>	provides incomplete information to the public to understand school or student results, legal issues, practices and implications.	shares information about federal, state and local laws, policies and regulations. provides information to decision-makers and the community.	communicates effectively with decision-makers and the community to improve public understanding of federal, state and local laws, policies and regulations.	actively communicates and clarifies federal, state and local laws, policies and regulations with stakeholders and decision makers to improve public understanding and input.
3. <i>Upholds laws and influences educational policies and regulations</i>	does not consistently uphold laws, regulations.	upholds federal, state and local laws and seeks to engage in public discourse about policies and regulations to support education.	upholds federal, state and local laws and influences policies and regulations in support of education.	works with district, state and/or national leaders to advocate for/or provide feedback about the implementation effectiveness of policies or regulations.

Element C: Policy Engagement

Leaders engage policymakers to inform and improve education policy.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<p>1. <i>Advocates for public policies to support the present and future needs of children and families</i></p>	<p>does not advocate for policies and procedures to meet the needs of all students and their families.</p>	<p>identifies some policies and procedures that can support equity and seeks to communicate with the community about these policies.</p>	<p>advocates for public policies and administrative procedures that provide for present and future needs of children and families to improve equity and excellence in education.</p>	<p>works with students, families and caregivers to successfully advocate for equitable and appropriate policies and procedures to close the achievement gap by ensuring all children have an equal opportunity to learn.</p>
<p>2. <i>Promotes public policies to ensure appropriate, adequate and equitable human and fiscal resources</i></p>	<p>is unaware of policies that result in equitable resources to meet the needs of all students.</p> <p>does not allocate resources appropriately, adequately or equitably.</p>	<p>supports fiscal guidelines to use resources that are aligned to meet school goals and student needs.</p> <p>allocates and distributes school resources among faculty, staff and students.</p>	<p>promotes public policies that ensure appropriate, adequate and equitable human and fiscal resources to improve student learning.</p>	<p>aligns with state and national professional organizations that promote public policy and advocate for appropriate, adequate and equitable resources to ensure quality educational opportunities that are equal and fair for all students.</p>
<p>3. <i>Collaborates with leaders to inform planning, policies and programs</i></p>	<p>demonstrates limited understanding or involvement with others to influence decisions affecting student learning inside or outside of own school or district.</p>	<p>is learning to collect analyze and share data with others to raise awareness of its impact on decisions affecting student learning on local, district, state and national levels.</p>	<p>collaborates with community leaders to collect and analyze data on economic, social and other emerging issues to inform district and school planning, policies and programs.</p>	<p>actively engages all stakeholders through conversations and collaboration to proactively change local, district, state and national decisions affecting the improvement of teaching and learning.</p> <p>is involved with local, state and national professional organizations in order to influence and advocate for legislation, policies and programs that improve education.</p>

APPENDIX I: EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE FOR LEADER EVALUATION RUBRIC (TIED TO CONNECTICUT SCHOOL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS)

Performance Expectation 1: Vision, Mission and Goals

Education leaders¹ ensure the success and achievement of all students by guiding the development and implementation of a shared vision of learning, a strong organizational mission and high expectations for student performance.

ELEMENT A: High Expectations for All

Leaders ensure that the creation of the vision, mission and goals establishes high expectations for all students and staff².

- The vision, mission and goals are supported by current, relevant data
- Written values and beliefs reflect high expectations for all students
- The vision focuses on student academic excellence and healthy social/ emotional development
- Goals and the instructional program are clearly aligned to the vision
- The vision, mission and goals are collaboratively developed by and shared with stakeholder groups

The school's goals and vision are shared and widely known within the school community

- Parents, staff and other stakeholders are clear about academic expectations
- School priorities are public—with a common understanding of short and long term milestones and goals
- Results of the school assessment are publicly shared with the staff and with members of the community

ELEMENT B: Shared Commitments to Implement and Sustain the Vision, Mission and Goals

Leaders ensure that the process of implementing and sustaining the vision, mission and goals is inclusive, building common understandings and commitments among all stakeholders.

- The school's goals and vision are shared and widely known within the school community
- Parents, staff and other stakeholders are clear about academic expectations
- School priorities are public—with a common understanding of short- and-long term milestones and goals
- Results of the school assessment are publicly shared with the staff and with members of the community

¹**Leader:** Connecticut School Leaders who are employed under their intermediate administrator 092 certificate (e.g., curriculum coordinator, principal, assistant principal, department head and other educational supervisory positions)

²**Staff:** All educators and non-certified staff

ELEMENT C: Continuous Improvement toward the Vision, Mission and Goals

Leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by consistently monitoring and refining the implementation of the vision, mission and goals.

- Disaggregated student data is continually monitored and analyzed to determine the current state of the school
- Progress toward goals is collaboratively reviewed to make necessary adjustments that keep the focus on student outcomes
- Fiscal and human resources are aligned with and support priority areas and goals

Performance Expectation 2: Teaching and Learning

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

ELEMENT A: Strong Professional Culture

Leaders develop a strong professional culture which leads to quality instruction focused on student learning and the strengthening of professional competencies.

- Stakeholders are focused on closing achievement gaps between subgroups of students and use data to determine appropriate interventions for students or subgroups not making progress
- Effective instructional practices are being implemented across multiple classrooms
- Staff are actively engaged in job-embedded collaborative learning including observations of other teachers
- Teachers are frequently observed by peers and the principal who provide actionable feedback for reflection and improved instruction
- Teacher leadership opportunities are available and designed to support improved instruction and student outcomes

ELEMENT B: Curriculum and Instruction

Leaders understand and expect faculty to plan, implement and evaluate standards-based curriculum and challenging instruction aligned with Connecticut and national standards.

- The school instructional framework aligns curriculum with standards, instruction, assessment and learning
- A rigorous, relevant and standards-based curriculum that meets the unique needs of each student is being implemented
- Stakeholders collaboratively review and analyze the effectiveness of the curriculum to make real-time and necessary adjustments
- Faculty and students are offered diverse and innovative learning opportunities that extend beyond the classroom

ELEMENT C: Assessment and Accountability

Leaders use assessments, data systems and accountability strategies to improve achievement, monitor and evaluate progress and close achievement gaps.

- Systems to access real-time data and purposefully monitor progress toward goals are in place and operational
- Information from multiple sources – qualitative and quantitative, formative and summative – is collaboratively collected and analyzed
- Teachers and staff are evaluated and receive targeted support and guidance through on-going classroom visits and dialogue
- Stakeholders are routinely updated on the progress toward meeting goals and realizing the vision

Performance Expectation 3: Organizational Systems and Safety

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

Element A: Welfare and Safety of Students, Faculty and Staff

Leaders ensure a safe environment by addressing real and potential challenges to the physical and emotional safety and security of students, faculty and staff.

- The school building is clean and safe in accordance with the school safety plan and any legal regulations

- The school is a positive learning environment that supports the success of all students by meeting their physical, emotional, social and academic needs

Element B: Operational Systems

Leaders distribute responsibilities and supervise management structures and practices to improve teaching and learning.

- School building is clean and safe in accordance with the school safety plan and any legal regulations
- Operational responsibilities are distributed among the individuals responsible for the students' education and well-being
- Up-to-date data systems are used to inform operational, instructional and safety procedures
- Technology equipment is functional and supports the success of all students and adults

Element C: Fiscal and Human Resources

Leaders establish an infrastructure for finance and personnel that operates in support of teaching and learning.

- Instructional funds are transparently and equitably distributed to accomplish the organizational goals
- Teachers who have the expertise to deliver instruction that maximizes student learning are recruited and retained
- Teachers and staff are evaluated and receive targeted support and guidance as required by district and state evaluation requirements

Performance Expectation 4: Families and Stakeholders

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

Element A: Collaboration with Families and Community Members

Leaders ensure the success of all students by collaborating with families and stakeholders.

- School staff, families and community members interact and communicate regularly to share ownership for the success of the school
- The school meaningfully engages families in the learning process

Element B: Community Interests and Needs

Leaders respond and contribute to community interests and needs to provide the best possible education for students and their families.

- The success of all students is promoted through collaboration among family and community partners
- School leadership welcomes and responds to diverse community interests and needs and mobilizes community resources
- Families and community members from a diversity of cultures and backgrounds are engaged as partners in the learning process
- Structures are in place to ensure all stakeholders, regardless of position or viewpoint, are engaged in the learning community

Element C: Community Resources

Leaders maximize shared resources among schools, districts and communities in conjunction with other organizations and agencies that provide critical resources for children and families.

- Community resources are leveraged to meet student needs such as after-school food sources, health care services, employment opportunities, social services and additional educational services
- School resources are used to support the needs of students and their families

Performance Expectation 5: Ethics and Integrity

Education leaders ensure the success and well-being of all student and staff by modeling ethical behavior and integrity.

Element A: Ethical and Legal Standards of the Profession

Leaders demonstrate ethical and legal behavior.

- Expectations for professional and ethical behavior are clearly communicated and modeled by school personnel
- Program implementation and outcome data are monitored to ensure equity and guarantee that all students are justly served
- There are audits of student and adult data to ensure privacy and confidentiality are maintained

Element B: Personal Values and Beliefs:

Leaders demonstrate a commitment to values, beliefs and practices aligned with the vision, mission and goals for student learning.

- Each person in the learning community is known, valued and respected
- Influential educational, political and community leaders are mobilized to advocate for the vision, mission and goals of the school
- The school is a positive learning environment that supports the success of all students by meeting their physical, emotional, social and academic needs

Element C: High Standards for Self and Others.

Leaders model and expect exemplary practices for personal and organizational performance, ensuring accountability for high standards of student learning.

- Life-long learning is modeled by staff through engaging in professional learning that is aligned with the vision, goals and objectives of the school
- Current educational research and best practices are reflected in all facets of the school
- Resources are equitably allocated to the core components of student academic, social, emotional, behavioral and physical development as well as to educator quality
- Technology is appropriately used for learning and communication purposes
- The learning community is inspired to work together toward high levels of student performance.

Performance Expectation 6: The Education System

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

Element A: Professional Influence

Leaders improve the broader, social, cultural, economic, legal and political contexts of education for all students and families.

- The goals of the school and education more broadly are promoted and advocated for throughout the school community
- Internal stakeholders are equipped with talking points and advocacy plans so they can influence key external groups with a consistent voice

Element B: The Educational Policy Environment

Leaders uphold and contribute to policies and political support for excellence and equity in education.

- Stakeholders are routinely updated on the progress toward meeting goals and realizing the vision
- The school complies with legal and ethical requirements in relationships with all stakeholders and clearly communicates all applicable state, federal and district policies, procedures and guidelines
- Structures and systems are in place to review compliance with all laws

Element C: Policy Engagement

Leaders engage policymakers to inform and improve education policy.

- The school leader is a visible ambassador for education in the learning community and in the district, city, state or nation
- Deliberate relationships with policy makers are developed to influence policy and advocate for programs that improve education

ADDENDUM: 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 SCHOOL YEAR

The U.S. Department of Education has approved the Connecticut State Department of Education's (CSDE) application for Field Test Flexibility for 2013-14. This choice has been extended into 2015-16 (pending federal approval). Given the timing of data's likely arrival next year and other factors, the CSDE has noted that it is impractical to expect to use results from the SB-FT for educator evaluation in 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16. As a result, East Hartford Public Schools will not be able to use student achievement data to help determine summative ratings for its teachers and administrators. As such, the district has is adding the following addendum into its Professional Development and Administrator Evaluation Plan for the 2013-2014, the 2014-2015, and the 2015-16 academic years:

Category # 3- 45% Student Learning

- Pending U.S. Department of Education's approval of CT's request for flexibility on the use of student test data in 2015-16, East Hartford Public Schools will not require that 22.5% of the administrator's student learning component incorporate SPI progress. Given this adjustment, the entire 45% of an administrator's rating on student learning indicators shall be based on the locally-determined indicators. These locally-determined indicators would also comprise the 5% Whole-School Student Learning Indicator rating for teachers.