

**CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford**

**TO BE PROPOSED:
April 6, 2016**

RESOLVED, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c)(2) of Section 10-151b of the Connecticut General Statutes, amends the guidelines for an educator evaluation and support program, known as the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, Sections 1.3 and 2.3(c), by approving recommendations made by the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC), regarding educator evaluation and support plan submission and approval (Section 1.3) and use of state test data in educator evaluation in the 2016-17 school year (Section 2.3(c)), as described in the Commissioner's April 6, 2016, memorandum to the State Board of Education, and directs the Commissioner to take the necessary action.

Approved by a vote of _____ this sixth day of April, Two Thousand Sixteen.

Signed: _____
Dianna R. Wentzell, Secretary
State Board of Education

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Hartford

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Dr. Dianna R. Wentzell, Commissioner of Education

DATE: April 6, 2016

SUBJECT: Proposed Amendments to the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation

Executive Summary

Introduction

On March 9, 2016, the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) met to consider key elements of the current Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (Guidelines) and to discuss potential flexibilities as a result of the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in December 2015. As local educational agencies (LEAs) are currently planning for the year ahead, PEAC proposed recommendations on two key elements in order to provide superintendents with timely guidance regarding requirements for the 2016-17 school year. PEAC will continue to meet in the coming months to further discuss key elements and to develop additional recommendations. The following proposed amendments to the Guidelines are recommended at this time:

Plan Submission and Approval Process: PEAC recommends that LEAs be allowed to continue with their current Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE)-approved plan for the 2016-17 school year. LEAs would not be required to submit their 2016-17 Educator Evaluation and Support Plan to the CSDE for review and approval. If an LEA's Professional Development and Evaluation Committee (PDEC) recommends a substantive change to their existing plan, the LEA would submit an amendment form to the CSDE for review and approval.

Use of State Test Data in Educator Evaluation: PEAC recommends the extension of current flexibility with respect to the incorporation of state test data in the evaluation of educators during the 2016-17 school year. PEAC will continue to discuss the use of state test data as part of educator evaluation beyond 2016-17 and will make recommendations at a later date.

History/Background

On January 25, 2012, PEAC reached unanimous agreement on the state's required evaluation framework for teacher evaluation, and on February 6, 2012, PEAC reached unanimous agreement on the required evaluation framework for administrator evaluation. Subsequently, in June 2012, the State Board of Education (SBE), in consultation with PEAC, adopted core requirements for educator evaluation and support, formally entitled the *Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation*.

Since the 2013-14 school year, each local or regional board of education has been implementing new systems for educator evaluation and support that align with the Guidelines. In January 2014, informed by the University of Connecticut’s NEAG School of Education, as well as stakeholder feedback, PEAC reached consensus on recommendations to the SBE regarding flexibilities to the Guidelines. These recommendations were approved by the SBE on February 6, 2014. In April 2014, PEAC made additional recommendations regarding amendments to the Guidelines, which were approved by the SBE on May 7, 2014. With passage of ESSA in December 2015, the Department has been working with PEAC to identify positive aspects, as well as opportunities, to strengthen the Guidelines. As such, PEAC convened on March 9, 2016, to discuss key areas for further refinement within the current Guidelines and arrived at two recommendations for consideration by the SBE.

Recommendation and Justification

It is critical to provide timely guidance to superintendents as LEAs are in the process of planning for the coming year. Therefore, we recommend that the SBE adopt the proposed amendments to the Guidelines for the 2016-17 school year.

Follow-up Activity

The CSDE will codify the amended language (see attached) in an updated version of the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation. As well, the CSDE will communicate the amended policy to all LEAs. PEAC will continue to meet to discuss key elements of the Guidelines given the transition to ESSA starting with 2016-17 school year.

PEAC will further examine and evolve the system of standardized and non-standardized student learning indicators, including the use of the state mastery examination in educator evaluation. As a result of this examination and further consultation with stakeholders and research experts, PEAC will develop recommendations for additional revisions to the Guidelines.

Prepared by: _____
Sharon Fuller, Education Consultant
Educator Effectiveness and Professional Learning

Reviewed by: _____
Shannon Marimón, Division Director
Educator Effectiveness and Professional Learning

Approved by: _____
Sarah J. Barzee, Ph.D., Chief Talent Officer
Talent Office

PEAC-Proposed Amendments to the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation

Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) — 3/9/16

Evaluation Approval Process

Section 1.3: (1) Educator evaluation and support system plans or revisions to such plans must be approved annually by the CT State Department of Education (CSDE) prior to district implementation. Such process will be an iterative one—between the State Department of Education and district superintendent or in the instance of a consortium of districts, superintendents—until the CSDE approves the teacher and administrator evaluation and support systems plan. The CSDE will inform districts of the approval process timeline.

Amendment: For the 2016-17 school year, local educational agencies (LEAs) are allowed to continue with implementation of their current CSDE-approved plan. LEAs are not required to submit their 2016-17 Educator Evaluation and Support Plan to the CSDE for review and approval. If an LEA's Professional Development and Evaluation Committee (PDEC) recommends a substantive change to their existing plan, the LEA would submit an amendment form to the CSDE for review and approval.

45% Student Growth Component

Section 2.3: (c) One half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goals/objectives are met shall not be determined by a single, isolated standardized test score, but shall be determined through the comparison of data across assessments administered over time, including the state test for those teaching tested grades and subjects or another standardized indicator for other grades and subjects where available. A state test can be used only if there are interim assessments that lead to that test, and such interim assessments shall be included in the overall score for those teaching tested grades and subjects. Those without an available standardized indicator will select, through mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute-resolution procedure as described in section 1.3, an additional non-standardized indicator.

Amendment:

- a. LEAs will have flexibility with respect to the incorporation of state test data in the evaluation of educators through the 2016-17 school year, pursuant to PEAC's recommendation on March 9, 2016, and the State Board of Education's action on April 6, 2016.

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

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