

Bridgeport Public Schools 2015

Educator Evaluation & Support Plan



Bridgeport Public Schools

45 Lyon Terrace
Bridgeport, CT 06604
www.bridgeportedu.com

Approved by Bridgeport Board of Education on _____

Bridgeport Board of Education

David P. Hennessey, Board Chair

Joe Larcheveque, Board Vice Chair

Hernan Illingworth, Secretary

Andre Baker Jr.

Sauda Baraka

Kadisha Coates

Howard Gardner

Jacqueline Kelleher

Kenneth Moales Jr.

Professional Development and Evaluation Committee

Frances M. Rabinowitz, Superintendent

Deborah Broccoli

Dane Brown

Rebecca Mitchell

Teresa Carroll

Shaun Mitchell

Ryan Howard

Gary Peluchette

Tiffany Ladson-Lang

Ricardo Rosa

Ann Langley

Hector Sanchez, BCAS Pres.

Carmella Lorusso

Christine Taylor

Amy Marshall

Robert Traber, BEA Pres.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Teacher Evaluation Overview	2
Teacher Evaluation and Support Framework	2
Process and Timeline	3
Goal-Setting and Planning	3
Mid-Year Check-in	4
End-of-Year Summative Review	4
Peer Observers	5
Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing	5
Support and Development	6
Improvement and Remediation Plans.....	6
Additional Levels of Support	6
Career Development and Growth	7
Teacher Practice Related Indicators	8
Component #1: Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)	8
Teacher Practice Framework- <i>CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014</i>	9
Observation Process	10
Pre-Conferences, Post-Conferences, and Feedback.....	13
Teacher Performance and Process Focus Area	14
Teacher Performance and Practice Scoring.....	14
Summative Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice Rating.....	14
Component #2: Parent Feedback (10%)	16
Administration of Whole-School Parent Survey.....	16
Determining School-Level Parent Goals.....	17
Selecting a Parent Engagement Goal and Improvement Targets.....	17
Measuring Progress on Growth Targets.....	17
Arriving at a Parent Feedback Rating.....	17
Student Outcomes Related Indicators	18
Component #3: Student Growth and Development (45%)	18
Overview of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)	18
PHASE 1: Review the Data	19
PHASE 2: Set Two SLOs	20
PHASE 3: Monitor Students Progress	24
PHASE 4: Assess Student Outcomes Relative to SLOs	25
Component #4: Whole-School Student Learning Indicator and/or Student Feedback (5%)	26
Option 1: Whole-School Student Learning Indicator	26
Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring	27

Summative Scoring	27
Adjustment of Summative Rating.....	30
Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness	30
Dispute-Resolution Process	31
Core Requirements for the Evaluation of Student and Educator Support Specialists.....	32
Flexibility from Core Requirements for the Evaluation of Teachers	32
ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION and Development -----	34
Purpose and Rationale.....	35
System Overview	36
Administrator Evaluation and Support Framework.....	36
Process and Timeline	37
Step 1: Orientation and Context-Setting	38
Step 2: Goal-Setting and Plan Development	38
Step 3: Plan Implementation and Evidence Collection.....	40
Step 4: Mid-Year Formative Review.....	41
Step 5: Self-Assessment.....	41
Step 6: Summative Review and Rating	42
Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing	42
Support and Development.....	43
Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning.....	43
Improvement and Remediation Plans.....	44
Career Development and Growth	46
Leadership Practice Related Indicators.....	46
Component #1: Observation of Leadership Practice (40%).....	46
Strategies for Using the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric.....	49
Arriving at a Leadership Practice Summative Rating	50
Component #2: Stakeholder Feedback (10%)	52
Stakeholder Feedback Summative Rating	53
Student Outcomes Related Indicators	54
Component #3: Student Learning (45%).....	54
State Measures of Academic Learning.....	54
Locally-Determined Measures (Student Learning Objectives).....	55
Parameters of Administrator SLOs.....	56
Examples of Administrator SLOs.....	57
Arriving at Student Learning Summative Rating	58
Component #4: Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%).....	59
Summative Administrator Evaluation Rating.....	59
Summative Scoring	59
Determining Summative Ratings	60

A. PRACTICE: Leadership Practice (40%) + Stakeholder Feedback (10%) = 50%	61
B. OUTCOMES: Student Learning (45%) + Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%) = 50%	61
C. OVERALL: Leader Practice + Student Outcomes	62
Adjustment of summative Rating	63
Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness	63
Dispute-Resolution Process	64
CT State Board of Education Adopted Revisions: guideline for Educator Evaluation May 2014	65

Appendix I: Teacher Resources;

Appendix II: Administrator Resources;

Appendix III: Contract Agreements;

Appendix IV: District Rubrics; &

Appendix V: Other Resources.....

Introduction

Bridgeport Public Schools is committed to ensuring that all students learn to the best of their potential. An effective teacher evaluation system supports high quality teaching and improved student learning in several ways. It provides an opportunity for ongoing and constructive dialogue between teachers and evaluators that is focused on student learning. It provides valuable information to administrators about the specific professional learning needs and development opportunities that teachers require to meet the diverse needs of their students. It creates a relationship of shared responsibility and accountability for student growth among teachers and administrators. It enables teachers to be recognized for their professional growth and their contributions to the school and educational communities. The system provides uniform evaluation procedures, yet reflects the needs of teachers at different stages of professional learning.

The Bridgeport Public Schools evaluation system builds upon many of the school improvement efforts that the district has invested in over the past several years and reinforces the culture of shared responsibility and leadership for student learning that has been at the center of these activities. The evaluation approach outlined in this plan uses multiple sources of information and evidence to complete a fair, accurate, and comprehensive picture of a teacher's performance, including teacher observations, student learning outcomes, and feedback from parents. It is a standards-based plan grounded in the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching, the Common Core State Standards, and the locally developed curriculum standards that Bridgeport Public Schools has used to increase rigor, implement data-driven decision making, and expand the system of supports provided to all students to ensure ongoing growth and achievement. Bridgeport's Professional Development and Evaluation Committee supports the ongoing process and development of its Educator Evaluation and Support Plan, and will regularly review and revise components of this system based on emerging needs.

It should be noted that the term "teacher" refers to all individuals in positions requiring certification, including, but not limited to classroom teachers. The terms "administrator" or "school leader" refer to those individuals in positions requiring an administrative certification, including, but not limited to principals.

Teacher Evaluation Overview


Teacher Evaluation and Support Framework

The evaluation and support system consists of multiple measures to paint an accurate and comprehensive picture of teacher performance. All teachers will be evaluated in four components, grouped into two types of major categories: Teacher Practice and Student Outcomes.

- 1. Teacher Practice Related Indicators:** An evaluation of the core instructional practices and skills that positively affect student learning. This category is comprised of two components:
 - (a) Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)** as defined within the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014*, which articulates four domains and twelve indicators of teacher practice
 - (b) Parent Feedback (10%)** on teacher practice through surveys
- 2. Student Outcomes Related Indicators:** An evaluation of teachers' contributions to student academic progress at the school and classroom level. There is also an option in this category to include student feedback. This area is comprised of two components:
 - (a) Student Growth and Development (45%)** as determined by the teacher's Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and associated Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs)
 - (b) Whole-School Measures of Student Learning** as determined by aggregate student learning indicators or Student Feedback (5%)

Scores from each of the four components will be combined to produce a summative performance rating designation of *Exemplary*, *Accomplished*, *Developing* or *Below Standard*. The performance levels are defined as:

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



Process and Timeline

The annual evaluation process between a teacher and an evaluator (principal or designee) is anchored by three conferences, which guide the process at the beginning, middle and end of the year. **These conferences shall be held individually between the primary evaluator and the evaluatee.** The purpose of these conversations is to clarify expectations for the evaluation process, provide comprehensive feedback to each teacher 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 teacher in order to be productive and meaningful. **For staff hired after the start of the school year, please see Appendix I.d for the appropriate timeline.**

Goal Setting & Planning	Mid-Year Check-in	End-of-Year Review
Goals submitted by October 15 th	Completed by February 15 th	Self-reflection submitted by May 15 th
Goal setting conference by November 15 th		Summative evaluation completed by June 15 th *

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

GOAL-SETTING AND PLANNING:

Timeframe: Completed by November 15th

- 1. Orientation on Process** – To begin the evaluation process, principals will meet with teachers for a ½ day orientation session in August, prior to the first day of school for students to discuss the evaluation process and their roles and responsibilities within it. They will discuss school and district priorities that should be reflected in Teacher Practice Focus Areas and Student Learning Objectives (SLOs). Specialized staff will receive their orientation at their first department meeting of the year, annually. New teachers will receive their orientation to the process as part of their orientation program in August – annually.
- 2. Teacher Reflection and Goal-Setting** – The teacher examines student data, prior year evaluation and survey results, school wide goal, and the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014*, or other rubric depending on their area of practice, to draft a proposed performance and practice focus area, a parent feedback goal, and two SLOs for the school year. The teacher may collaborate with grade-level or subject matter teams to create this draft.
- 3. Goal-Setting Conference** – The evaluator and teacher meet to discuss the teacher’s (or team’s) proposed focus area, goals and objectives in order to arrive at mutual agreement about them. The teacher collects relevant material about his / her practice and the evaluator collects relevant material about the teacher’s practice to support the review.

MID-YEAR CHECK-IN:

Timeframe: Completed by February 15th

1. **Reflection and Preparation** – The teacher and evaluator collect and reflect on relevant material to date about the teacher’s practice and student learning in preparation for the check-in.
2. **Mid-Year Conference** – The evaluator and teacher complete at least one mid-year check-in conference during which they review evidence related to the teacher practice focus area and progress towards SLOs and other goals. The mid-year conference is an important point in the year for addressing concerns and reviewing results for the first half of the year. The teacher completes a Mid-Year Self-Evaluation which is submitted to the evaluator prior to the conference. Evaluators may deliver mid-year formative information on indicators of the evaluation framework for which evidence has been gathered and analyzed. If needed, teachers 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 teacher can take and supports the evaluator can provide to promote teacher growth in his/her focus area.

END-OF-YEAR SUMMATIVE REVIEW:

Timeframe: Completed 10 days prior to the last day of school

1. **Teacher Self-Assessment** – The teacher 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 and uses them to generate component ratings. The component ratings are combined to calculate scores for Teacher Practice Related Indicators and Student Outcomes Related Indicators. These scores generate the final, summative rating. After all data, including state test data (not relevant for SY 14-15), are available, the evaluator may adjust the summative rating if the state test data would significantly change the Student-Related Indicators final rating. Such revisions should take place as soon as state test data are available and before September 15.
3. **End-of-Year Conference** – The evaluator and the teacher meet to discuss all evidence collected to date and to discuss **component ratings**. **Following the conference**, the evaluator assigns a **summative rating** and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year and before June 15th.

Peer Observers

The primary evaluator for most teachers will be the school principal or assistant principal who will be responsible for the overall evaluation process, including assigning summative ratings. Bridgeport Public Schools uses Peer Observers to assist primary evaluators with informal observations of non-tenured teachers. Peer Observers are certified educators who may be qualified TEAM mentors or are emerging teacher leaders who share knowledge and ideas with other colleagues. They demonstrate a professional attitude, maintain confidentiality, are fair, unbiased and collaborative and demonstrate professional involvement in the school community period. Peer Observers are knowledgeable about current teaching and learning best practices, and know and use a wide repertoire of effective classroom management and instructional strategies. Tenured teachers may request a Peer Observation. If the Peer Observation is to be used for the purpose of evaluation, it must be mutually agreed upon with the primary evaluator. *It is expected that peer observers conduct their first informal observation of non-tenured teachers by October 15th.*

Peer Observers share their feedback with the teacher they've observed and with the primary evaluator. Peer Observers do not rate the teacher's performance. That is the sole responsibility of the primary evaluator. Peer Observers may be part of the Structured Support Plan or Assistance Plan if requested by the teacher. **See Appendix 1.a for Peer Observer form.**

Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing

All evaluators are receiving extensive training in the evaluation process. Bridgeport Public Schools has contracted with PhocuseD on Learning, LLC to train administrators in teacher observation and feedback, including the norming and calibration of evaluators using *The Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT) Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* or other district approved rubrics for special areas. Criteria for demonstrating proficiency will consist of a performance based assessment in which administrators will be required to conduct and rate a previously normed observation. Training is scheduled throughout the school year to provide evaluators support and additional strategies to ensure calibration and effective evaluation practices.

Professional development will continue to be available to the district as needed thereafter to train and support evaluators and those requiring additional support to be proficient in their evaluation skills. Proficiency status of evaluators will be determined annually. Peer observers will receive extensive training on the evaluation process from PhocuseD on Learning, LLC to support their classroom observation skills.

Additionally, the district will participate in any trainings and technical assistance made available by the State Department of Education as applicable for district's implementing a modified version of the SEED evaluation model.

Support and Development

Evaluation alone cannot hope to improve teacher practice and student learning. However, when paired with effective, relevant, and timely support, the evaluation process has the potential to help move teachers along the path to exemplary practice.

Improvement and Remediation Plans

If a teacher's performance is rated as "*developing*" or "*below standard*", it signals the need for focused supervision, support and development.

Structured Support Plans and Assistance Cycle Plans will be developed in consultation with the teacher and his/her exclusive bargaining representative and be differentiated by the level of identified need and/or stage of development.

Additional Levels of Support:

1. **Structured Support Level:** An educator (tenured or non-tenured) would be placed on the Structured Support Level and receive a Structured Support Plan if they are rated as developing during the prior school year. The Structured Support Plan includes targeted supports, with timelines, for meeting the goals established as part of the teacher's evaluation plan and must be completed no later than October 15th. While on Structured Support teachers will have 3 check-in meetings during the year (December, February and April) along with a minimum of 1 formal observation and 4 informal observations for tenured teachers and 3 formal observations and a minimum of 2 informal observations for non-tenured teachers, all conducted by an administrator. Each observation will be followed by a post-observation conference within 5 business days. See Appendix I.b.1-I.b.3 for plans and sample plan.

Teachers may also request peer support. If peer support is requested, the support must become part of the Structured Support Plan. The teacher must document the support, and bring the documentation to the check-in meetings. If the teacher is successful in addressing the Structured Support Plan by the end of the school year and is rated accomplished or exemplary, he/she will be removed from Structured Support and placed on the regular 3 year cycle with the first year including the formal observation. The evaluator has discretion for keeping a teacher in Structured Support for a second year if the teacher is showing improvement. A new Structured Support Plan will be developed for the 2nd year in consultation with teacher's exclusive bargaining representative. Teachers may not stay in Structured Support beyond 2 consecutive years. If the teacher is not successful in addressing the Structured Support Plan by the end of the school year and is rated Developing or Below Standard they will be placed in the Assistance Level.

2. **Assistance Level:** An educator (tenured) would be placed on the Assistance Level and receive an Assistance Plan if they are rated Below Standard during the prior school year, or if they were not successful at the Structured Support Level. The Assistance Level is a communication of grave importance to the teacher that if the district's performance expectations remain unmet, termination of contract will follow. To communicate the serious nature of placement into the

Assistance Level, notice shall come from the Superintendent of Schools no later than September 22nd. By September 30th, the teacher shall meet with the Superintendent of Schools (or designee), the 3 assigned evaluators who make up the evaluation team, and the teacher's exclusive bargaining representative to discuss the specific performance objectives which the teacher must address. The process for meeting these performance objectives, the individuals responsible for providing support, a time frame for providing support and the evaluation team members will be presented to the teacher at this meeting.

The Assistance Level shall be divided into 3 assessment periods so that progress may be closely monitored throughout the year. The 3 assessments and 1 summative evaluation will be completed as follows: Assessment 1: October through December; Assessment 2: January through March; Assessment; April through June; and the summative evaluation: June. In each assessment period, the teacher will receive a minimum of three observations, including 1 formal observation. At the end of each assessment period the primary evaluator will complete a Summary of the Assessment Period and conduct a meeting with team members, teacher, and his/her exclusive bargaining representative. By the end of the third assessment period, if a teacher fails to achieve a rating of Accomplished or Exemplary then the teacher will be recommended for termination. If the teacher has successfully met the plan, and is rated Accomplished or Exemplary, they shall be removed from Assistance Level and placed in the district's evaluation cycle. **See Appendix I.c for plan.**

Career Development and Growth

Teachers recognized for exemplary performance through the evaluation process are encouraged to pursue professional growth opportunities that promote their own continued professional growth and also benefit their professional community.

Examples of such opportunities include, but are not limited to: conducting action research; peer observation and coaching; mentoring early career teachers; leading a professional learning community; preparing and leading a staff development program; curriculum development and adaptation; and other focused professional development based on goals for continuous growth and development.

Teacher Practice Related Indicators

The Teacher Practice Related Indicators evaluate the teacher's knowledge of a complex set of skills and competencies and how these are applied in a teacher's practice. Two components comprise this category:

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

Component #1: Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)

The Teacher Performance and Practice component is a comprehensive review of teaching practice conducted through multiple observations, which are evaluated against a standards-based rubric. It comprises 40% of the summative rating. Following observations, evaluators provide teachers with specific feedback to identify strong practice, to identify teacher development needs and to tailor support to meet those needs.

The *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014*, or district approved rubrics in specialized areas will be utilized to help determine the teacher performance and practice rating. The *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* includes references to Connecticut Core Standards and other content standards. The *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* is organized into four domains, each with three indicators. Forty percent of a teacher's final annual summative rating is based on his/ her performance across all four domains. The domains represent essential practice and knowledge and receive equal weight when calculating the summative Performance and Practice rating.

See **Appendix IV** for district Approved rubrics.

CCT RUBRIC FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING 2014 - AT A GLANCE

Evidence Generally Collected Through **In-Class Observations**

DOMAIN 1: Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning³

Teachers promote student engagement, independence and interdependence in learning and facilitate a positive learning community by:

- 1a. Creating a positive learning environment that is responsive to and respectful of the learning needs of all students
- 1b. Promoting developmentally appropriate standards of behavior that support a productive learning environment for all students; and
- 1c. Maximizing instructional time by effectively managing routines and transitions.

DOMAIN 3: Instruction for Active Learning

Teachers implement instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:

- 3a. Implementing instructional content for learning;
- 3b. Leading students to construct meaning and apply new learning through the use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies; and
- 3c. Assessing student learning, providing feedback to students and adjusting instruction.

DOMAIN 2: Planning for Active Learning

Teachers plan instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:

- 2a. Planning instructional content that is aligned with standards, builds on students' prior knowledge and provides for appropriate level of challenge for all students;
- 2b. Planning instruction to cognitively engage students in the content; and
- 2c. Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to monitor student progress.

DOMAIN 4: Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership

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

- 4a. Engaging in continuous professional learning to impact instruction and student learning;
- 4b. Collaborating with colleagues to examine student learning data and to develop and sustain a professional learning environment to support student learning; and
- 4c. Working with colleagues, students and families to develop and sustain a positive school climate that supports student learning.

Evidence Generally Collected Through **Non-Class Observations/Reviews of Practice**

Observation Process

Observations in and of themselves are not useful to teachers – it is the feedback, based on observations, that helps teachers reach their full potential. All teachers deserve the opportunity to grow and develop through observations and timely feedback. In fact, teacher surveys conducted nationally demonstrate that most teachers are eager for more observations and feedback to inform their practice throughout the year.

Therefore, in the teacher evaluation and support model:

- **Formal:** Observations that include a pre-conference, and are followed by a post-observation conference, which includes timely written and verbal feedback within five business days. The formal pre-conference must be followed by an observation that occurs within the timeframe of the unit of study. *For example, Mrs. Smith and her principal pre-conferenced about an instructional unit of study on The Scarlet Letter. The observation will then occur at some time during the delivery of instruction of that unit.*
- An observation **need not** address every indicator in any Domain. Absence of an indicator during an observation **does not** necessarily indicate a deficiency.
- **Informal:** Observations that are followed by written and/ or verbal feedback within five business days.
- **Non-classroom observations/reviews of practice include, but are not limited to:** Observations of data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, student work or other teaching artifacts and are followed by written and/or verbal feedback within five business days.

PLEASE NOTE:

- *Reviewing lesson plans in a pre-conference, prior to a scheduled observation, generally provides evidence for the planning domain and is considered a part of the formal observation process. It is not a separate observation, or review of practice.*
- *An observation is not considered complete until both evaluator (observer), and evaluatee (learner), have completed the post-conference endorsement form (sign-off).*

Teacher Categories	Bridgeport Model	Guidelines
<p>Non-Tenured Teachers Year 1 & 2 Rating: Accomplished or Exemplary</p>	<p>3 formal observations (minimum), by administrator, 1st to be completed by January 1st</p> <p>1 informal observation (minimum), by administrator, prior to December 1st and the 1st formal observation</p> <p>1 informal observation by Peer Observers, more if deemed necessary</p> <p>1 Review of Practice</p>	<p>3 formal observations to include a pre-conference and post-observation conference within 5 business days.</p> <p>At least 3 informal observations, one conducted by the administrator and two conducted by the peer observers and 1 Review of Practice. Additional observations if deemed necessary.</p> <p>All observations are followed by post-conferences to include next steps within 5 business days.</p>
<p>Non-Tenured Teachers Year 3 & 4 Rating: Accomplished or Exemplary</p>	<p>Will be placed in Year 1 of the 3-Year Cycle which includes:</p> <p>1 formal observation (minimum), by administrator, to be completed by January 1st</p> <p>1 informal observation (minimum), by administrator or Peer Observer prior to December 1st and the formal observation</p> <p>1 Review of Practice</p> <p>Cycle 2 & 3 will follow the tenured requirements</p>	<p>At least 1 formal observation to include a pre-conference and post conference within 5 business days.</p> <p>At least 3 informal observations, one conducted by the administrator and two conducted by the peer observers, and 1 Review of Practice. Additional observations if deemed necessary.</p> <p>All observations are followed by post-conferences to include next steps within 5 business days.</p>
<p>Year 1 – 4 Rated: Developing</p>	<p>See Improvement and Remediation Plan (Structured Support) section of this document</p>	<p>Three check-ins (December, February and April)</p>
<p>Tenured Teachers Rated: Accomplished or Exemplary</p>	<p>Teachers will be placed by their evaluator in a three year cycle and administrators will conduct the following:</p> <p>Teachers placed in Year 1 of the 3-year cycle: A minimum of 1 formal observation, 1 informal observation and 1 review of practice</p> <p>Teachers placed in Year 2 and 3 of cycle: A minimum of 3 informal observations and 1 review of practice annually</p>	<p>All observations are followed by post-conference, with substantial conversation, to include next steps within 5 business days.</p> <p>Post conference of a review of practice could be conducted with a group of teachers</p>
<p>Tenured Teachers Rated: Developing</p>	<p>Has a Structured Support Plan</p> <p>Minimum of 3 formal observations and 1 informal observations per year and 1 review of practice</p>	<p>Structured Support Plan is developed in consultation with the teacher’s exclusive bargaining representative.</p> <p>All mandatory observations are conducted by administrator.</p> <p>The teacher may request additional support from a peer mentor. This support will become part of the Plan and the teacher must document support and bring related materials to check in meetings.</p> <p>The teacher decides who their peer mentor is.</p> <p>Three check-ins (December, February and April)</p>
<p>Tenured Teachers Rated: Below Standard</p>	<p>Has an Assistance Plan</p> <p>Throughout each of the Assessment Periods, a minimum of 3 observations (at least 1 formal) will be conducted. At the end of each assessment period, the primary evaluator will complete the “Summary of the Assessment Period” and facilitate the meeting with the team, teacher and his/her bargaining unit representative</p> <p>A review of practice will be conducted once during the year.</p>	<p>Assistance Plan is developed in consultation with the teacher’s exclusive bargaining representative.</p> <p>All mandatory observations are conducted by administrator.</p> <p>The teacher may request additional support from a peer mentor. This support will become part of the Plan and the teacher must document support and bring related materials to the check in meetings.</p> <p>The teacher decides who their peer mentor is.</p> <p>Assessment Periods Meetings (Dec., March, and June)</p>

• See Appendix I.d for New Hires after September 1st

PLEASE NOTE:

- *It is expected that administrators begin to conduct informal observations by the first month of the school year.*
- *It is expected that peer observers conduct their first informal observation by October 15th.*
- *Beginning in SY 14-15, administrators will place tenured teachers in year 1, 2 or 3 to begin their 3 year observation cycle.*
- *Teachers have twenty-four hours to review their evaluation prior to signing.*

Pre-Conferences and Post-Conferences

Pre-conferences are valuable for establishing the context for the lesson, providing information about the students to be observed and setting expectations for the observation process and provide the evidence for Domain 2: Planning for Active Learning. Pre-conferences are mandatory for formal observations, but optional for informal observations. A pre-conference can be held with a group of teachers, where appropriate. While a group pre-conference may have been held, post-conferences are held individually to allow for individual feedback.

Post-conferences provide a forum for reflecting on the observation against the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* and for generating action steps that will lead to the teacher's improvement. A good post-conference:

- Begins with an opportunity for the teacher to share his/her reflections on the lesson;
- Cites objective relevant material to paint a clear picture for both the teacher and the evaluator about the teacher's successes, what agreed upon next steps will be made and where future observations may focus;
- Involves written and verbal feedback from the evaluator; and
- Occurs within a timely manner, within five business days.

Classroom observations generally provide the most evidence for Domains 1 and 3 of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014*. Non-classroom observations/reviews of practice generally provide the most evidence for Domains 2 and 4. Both pre-and post-conferences provide the opportunity for discussion of all four domains, including practice outside of classroom instruction (e.g., lesson plans, reflections on teaching).

Because the evaluation and support model aims to provide teachers with comprehensive feedback on their practice as defined by the four domains of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014*, all interactions with teachers that are relevant to their instructional practice and professional conduct may contribute to their performance evaluation. Non-classroom observations/reviews of practice generally provide the most evidence for Domains 2 and 4 of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014*. These interactions **may** include, but are not limited to, reviews of lesson/unit plans and assessments, planning meetings, data team meetings, Professional Learning Community meetings, call logs or notes from parent-teacher meetings, and observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers.

Feedback

The goal of feedback is to help teachers grow as educators and inspire high achievement in all 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 should include:

- Specific evidence and formative ratings, where appropriate, on observed indicators of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* or other district approved rubrics for specialized areas;

- Commendations and prioritized recommendations. Recommendations, or next steps, should include steps for further development, with specific strategies and / or resources available to the teacher within a specified timeframe.

Teacher Performance and Practice Focus Area

As described in the Evaluation Process and Timeline section, teachers develop one performance and practice focus area that is aligned to the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* or other district approved rubrics for specialized areas. The focus area will guide observations and feedback conversations throughout the year.

Each teacher will work with his/her evaluator to develop a practice and performance focus area through mutual agreement. All focus areas should have a clear link to student achievement and should move the teacher towards *accomplished* or *exemplary* on the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014*, or other district approved rubrics for specialized areas.

Growth related to the focus area should be referenced in feedback conversations throughout the year. The focus area and action steps should be formally discussed during the Mid-Year Conference and the End-of-Year Conference. Although performance and practice focus areas are not explicitly rated as part of the Teacher Performance and Practice component, growth related to the focus area will be reflected in the scoring of Teacher Performance and Practice evidence.

Teacher Performance and Practice Scoring

During observations, evaluators and/or Peer Observers will take evidence-based notes, capturing specific instances of what the teacher and students said and did in the classroom. Once the evidence has been recorded, the evaluator can align the evidence with the appropriate indicator(s) on the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* or other district approved rubrics in specialized areas and then make a determination about which performance level the evidence supports. Administrators should provide a rating for each attribute observed or an attribute that should have been observed. They should be prepared to discuss the evidence for their ratings during the post conference. Peer Observers do not rate teacher observations but must provide evidence-based feedback.

Summative Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice Rating

Primary evaluators must determine a final teacher performance and practice rating and discuss this rating with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference. Each domain of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014* or other district-approved rubrics in specialized areas carries equal weight in the final rating. The final teacher performance and practice rating will be calculated by the evaluator in a three-step process:

- Evaluator holistically reviews evidence collected through observations, interactions and reviews of practice (e.g., team meetings, conferences) and uses professional judgment to determine indicator ratings for each of the 12 indicators.
- Evaluator averages indicators within each domain to a tenth of a decimal to calculate domain-level scores of 1.0-4.0.
- Evaluator averages domain scores to calculate an overall Observation of Teacher

Performance and Practice rating of 1.0-4.0.

Each step is illustrated below:

1. Evaluator holistically reviews evidence collected through observations and reviews of practice and uses professional judgment to determine indicator level ratings for each of the 12 indicators.

By the end of the year, evaluators should have collected a variety of evidence on teacher practice from the year's observations and reviews of practice. Evaluators then analyze the consistency, trends and significance of the evidence to determine a rating for each of the 12 indicators. Some questions to consider while analyzing the evidence include:

- **Consistency:** What levels of performance have I seen relatively uniform, homogenous evidence for throughout the semester / year? Does the evidence paint a clear, unambiguous picture of the teacher'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:** Are 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	Indicator Level Rating	Evaluator's Score
1a	<i>Developing</i>	2
1b	<i>Developing</i>	2
1c	<i>Exemplary</i>	4
Average Score		2.7

1. Evaluator averages indicators with each domain to a tenth of a decimal to calculate domain-level scores:

Domain	Averaged Domain-Level Score
1	2.7
2	2.6
3	3.0
4	2.8

2. The evaluator averages domain level scores to calculate an overall observation of Teacher Performance and Practice rating of 1.0-4.0.

Domain	Score
1	2.7
2	2.6
3	3.0
4	2.8
Average Score	2.8

The summative Teacher Performance and Practice component rating and the domain/ indicator level ratings will be shared and discussed with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference. This process can also be followed in advance of the Mid-Year Conference to discuss formative progress related to the Teacher Performance and Practice rating.

Component #2: Parent Feedback (10%)

Feedback from parents will be used to help determine the remaining 10% of the Teacher Practice Indicators.

The process for determining the parent feedback rating includes the following steps:

1. The school conducts a whole-school parent survey (meaning data is aggregated at the school level and parent surveys will be translated that reflect the community);
2. Administrators and teachers determine one or more school-level parent goals based on the survey feedback;
3. The teacher and evaluator identify **one** related parent engagement goal and set improvement targets;
4. Evaluator and teacher measure progress on growth targets; and
5. Evaluator determines a teacher's summative rating, based on four performance levels.

Administration of a Whole-School Parent Survey

Parent surveys will be conducted at the whole-school level as opposed to the teacher- level, meaning parent feedback will be aggregated at the school level. Every effort will be made to promote maximum parent participation. This is to ensure adequate response rates from parents.

Parent surveys will be administered in a way that allows parents to feel comfortable providing feedback. Surveys will be anonymous. The parent survey will be administered every spring and trends analyzed from year to year.

Bridgeport Public Schools, in consultation with Panorama Education, members of School

Governance Councils, and district Parent Advisory Councils, assisted in developing whole school surveys to align with district/school improvement goals.

Determining School-Level Parent Goals

Evaluators and teachers will review the parent survey results at the beginning of the school year to identify areas of need and set general parent engagement goals. This goal-setting process will occur between the principal and teachers in August or September so agreement can be reached on at least one improvement goal(s) for the entire school.

Selecting a Parent Engagement Goal and Improvement Targets

Once the school-level goal(s) have been set, teachers will determine, through consultation and mutual agreement with their evaluators, one related parent 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-teacher conferences, etc.

The goal will be written in SMART language format and will include specific improvement targets. For instance, if the goal is to improve parent communication, an improvement target could be specific to sending more regular correspondence to parents such as 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 overall school improvement parent goals, and (2) that the improvement targets are aligned, ambitious and attainable.

Measuring Progress on Growth Targets

Teachers and their evaluators should use their judgment in setting growth/improvement targets for the parent feedback component. There are two ways teachers can measure and demonstrate progress on their growth targets. Teachers can:

1. Measure how successfully they implement a strategy to address an area of need (like the examples in the previous section); and/or
2. They can collect evidence directly from parents to measure parent-level indicators they generate. For example, teachers can conduct interviews with parents or a brief parent survey to see if they improved on their growth target.

Arriving at a Parent Feedback Rating

The Parent Feedback rating should reflect the degree to which a teacher successfully reaches his/her parent goal and improvement targets. This is accomplished through a review of relevant material provided by the teacher and application of the following scale:

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

Student Outcomes Related Indicators

Student Outcomes Related Indicators capture a teacher's impact on student learning and comprise half of the teacher's final summative rating. The inclusion of student outcomes indicators acknowledges that teachers are committed to the learning and growth of their students and carefully consider what knowledge, skills, and talents they are responsible for developing in their students each year. As a part of the evaluation and support process, teachers document their goals of student learning and anchor them in data.

Two components comprise this category:

- Student Growth and Development, which counts for 45%; and
- Whole-School Student Learning, which counts for 5% of the total evaluation rating.


Component #3: Student Growth and Development (45%)

Overview of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)

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

SLOs are carefully planned, long-term academic objectives. SLOs will reflect high, yet attainable, expectations for learning or improvement and aim for mastery of content or skill development. SLOs are measured by Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs), which include specific assessments/measures of progress and targets for student mastery or progress.

The SLO process will support teachers in using a planning cycle that will be familiar to most educators:



Developing SLOs is a process rather than a single event. The purpose is to craft SLOs that serve as a reference point throughout the year as teachers document their students' progress toward achieving the IAGD targets. Teachers may develop them through consultation with colleagues in the same grade level or teaching the same subject. The final determination of SLOs and IAGDs is made through mutual agreement between the teacher and his/her evaluator. The four phases of the SLO process are described in detail below:

PHASE 1: Review the Data

This first phase is the discovery phase which begins with reviewing district initiatives and key priorities, school/district improvement plans, and the building administrator's goals. Once teachers know their class rosters, they should examine multiple sources of data about their students' performance to identify an area(s) of need. Documenting the "baseline" data, or where students are at the beginning of the year, is a key aspect of this step. It allows the teacher to identify where students are with respect to the grade level or content area the teacher is teaching.

Examples of Data Review

A teacher may use, but is not limited to the following data in developing an SLO:

- a. Initial performance for current interval of instruction (writing samples, student interest surveys, pre-assessments etc.)
- b. Student scores on previous state standardized assessments
- c. Results from other standardized and non-standardized assessments
- d. Report cards from previous years
- e. Results from diagnostic assessments
- f. Artifacts from previous learning
- g. Discussions with other teachers (across grade levels and content areas) who have previously taught the same students

- h. Conferences with students' families
- i. Individual Educational Plans (IEPs) and 504 plans for students with identified special education needs
- j. Data related to English Language Learner (EL) students and gifted students
- k. Attendance, behavioral and suspension records
- l. Information about families, community and other local contexts

It is important that the teacher understands both the individual student and group strengths and challenges. This information serves as the foundation for setting the ambitious, yet realistic goals in the next phase.

PHASE 2: Set Two SLOs

Based on a review of district and building data, teachers will develop two SLOs that address identified needs. One SLO will be a reflection of the school wide goal, and the 2nd SLO will be specific to the needs of the students within the teacher's assignment. To create their SLOs, teachers will follow these four steps:

Step 1: Decide on the Student Learning Objectives

The SLOs are broad goal statements for student learning and expected student improvement. These goal statements identify core ideas, domains, knowledge and/or skills students are expected to acquire for which baseline data indicate a need.

- Each SLO should address a central purpose of the teacher's assignment and should pertain to a large proportion of his/her students, including specific target groups where appropriate.
- Each SLO statement should reflect high expectations for student learning at least a year's worth of growth (or a semester's worth for shorter courses) and should be aligned to relevant state, national (e.g., Common Core State Standards) or district standards for the grade level or course. For a 1st semester course, SLOs must be agreed upon by October 15th.
- Depending on the teacher's assignment, an SLO statement might aim for content mastery or else it might aim for skill development.

SLO broad goal statements can unify teachers within a grade level, or department, while encouraging collaborative work across multiple disciplines. Teachers with similar assignments may have identical SLOs although they will be individually accountable for their own students' results.

The following are examples of SLOs based on student data:

Grade/Subject	Student Learning Objective
6th Grade Social Studies	Students will produce effective and well-grounded writing for a range of purposes and audiences.
9th Grade Information Literacy	Students will master the use of digital tools for learning to gather, evaluate and apply information to solve problems and accomplish tasks.
11th Grade Algebra II	Students will be able to analyze complex, real-world scenarios using mathematical models to interpret and solve problems.
9th Grade English/ Language Arts	Students will cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.
1st and 2nd Grade Tier 3 Reading	Students will improve reading accuracy and comprehension leading to an improved attitude and approach toward more complex reading tasks.

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

An indicator of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD) is an assessment of student growth over time. Each SLO will include at least one IAGD, but may include multiple, differentiated IAGD's where appropriate.

For Classroom Teachers in Tested Grades and Subjects:

1. One SLO (22.5%) shall compare data across assessments administered over time. The state assessment will be included only if there are interim assessments available that have the psychometric properties which allow for analysis of progress over time. Professional Development and Evaluation Committee will determine, prior to the school year, different standardized indicators, including state assessment if available, that teachers may use towards this goal. The indicators and weighing of each is subject to mutual agreement between teacher and evaluator.
2. One SLO (22.5%) shall use at least one non-standardized indicator, but may use multiple non-standardized indicators. Indicators and weighing of each is subject to mutual agreement between teacher and evaluator.

All others:

1. A standardized indicator may be used to establish 22.5% of the evaluation. Standardized indicators will be subject to the same criteria as those used in tested subjects, that have the psychometric properties, which allow for analysis of progress over time and that are, administered over time and aligned. The teacher and evaluator will mutually agree on indicators and weight of each.
2. If standardized indicator(s) is used, the second 22.5% of this component shall be determined by use of at least one non-standardized indicator.
3. If no standardized indicator(s) is used, teachers and evaluators will mutually agree on at least two non-standardized indicators for the entire 45% of the evaluation. The indicators and weight of each are subject to mutual agreement.

IAGDs will be rigorous, attainable and meet or exceed district expectations (rigorous targets reflect both greater depth of knowledge and complexity of thinking required for success). Each indicator should make clear:

- a. **What evidence/measure of progress will be examined;**
- b. **What level of performance is targeted; and**
- c. **What proportion of students is projected to achieve the targeted performance level? *For example, how many students will it take to obtain a rating of did not meet, partially met, met, or exceeded the goal?***

IAGDs can also address student subgroups, such as high or low-performing students or EL students. It is through the Phase 1 examination of student data that teachers will determine what level of performance to target for which population(s) of students.

IAGDs should be written in SMART goal language:

S	=	Specific and Strategic
M	=	Measurable
A	=	Aligned and Attainable
R	=	Results-Oriented
T	=	Time-Bound

IAGDs are unique to the teacher's particular students; teachers with similar assignments may use the same assessment(s)/measure of progress for their SLOs, but it is unlikely they would have identical targets established for student performance. For example, all 2nd grade teachers in a district might set the same SLO and use the same reading assessment (measure of progress) to measure their SLOs, but the target(s) and/or the proportion of students expected to achieve proficiency would likely vary among 2nd grade teachers. Additionally, individual teachers may establish multiple differentiated targets for students achieving at various performance levels.

Taken together, an SLO and its IAGD(s) provide the evidence that the objective was met. The following are some examples of IAGDs that might be applied to the previous SLO examples:

Grade/Subject	SLO	IAGD(s)
6th Grade Social Studies	Students will produce effective and well-grounded writing for a range of purposes and audiences.	<p>By May 15: Students who scored a 0-1 out of 12 on the pre-assessment will score 6 or better Students who scored a 2-4 will score 8 or better. Students who scored 5-6 will score 9 or better. Students who scored 7 will score 10 or better</p> <p><i>*This is one IAGD (assessment/measure of progress) that outlines differentiated targets based on pre-assessments.</i></p>
9th Grade Information Literacy	Students will master the use of digital tools for learning to gather, evaluate, and apply information to solve problems and accomplish tasks.	<p>By May 30: 90%-100% of all students will be proficient (scoring a 3 or 4) or higher on 5 of the 6 standards (as measured by 8 items) on the digital literacy assessment rubric.</p> <p><i>*This is one IAGD (assessment/measure of progress) illustrating a minimum proficiency standard for a large proportion of students.</i></p>
11th Grade Algebra 2	Students will be able to analyze complex, real-world scenarios using mathematical models to interpret and solve problems.	<p>By May 15: 80% of Algebra 2 students will score an 85 or better on a district Algebra 2 math benchmark.</p> <p><i>*This is one IAGD (assessment/measure of progress) illustrating a minimum proficiency standard for a large proportion of students.</i></p>
9th Grade ELA	Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly, as well as inferences drawn from the text.	<p>By June 1: 27 students who scored 50-70 on the pre-test will increase scores by 18 points on the posttest. 40 students who score 30-49 will increase by 15 points. 10 students who scored 0-29 will increase by 10 points.</p> <p><i>*This is one IAGD (assessment/measure of progress) that has been differentiated to meet the needs of varied student performance groups.</i></p>
1st and 2nd Grade Tier 3 Reading	Students will improve reading accuracy and comprehension leading to an improved attitude and approach toward more complex reading tasks.	<p>By June:</p> <p>IAGD #1: Students will increase their attitude towards reading by at least 7 points from baseline on the full scale score of the Elementary Reading Attitude Survey, as recommended by authors, McKenna and Kear.</p> <p>IAGD #2: Students will read instructional level text with 95% or better accuracy on the DRA.</p> <p>Grade 1- Expected outcome- Level 14-16 Grade 2- Expected outcome- Level 22-24</p> <p><i>*These are two IAGDs using two assessments/measures of progress. IAGD #2 has also been differentiated to meet the needs of varied student performance groups.</i></p>

Step 3: Provide Additional Information

During the goal-setting process, teachers and evaluators will document the following:

- Baseline data used to determine SLOs and set IAGDs;
- Selected student population supported by data;
- Learning content aligned to specific, relevant standards;
- Interval of instruction for the SLO;
- Assessments/measures of progress teacher plans to use to gauge students' progress;
- Instructional strategies;
- Any important technical information about the indicator evidence (like timing or scoring plans); and
- Professional learning/supports needed to achieve the SLOs.

Step 4: Submit SLOs to Evaluator for Review

SLOs are proposals until the teacher and the evaluator mutually agree upon them. Prior to the Goal-Setting Conference, the evaluator will review each SLO relative to the following criteria to ensure that SLOs across subjects, grade levels and schools are both rigorous and comparable:

- Baseline – Trend Data
- Student Population
- Standards and Learning Content
- Interval of Instruction
- Assessments/Measures of Progress
- Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs)/Growth Targets
- Instructional Strategies and Supports

Step 5: Goal Setting Conference

- Goal setting conferences will be completed by November 15th; October 15th if it is a 1st semester course; and
- The Evaluator may provide written comments to the teacher prior to the conference.

PHASE 3: Monitor Students Progress

Once SLOs are agreed upon, teachers should monitor students' progress towards the objectives. Teachers, can for example, examine student work; administer interim assessments and track students' accomplishments and struggles. Teachers will share their interim findings with colleagues during collaborative time, and they can keep their evaluator apprised of progress. Progress towards SLOs/IAGDs and action steps for achieving progress should be referenced in feedback conversations throughout the year.

If a teacher's assignment changes, or if his/her student population shifts significantly, or if any

other extenuating circumstances occur, then the SLOs can be adjusted during the Mid-Year Conference between the evaluator and the teacher.

PHASE 4: Assess Student Outcomes Relative to SLOs

Throughout the school year, the teacher should collect the evidence required by their IAGDs, upload artifacts to the data management software system, where available and appropriate, and submit it to their evaluator. Along with the evidence, teachers will complete and submit a self-assessment, which asks teachers to reflect on the SLO outcomes by responding to the following four statements:

1. Describe the results and provide evidence for each IAGD.
2. Provide your overall assessment of whether this objective was met.
3. Describe what you did that produced these results.
4. Describe what you learned and how you will use that learning going forward.

Evaluators will review the evidence and the teacher'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 as follows:

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

The final student growth and development rating for a teacher is the average of their two SLO scores. For example, if one SLO was “Partially Met,” for a rating of 2, and the other SLO was “Met,” for a rating of 3, the Student Growth and Development rating would be 2.5 $[(2+3)/2]$. The individual SLO ratings and the Student Growth and Development rating will be shared and discussed with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference.

	Averaged Domain-Level Score
SLO 1	2
SLO 2	3
Student Growth and Development Rating	2.5

***PLEASE NOTE:** For SLOs that include an indicator(s) based on state standardized assessments, results may not be available in time to score the SLO prior to the June 15 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 assessments are the basis for all indicators and no other evidence is available to score the SLO, then the teacher’s student growth and development rating will be based only on the results of the second SLO. However, once the state assessment data is available, the evaluator should score or rescore the SLO, then determine if the new score changes the teacher’s final (summative) rating. The evaluation rating can be amended at that time as needed, but no later than September 15.*

Component #4: Whole-School Student Learning Indicator (5%)

Bridgeport Public Schools will use a whole-school student-learning indicator to determine the 4th component.


Whole-School Student Learning Indicator

A teacher’s indicator rating shall be equal to the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for his/her administrator’s evaluation rating. This will be based on the school performance index (SPI), when made available to the district, and the administrator’s progress on SLO targets, which correlates to the Student Learning rating on an administrator’s evaluation (equal to the 45% component of the administrator’s final rating).

Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring

Summative Scoring

The individual summative teacher evaluation rating will be based on the four components, grouped in two major categories: Student Outcomes Related Indicators and Teacher Practice Related Indicators.



Every educator will receive one of four performance* ratings:

Exemplary – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance

Accomplished – 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.

The rating will be determined using the following steps:

1. Calculate a Teacher Practice Related Indicators score by combining the observation of teacher performance and practice score (40%) and the parent feedback score (10%)
2. Calculate a Student Outcomes Related Indicators score by combining the student growth and development score (45%) and whole-school student learning indicator (5%).
3. Use the Summative Matrix to determine the Summative Rating

Each step is illustrated below:

1. **Calculate a Teacher Practice Related Indicators rating by combining the observation of teacher performance and practice score and the parent feedback score.**

The observation of teacher performance and practice counts for 40% of the total rating and parent feedback counts for 10% of the total rating. Simply multiply these weights by the component scores to get the category points. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

Component	Score (1-4)	Weight	Points (score x weight)
Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice	2.8	40	112
Parent Feedback	3	10	30
Total Teacher Practice Related Indicators Points			142

Rating Table

Teacher Practice Related Indicators Points	Teacher Practice Related Indicators Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-126	Developing
127-174	Accomplished
175-200	Exemplary

2. Calculate a Student Outcomes Related Indicators rating by combining the student growth and development score and whole-school student learning indicators.

The student growth and development component counts for 45% of the total rating and the whole-school student learning indicators counts for 5% of the total rating. Simply multiply these weights by the component scores to get the category points. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

Component	Score (1-4)	Weight	Points (score x weight)
Student Growth and Development (SLOs)	3.5	45	157.5
Whole School Student Learning Indicator	3	5	15
Total Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points			172.5 → 173

Rating Table

Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points	Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-126	Developing
127-174	Accomplished
175-200	Exemplary

3. Use the Summative Matrix to determine the Summative Rating

Using the ratings determined for each major category: Student Outcomes Related Indicators and Teacher Practice-Related Indicators, follow the respective column and row to the center of the matrix. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. For the example provided, the Teacher Practice Related Indicators rating is *accomplished* and the Student Outcomes Related Indicators rating is *accomplished*. The summative rating is therefore *accomplished*. If the two major categories are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of *exemplary* for Teacher Practice and a rating of *below standard* for Student Outcomes), then the evaluator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to determine a summative rating.

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

Adjustment of Summative Rating

Summative ratings must be provided for all teachers by **June 15**, of a given school year and reported to the CSDE per state guidelines. Should state standardized test data not yet be available at the time of calculating a summative rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. When the summative rating for a teacher may be significantly impacted by state standardized test data, the evaluator should recalculate the teacher’s summative rating when the data is available and submit the adjusted rating no later than **September 15**. These adjustments should inform goal setting in the new school year.

Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

A teacher will generally be deemed ineffective if they are rated developing or below standard for two consecutive years. A teacher will generally be deemed effective if they are rated accomplished or exemplary for two consecutive years.

Dispute-Resolution Process

In the event that the evaluator and evaluatee are unable to (1) mutually agree on goals and/or indicators, (2) the selection of appropriate professional development opportunities, or (3) a written appraisal of performance (including the summative appraisal), the parties are encouraged to make efforts to resolve any disagreements informally.

If the parties are unable to resolve the dispute informally, the matter will be resolved through the following procedure:

1. Where the evaluator and evaluatee are unable to resolve a dispute informally, the evaluatee shall contact the Staff Evaluation Mediator and a conference will be held with all parties in an effort to mediate the conflict and reach agreement. The conference will be held as soon as practicable.
2. In the event that the parties are unable to mediate the conflict with the assistance of the Staff Evaluation Mediator, the parties will prepare and execute a statement of impasses. Such statement of impasse may be used by the evaluatee to initiate the Grievance Procedure of the collective bargaining agreement at Step 1. Disputes will be resolved according to the established collective bargaining agreement, Article III (See attachment in appendices). This dispute resolution will include the superintendent or superintendent designee as part of the final process of resolution and the final decided resolution will stand. **See Appendix III. Agreement between the BEA and the BBO, dated 07-01 to 14-06-30-17.**

CORE REQUIREMENTS for the Evaluation of Student and Educator Support Specialists

As provided in Sec.10-151b of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.) as amended by P.A. 13-245, "The superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each Student and Educator Support Specialist," in accordance with the requirements of this section. Local or regional boards of education shall develop and implement Student and Educator Support Specialist evaluation programs consistent with these requirements.

Flexibility from Core Requirements for the Evaluation of Teachers


1. Student and Educator Support Specialists (SESS) shall have a clear job description, understanding of the district approved rubric for their evaluation, and delineation of their role and responsibilities in the school to guide the setting of Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs), feedback and observation. **See Appendix IV for District Approved Rubrics.**
2. Because of the unique nature of the roles fulfilled by Student and Educator Support Specialists, flexibility will be offered in applying the Core Requirements of the teacher evaluation in the following ways:
 - a. In using IAGDs to measure attainment of goals and/or objectives for student growth, the Goal-Setting Conference for identifying the IAGDs shall include the following steps:
 - I. The educator and evaluator will agree on the students or caseloads that the educator is responsible for and his/her role.
 - II. The educator and evaluator will determine if the indicator will apply to the individual teacher, a team of teachers, a grade level, or the whole school.
 - III. The educator and evaluator should identify the unique characteristics of the population of students, which would impact student growth (e.g. high absenteeism, highly mobile population in school).
 - IV. The educator and evaluator will identify the learning standard to measure: the assessment/measure of progress, data or product for measuring growth; the timeline for instruction and measurement; how baseline will be established; how targets will be set so they are realistic yet rigorous; the strategies that will be used; and the professional development the educator needs to improve their learning to support the areas targeted.
 - b. Because some Student and Educator Support Specialists do not have a classroom and may not be involved in direct instruction of students, the educator and evaluator shall agree to appropriate District approved rubrics for observations and an appropriate district approved rubric for rating practice and performance at the beginning of the school year. The observations will be based on standards when available. Examples of appropriate venues include, but are not limited to: observing Student and Educator Support Specialist staff working with small groups

of children, working with adults, providing professional development, working with families, participation in team meetings or Planning and Placement Team meetings.

- c. When student, parent, and/or peer feedback mechanisms are not applicable to Student and Educator Support Specialists, the development of short feedback mechanisms for students, parents, and peers specific to particular roles or projects for which the Student and Educator Support Specialists are responsible will be created.

Administrator Evaluation and Support

The model for administrator evaluation and support includes specific guidance for the four components of administrator evaluation:



ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION and Development

Purpose and Rationale

The Bridgeport administrator evaluation and support model defines administrator effectiveness in terms of (1) administrator practice (the actions taken by administrators that have been shown to impact key aspects of school life); (2) the results that come from this leadership (teacher effectiveness and student achievement); and (3) the perceptions of the administrator's leadership among key stakeholders in his/her community.

The model describes four levels of performance for administrators and focuses on the practices and outcomes of *Accomplished* administrators.

These administrators can be characterized as:

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader;
- Meeting expectations in at least 3 other areas of practice;
- Meeting 1 target related to stakeholder feedback;
- Meeting state accountability growth targets on tests of core academic subjects⁴;
- Meeting and making progress on 3 Student Learning Objectives aligned to school and district priorities; and
- Having more than 60% of teachers proficient on the student growth portion of their evaluation.

The model includes an exemplary performance level 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. An accomplished rating represents fully satisfactory performance, and it is the rigorous standard expected of most experienced administrators.

This model provides a structure for the ongoing development of principals and other administrators to establish 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.

⁴Smarter Balanced Assessments will be administered for the first time in the 2014-2015 academic year. These assessments are administered in Grades 3-8 and Grade 11. Contingent upon approval of the waiver submitted to the U.S. Department of Education (USED) regarding the use of student test data in educator evaluation in 2014-2015, districts may not be required to link student test data to educator evaluation and support in 2014-2015 only. Additionally, due to the transition to the new state assessments, there will not be an SPI available for 2014-2015.

As noted, the model applies to all administrators holding a 092 endorsement. Because of the fundamental role that principals play in building strong schools for communities and students, and because their leadership has a significant impact on outcomes for students, the descriptions and examples focus on principals. However, where there are design differences for assistant principals and central office administrators, the differences are noted.

System Overview

Administrator Evaluation and Support Framework

The evaluation and support system consists of multiple measures to paint an accurate and comprehensive picture of administrator performance. All administrators will be evaluated in four components, grouped into two major categories: Leadership Practice and Student Outcomes.

- a. **Leadership Practice Related Indicators:** An evaluation of the core leadership practices and skills that positively affect student learning. This category is comprised of two components:
 - i. **Observation of Leadership Performance and Practice (40%)** as defined in the Common Core of Leading (CCL): Connecticut School Leadership Standards (found on the CSDE website) or **See Appendix IV**.
 - ii. **Stakeholder Feedback (10%)** on leadership practice through surveys.
- b. **Student Outcomes Related Indicators:** An evaluation of an administrator's contribution to student academic progress, at the school and classroom level. This category is comprised of two components:
 - i. **Student Learning (45%)** assessed in equal weight by: (a) progress on the academic learning measures in the state's accountability system for schools and (b) performance and growth on locally-determined measures.
 - ii. **Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%)** as determined by an aggregation of teachers' success with respect to Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)

Scores from each of the four components will be combined to produce a summative performance rating of *Exemplary*, *Accomplished*, *Developing* or *Below Standard*. The performance levels are defined as:

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


Process and Timeline

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 annual cycle (see **Figure 1** below) allows for flexibility in implementation and lends itself well to a meaningful and doable process. Often the evaluation process can develop into a checklist of compliance activities that do little to foster improvement and leave everyone involved frustrated. To avoid this, the model encourages two things:

1. That evaluators prioritize the evaluation process, spending more and better time in schools observing practice and giving feedback; and
2. 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.

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.

The principals will start the self-assessment process in late spring in order to identify their goals and develop a plan prior to the start of the next school year.



* Summative assessment to be finalized by September 15th

Step 1: Orientation and Context-Setting

To begin the process, the administrator needs five things to be in place:

1. Student learning data are available for review by the administrator and the state has assigned the school a School Performance Index (SPI) rating⁷.
2. Stakeholder survey data are available for review by the administrator.
3. The superintendent has communicated his/her student learning priorities for the year in the District Improvement Plan.
4. The administrator has developed a school improvement 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.

Step 2: Goal-Setting and Plan Development

Before a school year starts, administrators identify **two Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)** and one survey target, drawing on available data, the superintendent's priorities, their school improvement plan and prior evaluation results (where applicable). **High School administrators must address the graduation rate.** They also determine two areas of focus for their practice. This is referred to as **"2-2-1 goal-setting"**.



Administrators should start with the outcomes they want to achieve. This includes setting two SLOs and one target related to stakeholder feedback.

Then administrators 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 on all six Performance Expectations, administrators 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 expected that at least one and perhaps both, of the practice focus areas will be in instructional leadership, specifically CCL Expectation 2 Teaching and Learning, 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 accomplished performance will depend on factors beyond the control of the principals? 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 learning needs to support the administrator in accomplishing his/her goals. Together, these components – the goals, the practice areas and the resources and supports – comprise an individual's evaluation and support plan. In the event of any disagreement, the evaluator has the authority and responsibility to finalize the goals, supports and sources of evidence to be used. **See Appendix II.a for sample language of “2-2-1” Goal Setting.**

The focus areas, goals, activities, outcomes and timeline will be reviewed by the administrator's evaluator prior to beginning work on the goals. The evaluator may suggest additional goals as appropriate.

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

1. Are the goals clear and measurable so that an evaluator will know whether the administrator has achieved them?
2. Can the evaluator see a through line from district priorities to the school improvement plan to the evaluation and support 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

As the administrator implements the plan, he/she and the evaluator both collect evidence about the administrator's practice. For the evaluator, this must include at least two and preferably more, school site visits. Periodic, purposeful school visits offer critical opportunities for evaluators to observe collect evidence and analyze the work of school leaders. At a minimum, fall, winter, and spring visits to the school leader's work site 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 site visits to observe administrator practice can vary significantly in length and setting. It is recommended that evaluators plan visits carefully to maximize the opportunity to gather evidence relevant to an administrator's practice focus areas. Evaluators should provide timely feedback after each visit.

Besides the school site visit requirement, there are no prescribed evidence requirements. The model relies on the professional judgment of the administrator and evaluator to determine appropriate sources of evidence and ways to collect evidence.

The administrator's evaluator may want to consult the following sources of evidence to collect information about the administrator in relation to his or her focus areas and goals:

- Data systems and reports for student information
- Artifacts of data analysis and plans for response
- Observations of teacher team meetings
- Observations of administrative/leadership team meetings
- Observations of classrooms where the administrator is present
- Communications to parents and community
- Conversations with staff
- Conversations with students
- Conversations with families
- Presentations at Board of Education meetings, community resource centers, parent groups etc.

Further, the evaluator may want to establish a **schedule of school site visits** with the administrator to collect evidence and observe the administrator's work. The first visit should take place near the beginning of the school year to ground the evaluator in the school context and the administrator's evaluation and support plan. Subsequent visits might be planned at two-to three-month intervals.

A note on the frequency of school site observations:

State guidelines call for an administrator's evaluation to include:

- Observations for each administrator.
- Four observations for any administrator new to their district, school, the profession or who has received ratings of *developing* or *below standard*.

School visits should be frequent, purposeful, and adequate for sustaining a professional conversation about an administrator's practice.

Step 4: Mid-Year Formative Review

Midway through the school year (especially at a point when interim student assessment data are available for review) is an ideal time for a formal check-in to review progress. In preparation for meeting:

- The administrator analyzes available student achievement data and considers progress toward outcome goals.
- The evaluator reviews observation and feedback forms to identify key themes for discussion.

The administrator and evaluator hold a Mid-Year Formative Conference, **completed by February 28th** 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 influence accomplishment of outcome goals; goals may be changed at this point. **Mid-Year Conference Discussion Prompts** are available on the CT SEED website at <http://www.connecticutseed.org>.

Step 5: Self-Assessment

In the spring, **by May 30th**, the administrator takes an opportunity **to assess his/her practice on the Performance Expectations/Indicators of the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards, that were mutually agreed upon during the initial goal-setting conference.**

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 needs to continue to grow and improve;
- is consistently effective on this element; or
- can empower others to be effective on this element.

The administrator should also review his/her focus areas and determine if he/she considers him/herself on track or not. The self-assessment is an opportunity to help inform the summative rating.

Step 6: Summative Review and Rating

The administrator and evaluator meet in the late spring, **by June 30th**, to discuss the administrator's self-assessment and all evidence collected over the course of the year. 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.

Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing

Evaluators will receive extensive training in the evaluation process of administrators. PhocuseD on Learning, LLC will train staff on all aspects on the components of the evaluation system using the Common Core of Leading (CCL) rubric in SY 2014-2015. All evaluators are required to complete training on the Bridgeport Public Schools evaluation and support model. The purpose of training is to provide evaluators of administrators with the tools that will result in evidence-based school site observations; professional learning opportunities tied to evaluation feedback, improved administrator, and teacher effectiveness and student performance. Subsequent training during the year and in following years will be provided as will ongoing professional development for newly hired administrators to support new learning and ongoing calibration to ensure effective practices.

Additionally, the district will participate in any trainings and technical assistance made available by the State Department of Education.

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 30 of a given school year. Should state standardized test data not yet be available at the time of a final rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. When the summative rating for an administrator may be significantly impacted by state standardized test data or teacher effectiveness ratings, the evaluator should recalculate the administrator's summative rating when the data is available and submit the adjusted rating no later than September 15. This adjustment should take place before the start of the new school year so that prior year results can inform goal setting in the new school year.

Initial ratings are based on all available data and are made in the spring so that they can be used for any employment decisions as needed. Since some components may not be completed at this point, here are rules of thumb to use in arriving at a rating:

- **If stakeholder survey results are not yet available**, then the observation of practice rating should count for 50% of the preliminary rating.
- **If the teacher effectiveness outcomes ratings are not yet available**, then the student learning measures should count for 50% of the preliminary 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 yet 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.

Support and Development

The Bridgeport Public Schools believes that evaluation alone cannot hope to improve leadership practice, teacher effectiveness, and student learning. However, when paired with effective, relevant, and timely support, the evaluation process has the potential to help move administrators along the path to exemplary practice.

Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning

Student success depends on effective teaching, learning and leadership. The Bridgeport Public School's vision for professional learning is that each and every Connecticut educator engages in continuous learning every day to increase professional effectiveness, resulting in positive outcomes for all students. For Bridgeport's students to graduate college and career ready, educators must engage in strategically planned, well-supported, standards-based, continuous professional learning focused on improving student outcomes.

Throughout the process of implementing this model, in mutual agreement with their evaluators, all administrators will identify professional learning needs that support their goal and objectives. The identified needs will serve as the foundation for ongoing conversations about the administrator's practice and impact on student outcomes. The professional learning opportunities identified for each administrator should be based on the individual strengths and needs that are identified through the evaluation process. The process may also reveal areas of common need among administrators, which can then be targeted with school-wide or district-wide professional learning opportunities.

Improvement and Remediation Plans

If an administrator's performance is rated as *developing* or *below standard*, it signals the need for focused support and development. A Structured Support Plan or Assistance Plan will be developed by the evaluator in consultation with the administrator and his/her exclusive bargaining representative, when applicable, and be differentiated by the level of identified need and/or stage of development.

Additional Levels of Support:

- 1. Structured Support:** An administrator would be placed on the Structured Support Level and receive a Structured Support Plan **by September 30th**, in addition to the obligations of the overall evaluation system, if they are rated as developing or below standard during the prior school year. The Structured Support Plan includes targeted performance goals, strategies, and means of measuring success along timelines. The administrator and evaluator will have 3 check-in meetings during the year (December, February and April). The administrator may also request peer support. If peer support is requested, the support must become part of the Structured Support Plan. The administrator must document the support and bring the documentation to the check-in meetings. If the administrator is successful in addressing the Structured Support Plan and is rated as Accomplished or Exemplary, he/she will be removed from the Structure Support Level. The evaluator has discretion for keeping an administrator in Structured Support for a second year if the administrator is showing improvement. A new Structured Support Plan will be developed for the 2nd year in consultation with the administrator's exclusive bargaining representative. Administrators may not stay in Structured Support beyond two consecutive years. If the administrator is not successful in addressing the Structured Support Plan by the end of the school year, or in some cases the second consecutive school year, and is rated Developing or Below Standard they will be placed on the Assistance Level. **See Appendix II.b.**
- 2. Assistance Level:** An administrator would be placed on the Assistance Level and receive an Assistance Plan if they are rated Below Standard during the prior school year, or if they were unsuccessful in addressing their Structured Support Plan and have been rated as Developing for one or two consecutive years. The Assistance Level is a communication of grave importance to the administrator that if the district's performance expectations remain unmet, termination of contract will follow. To communicate the serious nature of placement into the Assistance Level notice shall come from the Superintendent of Schools no later than September 22nd. By **September 30th** the administrator shall meet with the Superintendent of Schools (or designee), the 3 assigned evaluators who make up the Evaluation Team, along with the administrator's exclusive bargaining representative to discuss the specific performance objectives, means of measuring, strategies, observations and meeting which the administrator must adhere to and address. The process for meeting these performance objectives, the individuals responsible for providing support, a time frame for providing support and the evaluation team members will be presented to the administrator at this meeting.

The Assistance Level shall be divided into 3 assessment periods so that progress may be closely monitored throughout the year. The 3 assessments and 1 summative evaluation will be completed as follows: Assessment 1: October through December; Assessment 2: January through March; Assessment

April through June; and the summative evaluation: June. At the end of each assessment period the primary evaluator will complete a Summary of the Assessment Period and conduct a meeting with team members, administrator, and his/her exclusive bargaining representative. If the administrator has successfully met the plan, and is rated Accomplished or Exemplary, they shall be removed from Assistance Level and placed in the district's evaluation cycle. If the administrator does not successfully meet the performance objectives of the plan and is rated Developing or Below Standard then the administrator will be recommended for termination. **See Appendix II.c.**

Well-articulated Improvement and Remediation Plans:

- Clearly identify targeted supports, in consultation with the administrator, which may include specialized professional development, collegial assistance, increased supervisory observations and feedback, and/or special resources and strategies aligned to the improvement outcomes.
- Clearly delineate goals linked to specific indicators and domains within the observation of practice framework/rubric that specify exactly what the administrator must demonstrate at the conclusion of the Improvement and Remediation Plan in order to be considered "accomplished."
- Indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is developed. Determine dates for interim and final reviews in accordance with stages of support.
- Include indicators of success, including a rating of accomplished or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.

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 and support system itself and in building the capacity and skills of all leaders.

Examples of such opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring aspiring and 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 learning based on goals for continuous growth and development.

Leadership Practice Related Indicators

The Leadership Practice Related Indicators evaluate the administrator's knowledge of a complex set of skills and competencies and how these are applied in leadership practice. It is comprised of two components:

- Observation of Leadership Practice, which counts for 40%; and
- Stakeholder Feedback, which counts for 10%.

Component #1: Observation of Leadership Practice (40%)

An assessment of an administrator's leadership practice – by direct observation of practice and the collection of other evidence – is 40% of an administrator's summative rating.

Leadership practice is described in the Common Core of Leading (CCL) 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.

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.

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 approximately half of the leadership practice rating and the other five performance expectations are equally weighted.

Figure 3: Leadership Practice – 6 Performance Expectations



These weightings should be consistent for all principals and central office administrators. **For assistant principals and other school-based 092 certificate holders, working in an administrative capacity, the six performance expectations are weighed equally**, reflecting the need for emerging leaders to develop the full set of skills and competencies in order to assume greater responsibilities as they move forward in their careers. While assistant principals' roles and responsibilities vary from school to school, creating a robust pipeline of effective principals depends on adequately preparing assistant principals for the principal-ship.

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

- **Exemplary:** The Exemplary Level focuses on the concepts of developing capacity for action and leadership beyond the individual leader. Collaboration and involvement from a wide range of staff, students, and stakeholders is prioritized as appropriate in distinguishing Exemplary performance from Accomplished performance.
- **Accomplished:** The rubric is anchored at the Accomplished Level using the indicator language from the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The specific indicator language is highlighted in bold at the Proficient level.

- **Developing:** The Developing Level focuses on leaders with a general knowledge of leadership practices but most of those practices do not necessarily lead to positive results.
- **Below Standard:** The Below Standard Level focuses on a limited understanding of leadership practices and general inaction on the part of the leader.

Two key concepts, indicated by bullets, are often included as indicators. Each concept demonstrates a continuum of performance across the row, from *below standard* to *exemplary*.

Examples of Evidence are provided for each element of the rubric. While these Examples of Evidence can be a guide for evaluator training and discussion, they are only examples and should not be used as a checklist. As evaluators learn and use the rubric, they should review these Examples of Evidence and generate additional examples from their own experience that could also serve as evidence of “Accomplished” practice.

Strategies for Using the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric:

Helping administrators get better: The rubric is designed to be developmental in use. It contains a detailed continuum of performance for every indicator within the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards in order to serve as a guide and resource for school leaders and evaluators to talk about practice, identify specific areas for growth and development, and have language to use in describing what improved practice would be.

Making judgments about administrator practice: In some cases, evaluators may find that a leader demonstrates one level of performance for one concept and a different level of performance for a second concept within a row. In those cases, the evaluator will use judgment to decide on the level of performance for that particular indicator.

Assigning ratings for each performance expectation: Administrators and evaluators will not be required to complete this rubric at the Indicator level for any self-assessment or evaluation process. Evaluators and administrators will review performance and complete evaluation detail at the Performance Expectation level and may discuss performance at the Element level, using the detailed Indicator rows as supporting information as needed. As part of the evaluation process, evaluators and school leaders should identify a few specific areas for ongoing support and growth.

Assessing the practice of administrators other than principals: All indicators of the evaluation rubric may not apply to assistant principals or central office administrators. Districts may generate ratings using evidence collected from applicable indicators in the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards⁵.

⁵ Central Office Administrators have been given an additional year before being required to participate in Connecticut’s new evaluation and support system while further guidance is being developed. All Central Office Administrators will be required to participate in the new system in the 2015-2016 school year.

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 establishes high expectations for all students and staff**.

The Leader...

Indicator	Below Standard	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
1. Information & analysis shape vision, mission and goals	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.
2. Alignment to policies	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.

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

**Staff: All educators and non-certified staff

Arriving at a Leadership Practice Summative Rating

Summative ratings are based on the evidence for each performance expectation in the CCL Leader Evaluation Rubric. Evaluators collect written evidence about and observe the administrator's leadership practice across the six performance expectations of the rubric. Specific attention is paid to leadership performance expectations/indicators identified as needing development, mutually agreed upon for improvement, and the focus of the May self-reflection.

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

- a. The administrator and evaluator meet for a Goal-Setting Conference to identify focus areas for development of the administrator’s leadership practice.
- b. The administrator collects evidence about his/her practice and the evaluator collects evidence about administrator practice with a particular emphasis on the identified focus areas for development. **Evaluators of administrators must conduct:**
 - **At least two school site observations for any administrator**
 - **Should conduct at least four school site observations for administrators who are new to their district, school, the profession, or who have received ratings of *developing*, or *below standard*.**
- c. The administrator and evaluator hold a Mid-Year Conference with a focused discussion of progress toward Accomplished in the focus areas identified as needing development by February 28th.
- d. Near the end of the school year, the administrator reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a summative self-assessment for review by the evaluator, identifying areas of strength and continued growth, as well as progress on the focus areas by June 30th.
- e. The evaluator and the administrator meet to discuss all evidence collected to date. Following the conference, the evaluator uses the preponderance of evidence to assign a summative rating of *exemplary*, *accomplished*, *developing* or *below standard* for each performance expectation. Then the evaluator assigns a total practice rating based on the criteria in the chart below and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.

Principals and Central Office Administrators:

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

Assistant Principals and Other School-Based Administrators:

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

Component #2: Stakeholder Feedback (10%)

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

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 teachers and parents.

Surveys

Parent surveys capture feedback related to the key strategies, actions, and events at a school while the staff surveys focus directly on feedback related to the school leader’s performance and the impact on stakeholders. Panorama Education was consulted by the district to develop surveys that are valid and reliable. Surveys will be conducted annually and every effort will be made to ensure maximum participation of stakeholders.

Stakeholder Feedback Summative Rating

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

Exceptions to this include:

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

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

1. Select appropriate survey measures aligned to the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.
2. Review baseline data on selected measures, which may require a fall administration of the survey in year one.
3. Set one 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, where applicable.
5. Aggregate data and determine whether the administrator achieved the established target.
6. Assign a rating, using this scale:

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

Establishing what results in having “substantially exceeded” the target or what constitutes “substantial progress” is left to the discretion of the evaluator and the administrator being evaluated in the context of the target being set. However, more than half of the rating of an administrator on stakeholder feedback must be based on an assessment of improvement over time.

Student Outcomes Related Indicators includes two components:

- Student Learning, which counts for 45%; and
- Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes, which counts for 5%.

Component #3: Student Learning (45%)

Student learning is assessed in equal weight by: (a) performance and progress on the academic learning measures in the state's accountability system for schools and (b) performance and growth on locally-determined measures. Each of these measures will have a weight of 22.5% and together they will account for 45% of the administrator's evaluation.

State Measures of Academic Learning

A school's SPI—an average of student performance in all tested grades and subjects for a given school—allows for the evaluation of school performance across all tested grades, subjects and performance levels on state tests. The goal for all Bridgeport schools is to achieve an SPI rating of 88, which indicates that on average all students are at the 'target' level.

Currently, the state's accountability system³ includes two measures of student academic learning:

1. **School Performance Index (SPI) progress** – changes from baseline in student achievement on Connecticut's standardized assessments.

See 2015 SEED Document

PLEASE NOTE: SPI calculations will not be available for the 2014-15 school year due to the transition from state legacy tests to the Smarter Balanced Assessment, 45% of an administrator's rating for Student Learning will be based on student growth and performance on measures determined by the district.

2. **SPI progress for student subgroups** – changes from baseline in student achievement for subgroups on Connecticut's standardized assessments.

⁶All of the current academic learning measures in the state accountability system assess status achievement of students or changes in status achievement from year to year. There are no true growth measures. If the state adds a growth measure to the accountability model, it is recommended that it count as 50% of a principal's state academic learning rating in Excelling schools, 60% in Progressing and Transition schools, and 70% in Review and Turnaround schools.

Locally-Determined Measures (Student Learning Objectives)

Administrators establish three Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) on measures they select. In selecting measures, certain parameters apply:

- All measures must align to Common Core State Standards and Connecticut Content Standards. In instances where there are no such standards that apply to a subject/grade level, districts must provide evidence of alignment to research-based learning standards.
- 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.
- For administrators assigned to a school in "review" or "turnaround" status, indicators will align with the performance targets set in the school's mandated improvement plan.

Parameters of Administrator SLOs

	SLO ₁	SLO ₂	SLO ₃
Elementary or Middle School Principal	Non-tested subjects or grades	Broad discretion	
High School Principal	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement)	Broad discretion	
Elementary or Middle School AP	Non-tested subjects or grades	Broad discretion: Indicators may focus on student results from a subset of teachers, grade levels or subjects, consistent with the job responsibilities of the assistant principal being evaluated.	
High School AP	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement)	Broad discretion: Indicators may focus on student results from a subset of teachers, grade levels or subjects, consistent with the job responsibilities of the assistant principal being evaluated.	
Central Office Administrator	(meets the non-tested grades or subjects requirement) Indicators may be based on results in the group of schools, group of students or subject area most relevant to the administrator's job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.		

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 for administrators:

Examples of Administrator SLOs

Grade Level	SLO
2nd Grade	Among second graders who remain enrolled in school and in good attendance from September to May, 80% will make at least one year's growth in reading as measured by MAP/NWEA assessments.
Middle School Science	78% of students will attain <i>proficient</i> or higher on the science inquiry strand of the CMT in May.
High School	9th grade students will accumulate sufficient credits to be in good standing as sophomores by June.
Central Office Administrator	By June 1, 2014, the percentage of grade 3 students across the district (in all 5 elementary schools) reading at or above grade level will improve from 78% to 85%. (Curriculum Coordinator)

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 follow a pre-determined timeline.

First, 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.

- The administrator uses available data to craft an improvement plan for the school/area. This is done in collaboration with other stakeholders and includes a manageable set of clear student learning targets.
- The administrator chooses student-learning priorities for her/his own evaluation that are (a) aligned to district priorities (unless the school is already doing well against those priorities) and (b) aligned with the school improvement plan.
- The administrator chooses measures that best assess the priorities and develops clear and measurable SLOs for the chosen assessments/indicators (see the Administrator's SLO Handbook, and SLO Quality Test – found on the CT SEED website).
- 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.
- The administrator and evaluator collect interim data on the SLOs to inform a mid-year conversation (which is an opportunity to assess progress and, as needed, adjust targets) and summative data to inform summative ratings.

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

Exemplary	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard
Met all 3 objectives and substantially exceeded at least 2 targets	Met 2 objectives and made at least substantial progress on the 3rd	Met 1 objective and made substantial progress on at least 1 other	Met 0 objectives OR Met 1 objective and did not make substantial progress on either of the other 2

Arriving at Student Learning Summative Rating

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

		State Measures of Academic Learning			
		4	3	2	1
Locally Determined Measures of Academic Learning	4	Rate Exemplary	Rate Exemplary	Rate Accomplished	<i>Gather further information</i>
	3	Rate Exemplary	Rate Accomplished	Rate Accomplished	Rate Developing
	2	Rate Accomplished	Rate Accomplished	Rate Developing	Rate Developing
	1	<i>Gather further information</i>	Rate Developing	Rate Developing	Rate Below Standard

Component #4: Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%)

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

Improving teacher effectiveness outcomes is central to a administrator’s role in driving improved student learning. That is why, in addition to measuring the actions that administrators take to increase teacher effectiveness the administrator evaluation and support model also 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. In order to maintain a strong focus on teachers setting ambitious SLOs for their evaluation, it is imperative that evaluators of administrators discuss with the administrator 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	Accomplished	Developing	Below Standard
>80% of teachers are rated accomplished or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	>60% of teachers are rated accomplished or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	>40% of teachers are rated accomplished or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation	<40% of teachers are rated accomplished or <i>exemplary</i> on the student learning objectives portion of their evaluation

- Central Office Administrators will be responsible for the teachers under their assigned role.
- All other administrators will be responsible for the teachers they directly evaluate.

Summative Administrator Evaluation Rating

Summative Scoring

Every educator will receive one of four performance ratings:

- Exemplary:** Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
- Accomplished:** Meeting indicators of performance
- Developing:** Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
- Below standard:** Not meeting indicators of performance

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

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader;
- Meeting expectations in at least 3 other areas of practice;
- Meeting and making progress on 1 target related to stakeholder feedback;
- Meeting state accountability growth targets on tests of core academic subjects;
- Meeting and making progress on 3 student learning objectives aligned to school and district priorities; and
- Having more than 60% of teachers accomplished on the student growth portion of their evaluation.

Supporting administrators to become accomplished is at the very heart of this evaluation model.

Exemplary ratings are reserved for performance that significantly exceeds accomplished and could serve as a model for leaders district-wide or even statewide. Few administrators are expected to demonstrate exemplary performance on more than a small number of practice elements.

A rating of *developing* means that performance is meeting accomplished in some components but not others. Improvement is necessary and expected and two consecutive years at the developing level is, for an experienced administrator, a cause for concern.

A rating of *below standard* indicates performance that is below accomplished on all components or unacceptably low on one or more components.

Determining Summative Ratings

The rating will be determined using the following steps:

1. Determining a Leader Practice Rating;
2. Determining an Student Outcomes Rating; and
3. Combining the two into an overall rating using the Summative Matrix.

Each step is illustrated below:

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

The practice rating derives from an administrator’s performance on the six performance expectations of the Common Core of Leading Evaluation Rubric (CCL) and the one stakeholder feedback target. The observation of administrator performance and practice counts for 40% of the total rating and stakeholder feedback counts for 10% of the total rating. Simply multiply these weights by the component scores to get the category points. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

Component	Score (1-4)	Weight	Summary Score
Observation of Leadership Practice	2	40	80
Stakeholder Feedback	3	10	30
TOTAL LEADER PRACTICE-RELATED POINTS			110

Leader Practice-Related Points	Leader Practice-Related Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-126	Developing
81-126	Accomplished
127-174	Exemplary

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

The outcomes rating is derived from student learning – student performance and progress on academic learning measures in the state’s accountability system (SPI) and student learning objectives – and teacher effectiveness outcomes. As shown in the **Summative Rating Form**, state reports provide an assessment rating and evaluators record a rating for the student learning objectives agreed to in the beginning of the year. Simply multiply these weights by the component scores to get the category points.

Component	Score (1-4)	Weight	Points (score x weight)
Student Learning (SPI Progress and SLOs)	3	45	135
Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes	2	5	10
TOTAL STUDENT OUTCOMES-RELATED POINTS			145

Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points	Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating
50-80	Below Standard
81-126	Developing
127-174	Accomplished
175-200	Exemplary

C. OVERALL: Leader Practice + Student Outcomes

The overall rating combines the practice and outcomes ratings using the matrix below. Using the ratings determined for each major category: Student Outcomes-Related Indicators and Leader Practice-Related Indicators, follow the respective column and row to the center of the matrix. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. For the example provided, the Leader Practice-Related rating is developing and the Student Outcomes-Related rating is accomplished. The summative rating is therefore accomplished.

If the **two major categories are highly discrepant** (e.g., a rating of *exemplary* for Leader Practice and a rating of *below standard* for Student Outcomes), then the evaluator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to determine a summative rating.

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

Adjustment of Summative Rating:

Summative ratings must be completed for all administrators by June 30 of a given school year. Should state standardized test data not yet be available at the time of a summative rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. When the summative rating for an administrator may be significantly affected by state standardized test data, the evaluator should recalculate the administrator’s final summative rating when the data is available and submit the adjusted rating not later than September 15. These adjustments should inform goal setting in the new school year.

Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

An administrator will generally be deemed ineffective if they are rated below standard or developing for two consecutive years.

An administrator will be deemed effective if they are rated accomplished or exemplary for two consecutive years.

Dispute-Resolution Process

1. Bridgeport Public Schools has established a process for resolving disputes in cases where the evaluator and administrator cannot agree on goals / objectives, the evaluation period, feedback or the professional development plan. When such agreement cannot be reached, the issue in dispute will be resolved according to the established collective bargaining agreement, Article VI (See attachment in appendices). This dispute resolution will include the superintendent or superintendent designee as part of the final process of resolution and the final decided resolution will stand. **See Appendix III. Agreement between the BCAS and the BBO, dated 07-01-14 to 06-30-17.**

CT State Board of Education-Adopted Revisions: Guidelines for Educator Evaluation May 7, 2014

Dispute-Resolution Process

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

Rating System

2.1: 4-Level Matrix Rating System

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

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

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

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

CT State Board of Education-Adopted Revisions: Guidelines for Educator Evaluation

45% Student Growth Component

- (c) One half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goals/objectives are met shall not be determined by a single, isolated standardized test score, but shall be determined through the comparison of data across assessments administered over time, including the state test for those teaching tested grades and subjects or another standardized indicator for other grades and subjects where available. A state test can be used only if there are interim assessments that lead to that test, and such interim assessments shall be included in the overall score for those teaching tested grades and subjects. Those without an available standardized indicator will select, through mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute-resolution procedure as described in section 1.3, an additional non-standardized indicator.
- a. For the 2014-15 academic year, the required use of state test data is suspended, pending federal approval, pursuant to PEAC's flexibility recommendation on January 29, 2014 and the State Board of Education's action on February 6, 2014.
 - b. Prior to the 2015-16 academic year, the SDE will work with PEAC to examine and evolve the system of standardized and non-standardized student learning indicators, including the use of interim assessments that lead to the state test to measure growth over time.

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

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