

Hebron Public Schools Educator Growth and Evaluation Plan 2015-2016

High Expectations, Bright Futures



Education is not preparation for life; education is life itself. John Dewey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	3
Educator Growth and Evaluation Plan Overview	4
Process and Timeline	5
Dispute Resolution	7
Components of Teacher Evaluation and Rating	9
Category 1: Student Outcomes and Achievement 45%	9
Category 2: Teacher Performance and Practice 40%	14
Category 3: Parent Feedback 10%	20
Category 4: Whole School Learning 5%	20
Summative Teacher Evaluation and Rating	21
Definition of Teacher Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness	23
Teacher Professional Assistance Support System (PASS)	24
Evaluation Based Professional Learning	26

Teacher/Administrator Growth and Evaluation Committee

Stephanie Bancroft, Music, Hebron Elementary School

Eric Brody, Principal, Gilead Hill School

Amy Campbell, Principal, Hebron Elementary School

Nicole Craig, First Grade Teacher, Gilead Hill School

Maureen Duffy, Speech/Language, Hebron School District

Cathy Luddy, Speech/Language, Gilead Hill School

Adam Parks, Fifth Grade Teacher, Hebron Elementary School, HEA Union Representative

Laura Quarticelli, Sixth Grade Teacher, Hebron Elementary School

Diane Rees, Kindergarten Teacher, Gilead Hill School

Karen Sanstrom, Unified Arts Representative, Gilead Hill School

Vonda Tencza, Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Technology

Mark Winzler, Interim Superintendent of Schools

“I was taught that the way of progress is neither swift nor easy.” Marie Curie

EDUCATOR GROWTH AND EVALUATION PLAN

OVERVIEW

Hebron Public School's Educator Growth and Evaluation Plan supports an environment in which educators have the opportunity to regularly employ inquiry into and reflection on practice, to give each other feedback, and to develop teaching practices that positively affect student learning.

To help foster such an environment, we have created the Educator Growth and Evaluation Plan as a district-wide system that provides multiple opportunities and options for teachers to engage in individual and collaborative activities in which they collect, analyze, and respond to data about student learning, within and among Hebron Public Schools. Teachers and administrators are expected to provide evidence related to the effectiveness of instructional practices and their impact on student learning. Teachers and administrators are also expected to take an active role in a cycle of inquiry into their practice, development, implementation, and analysis of strategies employed to advance student growth and reflection on effectiveness of their practice. The Program includes an additional component, Professional Assistance and Support System (PASS), for those teachers and administrators in need of additional support to meet performance expectations.

Standards and Indicators of Teaching Practice

The expectations for teacher practice in Hebron's Educator Growth and Evaluation Plan are defined using the four domains and their indicators of the Common Core of Teaching (CCT, 2010, revised 2014 and the CCT-SESS), Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning, Planning For Active Learning, , Instruction For Active Learning, Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership. Hebron Public School's Performance and Practice Continuum , the tool used for observing and assessing teacher practice in each of the domains, reflects the spirit and specifics of the CCT, articulates components of teaching, and establishes designations of levels of practice, including: *Below Standard; Developing; Proficient; Exemplary*.

Core Requirements of the Evaluation Program

Hebron Public School's Educator Growth and Evaluation Plan is aligned with the Core Requirements of the State Board-approved Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, as provided in subsection (a) of Sec. 10-151b (C.G.S.), as amended by Sec. 51 of P.A. 12-116. The following is description of the processes and components of Hebron's program for teacher evaluation, through which the Core Requirements of the Guidelines shall be met.

PROCESS AND TIMELINE OF TEACHER EVALUATION

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

1. Orientation (by September 30th):

- To begin the annual evaluation process, evaluators meet with teachers, in groups and/or individually, to discuss the evaluation process and their roles and responsibilities within it. In this meeting, they will review and discuss the following:
 1. The *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching*.
 2. Administrator, school, or district priorities that should be reflected in teacher performance and practice focus area(s).
 3. Development of SMART goals related to student outcomes and achievement.
 4. Data regarding whole-school indicators of student learning.
 5. Self-assessment processes and purposes.
 6. Data collection, including types of data and processes for collection and analysis.
 7. Access to the on-line evaluation system
- Evaluators and teachers will establish a schedule for collaboration required by the evaluation process.
- In the case of unforeseen circumstances, the teacher and administrator will work to establish mutually agreed upon adjustments to the parameters of the plan (meeting times, numbers of observations, implementation and measurement of goals, etcetera).

2. Goal-setting Conference – (by October 31st):

- *Teacher Reflection*—In advance of the Goal Setting Conference, the teacher will examine data related to current students' performance (including, but not limited to: standardized tests, portfolios, and other samples of student work appropriate to teacher's content area, etc.), prior year evaluation and survey results, previous professional learning goals, and the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching*. First-year beginning teachers may find it helpful to reflect on their practice goals with their mentor teachers, using the TEAM program's Module Resources and Performance Profiles, to determine a baseline for establishing goals. The teacher will draft the following goals:
 - a) **one SMART Goal** to address student learning and achievement objectives, which will comprise 45% of a teacher's summative evaluation;
 - b) **a performance and practice focus area**, based on data from teacher reflection and evaluator observations and review of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching*;
 - c) **goal aligned with a whole-school goal** determined by the school administrator based on data from **parent feedback**; and
 - d) **a focus area based on whole school indicators of student learning as identified in their Administrator's Evaluation Plan** for the school year, which

will comprise 5% of the evaluation. Staff members who are shared between the two schools will share the focus area of the school where they spend more than 50% of their time.

The teacher may collaborate in grade-level or subject-matter teams to support the goal-setting process.

- *Goal-setting conference* – No later than October 31st of the school year, the evaluator and teacher will meet to discuss the teacher’s proposed goals in order to arrive at a shared agreement. The goals for the year must be informed by data and evidence collected by the teacher **and** evaluator about the teacher’s practice. The evaluator collects evidence about teacher practice to support the review and may request revisions to the proposed goals and objectives if they do not meet approval criteria.

Examples of data and evidence that may be included in the goal-setting conference:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lesson Plans • Formative Assessment Data • Summative Assessment Data • Student Work • Parent Communication Logs • Data Team Minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey Data • Class List • Standardized and Non-Standardized Data (based on the teacher’s class) • School-Level Data • CCT Continuum
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

3. Observations of practice:

- Evaluators will observe teacher practice using a combination of formal and informal in-class observations and non-classroom reviews of practice throughout the school year, with frequency based on the year of implementation of the plan and the teacher’s summative evaluation rating or years in district.

4. Evidence collection and review (throughout school year):

- The teacher collects evidence about his/her practice and student learning that is relevant to the agreed-upon professional goals. (*Evidence/artifacts will be reviewed at the goal setting conference, but additional artifacts may be included throughout the year.*) The evaluator also collects evidence about teacher practice for discussion in the interim conference and summative review.

5. Interim Conference/Mid-year Formative Conference (by February 15th) :

- The evaluator and teacher will hold at least one mid-year conference. The discussion should focus on processes and progress toward meeting the goals and developing one’s practice. Both the teacher and the evaluator will bring evidence about practice and student learning data to review. The teacher and evaluator will discuss the cause and effect relationship of practice to student learning data, i.e. how practice positively

impacts student learning. During the conference, both the teacher and evaluator will make explicit connections between the 40% and the 45% components of the evaluation program. If necessary, teachers and evaluators may mutually agree to **revisions to strategies or approaches** used and/or mid-year adjustment of SMART goals 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 development areas.

6. End-of-year summative review (by June 10th):

- a. *Teacher self-assessment* - The teacher reviews and reflects on all information and data collected during the year related to the goals and completes a self-assessment for review by the evaluator. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development, referencing the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching*, and established in the goal-setting conference.
- b. *The self-assessment* should address all components of the evaluation plan and include what the teacher learned throughout the year supported by evidence and personal reflection. The self-assessment should also include a statement that identifies a possible future direction that is related to the year's outcomes.
- c. *End-of-year conference* - The evaluator and the teacher meet to discuss all evidence collected to date. The teacher and evaluator will review evidence that supports the extent to which students met the SMART goals and how the teacher's performance and practice focus contributed to student outcomes and professional growth. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.
- d. *Summative Rating*—The evaluator reviews submitted evidence, self-assessments, and observation data to generate category and focus area ratings. The category ratings generate the final summative rating using the summative rating matrix.

Dispute Resolution

Hebron Public Schools believes that evaluation must be a collaborative process between the evaluator and teacher, drawing on the expertise and perspective of both parties. However, recognizing that disagreements may arise during the process, and in accordance with the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, a comprehensive dispute resolution process has been designed and agreed to by the HEGE committee, which will include the superintendent. The HEGE committee will have responsibility for overseeing the dispute resolution process, and will establish an Appeal sub-committee. ~~The Appeal sub-committee will include the superintendent or his/her designee.~~


If an evaluatee does not initiate the appeals procedure within 5 school days of the final outcome of the meeting (observation, mid-year conference, summative meeting, goal setting, shared ratings, etc.), the evaluatee shall be considered to have waived the right of appeal.

Within five school days of articulating the dispute in writing/completion of the Appeal form, the evaluatee will meet and discuss the matter with the evaluator with the object of resolving the matter informally.

If there has been no resolution, the appeal committee will review information from the evaluator and evaluatee and will meet with both parties as soon as possible. Within five school days of the appeal committee meeting and review of all documentation and recommendations, the appeal committee will serve as the arbitrator and make a final decision.

HEGE committee members who wish to do so will serve as the members Appeal Committee with both schools are appropriately represented. All who are accepted onto the Appeal Committee will have evaluation ratings of at least proficient or higher in the year prior to their joining the committee. Any dispute that cannot be resolved at the school level can be filed with the Appeal Committee for resolution through a hearing. The dispute will be heard by a minimum of 4 selected members of the Appeal Committee with the number of teachers and administrators always being equal. The Appeal Committee teacher members may not work in the same school as the party filing the dispute, and the administrator rep may not be the evaluator. The Appeal Committee must come to a resolution for the dispute through consensus. If for some reason there can be no agreement the Superintendent will review the appeal, meet with both parties, and make the final decision.

Components of Teacher Evaluation and Rating



The Core Requirements of the CT Guidelines for Teacher Evaluation require that districts weight the components of teacher's annual summative evaluations and ratings as follows:

CATEGORY 1: STUDENT OUTCOMES AND ACHIEVEMENT (45%)

Forty-five percent (45%) of a teacher's evaluation will be based on achievement of student learning outcomes defined by one or more teacher-created SMART Goals that are aligned with both standardized and non-standardized measures. SMART Goal(s) will be written using a **Student Growth** framework.

- 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 an additional non-standardized indicator.
- 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.

- SMART goals for all personnel must demonstrate alignment with school-wide student achievement priorities.

Goal Setting


Hebron teachers' SMART goals must address the learning needs of their students and be aligned to the teacher's assignment. The student outcome related indicators will be written to meet SMART goal criteria, i.e. Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-Bound. Teachers will write one SMART goal that will address targeted areas for **student growth** and/or achievement.

The SMART goal will:

1. take into account the academic track record and overall needs and strengths of the students that teacher is teaching that year/semester.
2. address the most important purposes of a teacher's assignment through self-reflection.
3. align with school, district, and state student achievement objectives.
4. take into account students' learning needs vis-à-vis relevant baseline data.
5. consider Public School Information System (PSIS) factors.
6. be mutually agreed upon by teacher and their evaluator.
7. be fair, valid, reliable and useful to the greatest extent possible.

SMART Goals and Student Progress

The following diagram illustrates the processes involved in establishing and assessing SMART goals for student learning.



Phase 1: Learn About This Year's Students By Examining Baseline Data

To write meaningful and relevant SMART goals that align to their teaching assignment and result from a thorough knowledge of their students, data analysis is required.

Examples of data that teachers will be required to analyze are:

1. Student outcome data (academic)
2. Behavior data (absences, referrals)
3. Program data (participation in-school or extracurricular activities or programs)
4. Perceptual data (learning styles and inventories, anecdotal)

Teachers must learn as much as they can about the students they teach, be able to document baseline data that they have used to determine their instructional focus and be able to write SMART goals on which they will, in part, be evaluated.

Analysis of these initial pieces of data on incoming students for the year should be completed by mid-September of the academic year.

Phase 2: Set SMART Goals for Student Growth

Each teacher will write one SMART goal. For the 2015-2016 school year, teachers may develop their SMART goal based on non-standardized assessment or a standardized assessment where available and appropriate.

Each SMART goal should make clear (1) what evidence was or will be examined, (2) what level of growth is targeted, (3) what assessment/indicator will be used to measure the targeted level of growth, and (4) what proportion of students is projected to achieve the targeted level of growth. SMART goals can also address student subgroups, such as high or low-performing students or ELL students. It is through the Phase I examination of student data that teachers will determine what level of performance to target for which students.

Teachers will submit their SMART goal(s) to their evaluator for review, mutual agreement and approval. The review and approval process of the SMART goal will take place during the Goal-Setting conference, on or before October 31. If mutual agreement cannot be reached, the teacher and evaluator will **follow the dispute resolution process**. Evaluators will review and approve the SMART goal based on the following criteria, to ensure they are as fair, reliable, valid, and useful to the greatest possible extent:

- **Priority of Content**:- SMART goal is deeply relevant to teacher's assignment and address the most important purposes of that assignment.
- **Rigor of SMART goal**: SMART goal is attainable, but ambitious, and represents at least one year's student growth (or appropriate growth for a shorter interval of instruction).
- **Analysis of Student Outcome Data**: SMART goal provides specific, measurable evidence of student outcome data through analysis by the teacher and demonstrates knowledge about students' growth and development.

Phase 3: Monitor and Document Student Progress

Teachers may monitor and document student progress through:

1. Examination of student work
2. Administration of interim assessments
3. Tracking of students' accomplishments and struggles

Teachers may choose to share their interim findings with colleagues during collaborative time. They may also wish to keep their evaluator apprised of progress. Artifacts related to the teacher's monitoring practices can be reviewed and discussed during the Mid-Year Conference.

Interim Conferences - Mid-year Formative Conference:

Evaluators and teachers will review progress toward the goals/objectives at least once during the school year, using available information and data collected on student progress. This review may result in revisions to the instructional strategies or approaches teachers use. Teachers and evaluators may mutually agree to mid-year adjustments to the SMART goal to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignment). If mutual agreement cannot be reached, the teacher and evaluator will follow the dispute resolution process. The Mid-Year Conference will take place by February 15th of the academic year.

Phase 4: Review multiple measures to determine progress towards SMART goal

End-of-year review of SMART goal/ Student Outcomes and Achievement:

Teacher Self-Assessment – The teacher reviews all information and data collected during the year and comes prepared to discuss the following:

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

End of Year Conference – The teacher shall collect evidence of student progress toward meeting the student learning goal/objective. This evidence will reflect student progress toward meeting the SMART goal for learning. The evidence will be submitted to the evaluator, and the teacher and evaluator will discuss the extent to which the students met the learning goals/objectives. Following the conference, the evaluator will rate the extent of student progress toward meeting the student learning goals/objectives, based on criteria for the 4 performance level designations shown in the table below.

Evaluators will review the evidence and the teacher’s self-assessment and assign one of four ratings to each SMART goal: Exceeded (4 points), Met (3 points), Partially Met (2 points), or Did Not Meet (1 point). These ratings are defined as follows:

Exceeded (4)	Exceeded SMART goal(s) by 10% margin or higher.
Met (3)	Met the SMART goal(s).
Partially Met (2)	Did not meet the SMART goal(s) by 10% margin.
Did Not Meet (1)	Did not meet the SMART goal(s) by greater than 10% .

To arrive at a rating for each SMART goal, the evaluator will review the results from data collected as a body of evidence regarding the accomplishment of the goal and score the achievement of the SMART goal holistically.

The final rating for Category 1: Student Outcomes and Achievement rating for a teacher is based on the above chart. The individual SMART goal rating will be discussed with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference. Final ratings will be provided prior to the end of the school year.

Professional Learning for Teachers and Evaluators

Specific training will be provided to develop evaluators’ and teacher’s data literacy and creation of SMART goals by which teachers will be evaluated. Professional learning sessions will support and/or enhance the abilities and skills of each teacher to communicate their goals for student learning outcomes and achievement. The content of the professional learning will include, but not be limited to:

Alignment of SMART goal(s) to school and/or district goals

Writing plans that articulate:

effective strategies to achieve their SMART goals and

progress monitoring tools teachers will implement to achieve their SMART goal

All teachers and evaluators will be required to participate in professional learning to ensure a standardized approach to the documentation of student learning outcomes and achievement. Should additional professional learning be needed, it will be decided on a case-by-case basis at the school or individual level.

CATEGORY 2: TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICE (40%)

Forty percent (40%) of a teacher's evaluation will be based on evidence of teacher practice and performance, using the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching* or *CCT-SESS*, as assigned by the evaluator.

The Common Core of Teaching (CCT) Rubric for Effective Teaching

The CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching has been developed to align with Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching (CCT) and to reflect the content of its domains and indicators. The CCT has defined for Connecticut's educators key aspects of effective teaching, correlated with student learning and achievement, that have been evidenced in professional literature.

The *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching*, which observers will use in conducting teacher observations and reviews of practice, was developed by teams of educators (including teachers, building-level administrators, central office administrators, and professional staff developers), who reviewed the four domains and 12 indicators that comprise the CCT, relevant research on effective instructional practices that improve student learning and achievement, and other models for observation of professional teaching practice (Danielson, 2011; Marshall, 2011; Marzano, et al., 2011). The *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching* represents a distillation of each of these resources to essential elements, crucial to effective practice, that can be observed and applied in appraisals of teachers.

The *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching* addresses several principles that are essential components of effective teacher performance and practice. These principles are explicitly embedded in the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching* as observable practices, and teachers and evaluators are required to reflect on these practices during pre- and post-observation conferences and self-evaluations. The overarching principles of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching* are:

- *Diversity* as enrichment of educational opportunities for all students;
- *Differentiation* as a necessity for success and equal opportunities for all students;
- *Purposeful use of technology* as a pathway to access to learning for all students;
- *Collaboration* as essential to producing high levels of learning for all students;
- *Data collection and analysis* as essential to informing effective planning, instruction, and assessment practices that enhance student learning;
- *Professional learning* as integral to improved student outcomes.

Key attributes of teacher performance and practice outlined in the CCT are reflected in the descriptors of the Indicators within the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching*, so that evaluators and teachers may understand how these attributes apply in practice, observations, and evaluation. Teacher lesson plans and associated documentation, pre-observation, post-observation, and teacher self-reflection forms and related conversations, as well as non-classroom reviews of

practice, such as communication with families, collaboration with colleagues, participation in data teams, professional learning presentations by faculty members, participation in mentoring, instructional rounds, PPTs and action research, all provide rich data related to the CCT standards and the effectiveness of teachers' performance and practice.

In employing the CCT as its foundation, the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching* maintains consistency with Connecticut's TEAM program of mentorship and professional development of new teachers. TEAM's Performance Profiles, which also describe attributes of effective teaching practice along a continuum for each of its professional growth modules, apply the CCT indicators as the focus for new teacher reflection on their practice and development of differentiated professional growth plans. The *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching* and TEAM both rely on rich professional discussion about and reflection on professional practice to advance teacher effectiveness and student learning. Therefore, consistency between these two programs makes it possible for all educators to acquire common understandings and language about teaching and learning, with the intent of enriching collaboration, communication, and community to pave the way for school improvement and success for all students.

Teacher Focus Area for Performance and Practice

In preparation for instructional planning a Goal Setting Conferences with evaluators, teachers will analyze their student data and use the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching* to reflect on their own practices and their impact on student performance. Based on that reflection, teachers will develop a performance and practice focus area to guide their own professional learning and improvements in practice that will ultimately promote student growth and achievement of student outcome goals. Teacher practice focus area will not be evaluated, but should result in improvements in teacher knowledge and skills which will be evidenced in observations of teacher performance and practice.

Data Gathering Process

Hebron evaluators will use the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching/CCT-SESS* to guide data collection from multiple sources: teacher conferences, classroom observations, reviews of practice and artifacts and evidence aligned to specific domains.

Over the course of the school year, evaluators will gather evidence for all Indicators and Domains of the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching* which will allow teachers to demonstrate: the context for their work; their ability to improve student learning and performance; their ability to engage in reflective practice to improve their own knowledge and skills; how they exercise leadership skills within their classrooms, schools, and districts.

Observation of Teacher Practice

Observations, both formal and informal, provide valuable information to all professional staff about instructional practice. Data collected through observations allow school leaders to understand more about the nature of learning and instruction in our schools, and feedback from observation provides individual teachers with insights regarding the impact of their management, planning, instruction, and assessment practices on student growth. Annually, evaluators will engage in professional learning opportunities, including online options and collaborative sessions that will develop their skills in effective observation providing meaningful, useful feedback, and engaging in productive professional conversations with teachers.

Evaluators use a combination of formal and informal, announced, and unannounced observations to:

1. Gather evidence of and facilitate professional conversation regarding the quality of teacher practice;
2. Provide constructive oral and written feedback of observations that is timely (administrators will make every effort to share feedback within two weeks of post-conference) and useful for educators;
3. Provide information for the on-going calibration of evaluators and evaluation practices in the district.

Evaluators may differentiate the number of observations based on experience, prior ratings, needs and goals of individual teachers, so long as the minimum expectations of the evaluation plan are met for all teachers.

In addition to formal conferences for goal-setting and performance review and in-class formal observations, informal observations of teachers by evaluators will occur periodically. Observations are for the purpose of helping teachers to gain insights about their professional practice and its impact on student learning. Formal and informal observation of teachers is considered a normal part of the evaluator's job responsibilities. More importantly, observation is essential for establishing a culture of continuous learning for educators and for understanding the nature, scope and quality of student learning in a school as a whole. In addition to in-class observations, non-classroom reviews of practice will be conducted. Examples of non-classroom observations or reviews of practice include but are not limited to: observations of data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, participation in PPTs and similar meetings, and also should include review of lesson plans and other teaching artifacts.

Data-Informed Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)		
Conferences	Data related to all domains Conversation and artifacts that reveal the teacher has an understanding of content, students, strategies, and use of data Teacher's use of data to inform instruction, analyze student performance and set appropriate learning goals	Provides opportunities for teachers to demonstrate cause and effect thinking. Provides opportunities for evaluator learning in content; systems effectiveness; priorities for professional learning Provides context for observations and evaluation
In-class formal observations	Teacher-student, student, student -student conversations, interactions, activities related to learning goals	Provides evidence of teacher's ability to improve student learning and promote growth
Non-classroom reviews of practice	Teacher reflection, as evidenced in pre - and post-conference data. Engagement in professional development opportunities , involvement in action research. Collaboration with colleagues Teacher-family interactions Ethical decisions	Provides evidence of teacher as learner, as reflective practitioner and teacher as leader.

Observation Schedule

PERFORMANCE DESIGNATION	NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS	CONFERENCING AND FEEDBACK
New Hebron Employees and teachers who have not completed TEAM	3 formal observation	All must have pre-conferences, all must have post-conferences.
	At least 1 review of practice, with a mutually agreed upon area of practice	Feedback will be verbal and/or written.
	informal observation(s) as appropriate	
New to role (not including classroom teacher grade level change) or under different certification	3 formal observations	All must have pre-conferences, all must have post-conferences.
	At least 1 review of practice, on a mutually agreed upon area of practice	Feedback will be verbal and/ or written.
	informal observation(s) as appropriate	
All Teachers (with 3 or more years of service and TEAM completion if applicable) designated Proficient or Exemplary in the prior year's summative evaluation	One formal observation and two informal observations every three years.	Formal observation must have pre-conference and post-conferences. Informals will have verbal and/or written feedback.
	Three informal observations (each of the other two years of the three year cycle)	Informal observation post conference meetings will be held after each informal observation.
	At least 1 review of practice each year on a mutually agreed upon area of practice	Feedback will be verbal and/or written
Teachers with Three or More years and designated as Below Standard and/or Developing (Participation in PASS)	3 formal observations	Each informal must have a post-conference. Formal observation must have a pre and post observation conference. Formal observation with pre and post-observation and 3 informals have feedback written and/or verbal.
	2 reviews of practice, with a mutually agreed upon area of practice	Feedback for review of practice will be verbal and/or written.
	Informal observations as appropriate	Feedback will be verbal and/ or written.

Administrators will make every effort to spread the observations throughout the school year, with a minimum of one observation to be completed prior the mid-year. Teachers will be observed in their primary area of practice.

Evaluation Ratings for Performance and Practice

Evaluation ratings will be assigned at the end of each school year. For informal and formal observations, if there is no evidence of a particular indicator or domain, this is not seen as negative evidence, and the evaluator would leave that spot blank for observations, but every domain must be rated at the end of the year. After gathering and analyzing evidence for all Indicators observed within each of the domains, evaluators will use the CCT Continuum to initially assign ratings of Below Standard, Developing, Proficient or Exemplary. **Summative ratings will be made at the Domain level only and all domains must be rated.**

Once Domain ratings have been assigned, evaluators will use the *Rating Guidelines for Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice* to assign a rating.

Ratings Guidelines for Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice (average of each of the 4 domains)	
Rating	Criteria
Exemplary	3.6-4
Proficient	2.6-3.59
Developing	1.6-2.59
Below Standard	1.59 and below

EVALUATOR TRAINING AND PROFICIENCY

Formal observations of practice are guided by the Domains and indicators of the *CCT or CCT-SESS rubric*. Evaluators participate in explicit training and are required to be proficient in the use of the *rubric* for educator evaluation. Training is conducted annually (at a minimum) to ensure consistency, compliance, and high-quality application of the *rubric* in observations and evaluation. Formal observations include pre- and post-conferences that provide opportunities for deep professional conversations that allow evaluators and educators to set goals, allow administrators to gain insight into the educator’s progress in addressing issues and working toward their goals, and share evidence each has gathered during the year.

All evaluators will be required to participate in training and successfully complete calibration activities. Evaluators will also attend additional support sessions during the school year. To ensure consistency and fairness in the evaluation process, all evaluators must meet the proficiency standard prior to conducting teacher observations.

Evaluators will also participate in support sessions during the school year in order to facilitate conversations in preparation for Mid-Year Conferences and End of Year Conferences.

All evaluators new to Hebron will be required to participate in the training, proficiency, calibration and supports sessions described above.

All Hebron evaluators will participate in ongoing calibration activities in the use of the *rubric* for educator evaluation. Any evaluator who does not initially demonstrate proficiency will be provided with additional practice and coaching opportunities as needed and will be required to successfully complete online proficiency activities.

CATEGORY 3. PARENT FEEDBACK (10%)

Ten percent (10%) of a teacher’s evaluation shall be based on the strategies individual teachers identify and implement to achieve the school-wide goal that is determined from parent feedback. The feedback may include data from surveys, and may also include focus group data and result in this one goal. The Parent Feedback rating shall be measured against four performance levels.

The Hebron Public School District strives to meet the needs of all of the students all of the time. To gain insight into what parents perceive about our ability to accomplish this, a school-wide parent survey will be used. Our Parent Survey will be administered on-line and will allow for anonymous responses. Hebron Public Schools plans to collect and analyze parent feedback data that will be used for continuous improvement. Surveys will be administered one time per year, in May. The May survey data will be used by teachers as baseline data for the following academic year. Analysis of survey data will be conducted on a school-wide basis, with all certified staff engaged in the analysis in order to assist administrators in determining their school-wide goal.

Exceeded (4)	Exceeded the goal
Met (3)	Met the goal
Partially Met (2)	Partially met the goal
Did Not Meet (1)	Did not meet the goal

CATEGORY 4. WHOLE-SCHOOL STUDENT LEARNING INDICATORS (5%)

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

Hebron Public Schools will define and communicate a Whole School Learning Indicator that is based on an aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the

administrator's evaluation rating (45%). Certified staff will be asked to identify strategies that will, through their instructional practice, contribute to the achievement of the Whole School Learning Indicator.

Teachers' efforts and actions taken towards achievement of the Whole School Learning Indicator will be discussed during the pre-, mid-year, and post-conferences. Teachers will be expected to bring artifacts from their practice that support and provide evidence of their contributions to the attainment of this indicator.

Teachers' rating in this area will be determined by the administrator's performance rating of multiple student learning indicators that comprise 45% of an administrator's evaluation.

SUMMATIVE TEACHER EVALUATION RATING:

Each teacher shall annually receive a summative rating in one of four levels:

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

Exemplary ratings are reserved for performance that significantly exceeds proficiency and could serve as a model for teachers district-wide or even statewide.

Proficient represents fully satisfactory performance. It is the rigorous standard expected for experienced teachers. A rating of *developing* means that performance is meeting proficiency in some indicators but not others (see practice/outcome rating chart below). Improvement is necessary and expected. A rating of *below standard* indicates performance that is below proficient on all components or unacceptably low on one or more indicators.

Determining Summative Ratings

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

A. PRACTICE: Teacher Performance & Practice (40%) + Peer Feedback (10%) = 50%

The practice rating derives from a teacher's performance on the five domains of the CCT Performance and Practice Continuum and the peer feedback target. Evaluators record a rating for the domains that generates an overall rating for teacher practice. The Peer Feedback rating is combined with the Teacher Practice rating and the evaluator uses the matrix to determine an overall Teacher Performance & Practice Rating.

B. OUTCOMES: Student Outcome and Achievement (45%) + Whole-School Student Learning Indicators (5%) = 50%

The outcomes rating derives from the student outcome and achievement measures – SMART goal(s) – and whole-school learning indicators outcomes. As shown in the Summative Rating Form, evaluators record a rating for the SMART goal agreed to in the beginning of the year. The Whole-School Student Learning Indicator Rating is combined with the SMART goal rating and the evaluator uses the matrix to determine an overall Outcomes Rating.

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

The Summative rating combines the practice and outcomes ratings using the matrix below.

If the two areas in any Matrix are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of exemplary for Teacher Practice and a rating of below standard for Student Outcomes), then the evaluator and the evaluatee will re-examine the data and/or gather additional information in order to determine the rating for the Matrix.

If upon re-examination of the data, the ratings do not change, the evaluator will use the Matrix to determine the rating.

<i>Teacher Practice Rating</i>					
		<i>Exemplary</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Developing</i>	<i>Below Standard</i>
<i>Teacher Outcomes Rating</i>	<i>Exemplary</i>	<i>Exemplary</i>	<i>Exemplary</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Developing</i>
	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Exemplary</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Developing</i>
	<i>Developing</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Proficient</i>	<i>Developing</i>	<i>Below Standard</i>
	<i>Below Standard</i>	<i>Developing</i>	<i>Developing</i>	<i>Below Standard</i>	<i>Below Standard</i>

In accordance with The CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, Hebron’s Professional Learning and Evaluation Plan employs a 4-level matrix rating system, as follows:

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

In order to determine summative rating designations for each teacher, Hebron evaluators will:

Rate teacher performance in each of the four Categories:

Student Outcomes and Achievement;

Observations of Teacher Performance and Practice;

Peer Feedback, and

Whole-School Student Learning Indicators.

Combine the Student Outcomes and Achievement (Category 1, above) and Whole-School Student Learning Indicator rating (Category 4, above) into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights. This will represent an overall “**Outcomes Rating**” of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard.

Combine the Observations of Teacher Performance and Practice rating (Category 2, above) and the Peer Feedback rating (Category 3, above) into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “**Practice Rating**” of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard.

Combine the **Outcomes Rating** and **Practice Rating** into a **final rating**. In undertaking this step, teachers will be assigned a summative rating category of **Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard**.

DEFINITION OF TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS AND INEFFECTIVENESS

Teacher effectiveness will be based upon a pattern of summative teacher ratings collected over time. In order to be deemed effective, teachers will need to have a summative rating of Proficient or Exemplary. Teachers are required to be effective within two years of being evaluated using this plan.

Any teacher having a summative rating of Developing or Below Standard after one year of being evaluated with this plan will be placed on an individual improvement plan. (See **description of PASS, PASS Improvement and Remediation Plan, and PASS Intensive Remediation Plan that follows.**)

After participating in PASS, a teacher receiving such support will be expected to have a summative rating of Proficient or Exemplary.

TEACHER PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT SYSTEM (PASS)

Teachers who receive a summative evaluation rating of Developing or Below Standard may work with their local association president in the development of a PASS plan, in collaboration with the evaluator. The plan will be created prior to the beginning of the next school year. The PASS process will identify areas of improvement needed and will include supports that Hebron Public Schools will provide to address the performance areas identified as in need of improvement. A teacher's successful completion of participation in PASS is determined by a summative final rating of Proficient or Exemplary at the conclusion of the school year.

The plan must include the following components:

Areas of Improvement: Identify area of needed improvement

Rationale for Areas of Improvement: Evidence from observations that show an area needing improvement.

Domain: List domain rated "developing" or "below standard."

Indicators for Effective Teaching: Identify exemplary practices in the area identified as needing improvement.

Improvement Strategies to be Implemented: Provide strategies that the teacher can implement to show improvement in any domain rated "developing" or "below standard."

Tasks to Complete: Specific tasks the Teacher will complete that will improve the domain.

Support and Resources: List of supports and resources the Teacher can use to improve, e.g. professional learning opportunities, peer observation, colleague mentor, books, etc. .

Indicators of Progress: How the teacher will show progress towards proficient/exemplary in identified domain(s) through observations, data, evidence, etc.

The plan will be designed and written in a collaborative manner, which focuses on the development of a professional learning community supporting colleagues within this level. Hebron Public Schools values the team framework as a vehicle for supporting and improving individual and collective growth. As such, team support will be required as part of the PASS plan. The teacher, evaluator and local education president or designee will work together to identify what the team support will consist of and how it will be monitored over time. The

purpose of team support while an individual is participating in the PASS phase is to support the individual in their growth towards proficiency or exemplary performance through an existing and successful structure in the Hebron Public Schools. The teacher, local association president or designee, and evaluator or designee will sign the plan. Copies will be distributed to all those who will be involved in the implementation of the plan as well as the Superintendent. The contents of the plan will be confidential.

PASS Improvement and Remediation Plan (30 Days)

The PASS Remediation Plan is a further step in the attempt to provide a teacher with the support, supervision, and resources needed to foster positive growth in situations when an individual is having considerable difficulty implementing the professional responsibilities of teaching. Based on a determination by the appropriate administrator, the administrator and/or evaluator will help the teacher outline specific goals and objectives with timelines, resources, and evaluative criteria. The teacher may choose to include their bargaining representative. The evaluator and/or teacher may draw upon whatever personnel and resources are needed to implement the plan and are deemed reasonable by the evaluator. Consistent supervision and, at minimum, a weekly observation followed by timely feedback, will be provided by the evaluator. This intervention will operate for a period of time that the evaluator determines to be appropriate, but will normally conclude within 30 school days. At the end of the intervention period, the evaluator will issue a recommendation. If the teacher demonstrates that he/she is Proficient or better, the evaluator will designate placement of that teacher to a normal plan. In situations when progress is unacceptable, the teacher will move into Intensive Remediation Plan. Specific written reports of the intervention plan with reports of observations and a final determination on progress will become part of the teacher's personnel file.

PASS Intensive Remediation Plan (60 Days)

The PASS Intensive Remediation Plan is the final attempt and is implemented after the Improvement and Remediation Plan if necessary, and based on the judgment of the administrator, to provide the help necessary to meet the requirements of the position. The teacher, evaluator, and/or another appropriate administrator will develop a plan that includes specific goals, timelines, resources, and evaluative criteria. The teacher may choose to include their bargaining representative. The evaluator and/or the teacher may draw upon whatever personnel and resources are needed to implement the plan and are deemed reasonable by the

evaluator. The plan will be in operation for a period of time that the evaluator determines to be appropriate, but will normally conclude after 60 school days. Weekly observations followed by feedback will be provided during this phase. At the conclusion of this phase, the evaluator will make a recommendation as to whether the intensive supervision will be terminated or extended. If the teacher demonstrates that he/she is Proficient or better, the evaluator will designate placement of that teacher on the normal plan. If the teacher's performance is below Proficient, the administrator will recommend termination of that teacher's employment to the superintendent.

EVALUATION-BASED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

Hebron Public Schools believes that the primary purpose for professional learning is school improvement as measured by the success of every student. We also believe that professional learning must focus on creating meaningful experiences for all staff members. Designing evaluation-based professional learning is a dynamic process. Working with program goals and data from the educator evaluation process, professional learning is planned to strengthen instruction around identified student growth needs or other areas of identified educator needs.

We recognize that educators as well as students learn in different ways and have different learning needs at different points in their career. Effective professional learning, therefore, must be highly personalized and provide for a variety of experiences, including learning teams, study groups, individual study, etc. as well as opportunities for conducting research and collaborating with colleagues on content-based pedagogical activities.

Hebron's evaluation-based professional learning design has as its foundation the Standards for Professional Learning (Learning Forward, 2011). Each of the tenets of Hebron's Educator Growth and Evaluation Plan is aligned with at least one, and often several, of the seven Standards for Professional Learning, as follows.

TENETS: ALIGNING STANDARDS AND PROCESSES:

Evaluation is a teacher-centered process: We believe that, for evaluation to improve professional practice, it is essential to "make evaluation a task managed by a teacher, and not a thing done to a worker" (Peterson, 2000, p. 5).

Teacher reflection on aspects of their instructional practice and its effect on student achievement, on other facets of responsibility to the school community, and on their professional contributions to their field is critical to improved practice for both veteran and novice teachers. [Standards: Learning Communities; Data; Outcomes]

Educator self-reflection represents the initiation and culmination of the cycle of professional praxis and procedures for evaluation.

Teachers collect and assemble relevant data related to student outcomes and their professional contributions, and determine how their data can be used in evaluation.

Organizational culture matters: The framework and outcomes of systems for the evaluation of teachers must reflect an understanding of the culture of schools as learning organizations (see Schein, 2010; Senge, 2012).

It is vitally important to examine the core beliefs that underpin organizational processes such as professional learning and evaluation, as well as teachers' and administrators' perception of their roles and effectiveness, to effect positive changes in student learning, growth, and achievement. Further, it is important to evolve the role of principals and administrators from the sole judges and evaluators of teachers and teaching to emphasize their role as instructional leaders who collaborate with teachers.

Evaluators and teachers support each other in the pursuit of individual and collective professional growth and student success through rich professional conferences and conversations. [Standards: Leadership; Resources]

Each school's core beliefs about student learning are the foundation for evaluation and support systems, and provide a focus for individual and collaborative reflections on personal practice and organizational functioning. [Standards: Learning Communities; Implementation]

Teachers and administrators collaborate to observe instructional practices in their school and to analyze data on instruction and student performance. [Standards: Data; Outcomes]

Teachers and administrators collaborate to plan, assess, and evaluate professional learning. [Standards: Leadership; Learning Communities; Implementation; Learning Designs]

Evaluation and professional learning must be differentiated to increase organizational effectiveness: There is a growing research base that demonstrates that individual and collective teacher efficacy (defined by Bandura, 1997, as "the group's shared belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to produce given levels of attainments"), is positively associated with and predictive of student achievement (Allinder, 1995; Goddard, et al., 2000; Moolenaar, et al., 2012; Tschannen-Moran and Barr, 2004)

The needs of veteran and novice teachers are different, and evaluation-based professional learning is be designed to meet those needs, inspire and motivate individual and collective efficacy, and build leadership capacity in schools and districts (see Peterson, 2000). [Standards: Learning Design; Leadership; Resources]

The development of such structures including personal professional portfolios and collaborative opportunities are provided for teachers to share their learning from professional activities, findings from their own research or from research-based practices they have applied, classroom-level and professional accomplishments and/or challenges. [Standards: Data; Outcomes: Learning Communities; Leadership]

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Hebron will provide opportunities for extended professional growth based on the results of the evaluation. Educators with an evaluation of Proficient or Exemplary will be able to participate in opportunities to further their professional growth. Hebron acknowledges and values the contribution of high performing teachers and understands that the performance of the entire group is elevated by the outstanding work individual staff members. Additionally, embedded and consistent examples and support that are available through the high level work of teacher mentors/role models is invaluable in advancing the work of the district.

For educators rated Exemplary and Proficient, the following professional growth opportunities would be available: observation of peers; mentoring/coaching early-career educators or educators new to Hebron; serving as master mentors, participating in development of educator Professional Assistance and Support System plans for peers whose performance is developing or below standard; leading Professional Learning Communities/Data Teams for their peers; participating in stipend position opportunities; and, targeted professional development based on areas of need.

Hebron Public Schools
Administrator Growth and Evaluation Plan 2015-2016



Education is not preparation for life; education is life itself. John Dewey

Hebron Administration Growth and Evaluation Plan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview.....3

Components of the Administrator Evaluation Plan.....4

Category 1: Leadership Practice 40%.....4

Category 2: Stakeholder Feedback 10%.....7

Category 3: SMART Goals 45%..... 8

Category 4: Teacher Effectiveness 5%..... 10

Administrator Evaluation Process and Timeline.....11

Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness.....15

Administrator Professional Assistance and Support Plan (PASS).....16

Evaluation Based Professional Learning..... 17

Explanation of Administrator Summative Evaluation Form..... 20

Forms A-O22-31

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION PLAN

OVERVIEW

Hebron's Administrator Evaluation Plan means to develop a shared understanding of leader effectiveness. Hebron's administrator evaluation and support plan 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 their community.

The plan describes four levels of performance for administrators and focuses on the practices and outcomes of **Proficient** administrators. These administrators can be characterized as:

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader
- Meeting expectations in at least 2 other areas of practice
- Meeting 1 target related to stakeholder feedback
- Meeting and making progress on 2 locally developed SMART goals aligned to school and district priorities
- Having more than 60% of teachers proficient on the student growth portion of their evaluation

This document describes the administrator evaluation plan, beginning with a set of underlying core design principles. We then describe the four components on which administrators are evaluated – leadership practice, stakeholder feedback, student learning and teacher effectiveness – before describing the process of evaluation and, finally, the steps evaluators take to reach a summative rating for an administrator.

COMPONENTS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION PLAN

The evaluation of administrators, as well as supports for their ongoing growth and development, are based on four categories:

CATEGORY #1: 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: 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. These expectations are: *Vision, Mission, and Goals; Teaching and Learning; Organizational Systems and Safety; Families and Stakeholders; Ethics and Integrity; The Educational System.*

(See Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards)

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) for administrators will be weighted twice as much as** any other Performance Expectation. The other Performance Expectations must have an equal weighting to complete the overall evaluation. These weightings will be consistent for all principals and other Hebron administrators.

In order to arrive at these ratings, administrators are measured against the **Leader Evaluation Rubric (see 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 Proficient performance.
- **Proficient:** The rubric is anchored at the Proficient Level using the indicator language from the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The specific indicator language is highlighted in **bold** at the Proficient level.

- **Developing:** 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 of the concepts demonstrates a continuum of performance across the row, from *below standard* to *exemplary*.

Assigning ratings for each Performance Expectation: Performance indicators provide examples of observable, tangible behavior that indicate the degree to which administrators are meeting each Performance Expectation. Evaluators and administrators will review performance and complete evaluation at the Performance Expectation level, NOT at the Element level. Additionally, it is important to document an administrator’s performance on each Performance Expectation with evidence generated from multiple performance indicators, but not necessarily all performance indicators. 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 and assistant principals: For Hebron administrators in non-school roles, administrator practice will be assessed based upon ratings from evidence collected directly from the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The leader evaluation rubric will be used in situations where it is applicable to the role of the administrator.

Leadership Practice Summative Rating

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

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

The administrator and evaluator meet for a Goal-Setting Conference by August 31 to identify focus areas for development of the administrator’s leadership practice.

1. The administrator being evaluated collects evidence about his/her practice and the evaluator collects evidence about administrator practice with particular focus on the identified focus areas for development. Evaluators of administrators must conduct at least two school site observations and/or reviews of practice for any administrator and will conduct at least four school site observations within the school year for administrators who

are new to their district, school, the profession, or who have received ratings of *developing* or *below standard*.

2. The administrator being evaluated and the evaluator hold a Mid-Year Formative Conference by February 28 with a focused discussion of progress toward proficiency in the focus areas identified as goals
3. By June 15, the administrator being evaluated reviews all information and data collected during the year. The administrator reviews and submits a summative self-assessment for review by the evaluator, identifying areas of strength and continued growth as well as progress on focus areas.
4. By June 30, the evaluator and the administrator being evaluated meet to discuss all evidence collected. Following the conference, the evaluator uses the preponderance of evidence to assign a summative rating of exemplary, proficient, developing, or below standard for each performance expectation. Then the evaluator assigns a total practice rating based on the criteria in the Leadership Practice Matrix and generates a summary report of the evaluation by June 30. (Supported by the “Administrator Evaluator Summative Rating Form.”)

Hebron Public Schools Teacher Growth and Evaluation: Administrator

Orientation and Training Programs

During the spring of each year, Hebron will provide a series of training sessions for all administrators being evaluated so that they will understand the evaluation system, the processes, and the timelines for their evaluation. Special attention will be given to the Common Core of Leading Performance Expectations and the Leadership Practice Rubric, so that all administrators fully understand Performance Expectations and the requirement for being a “Proficient” administrator. Additional sessions will be provided throughout the academic year that will provide Hebron administrators access to resources and opportunities to connect with colleagues to deepen their understanding of the Evaluation Program.

In each academic year by the third week in August, evaluators of administrators will be provided training focused on the administrator evaluation system.

By the third week in August, Hebron will provide all administrators with training focused on the administrator evaluation system. Training will include an in-depth overview and orientation of the 4 categories that are part of the plan, (Leadership Practice 40%, Stakeholder Feedback 10%, SMART Goals 45%, Teacher Effectiveness 5%), the process and timeline for plan implementation, the process for arriving at a summative evaluation, and use of the electronic platform, BloomBoard. Training will be provided on using the Leadership Practice Rubric, so that evaluators are thoroughly familiar with the language, expectations, and examples of evidence required for administrator proficiency. Training will be provided to all evaluators in conducting effective observations and providing high-quality feedback,

and training will be provided on the 3 other categories in the plan (Stakeholder Feedback, SMART Goals, and Teacher Effectiveness) and in the use of BloomBoard.

All Administrators:

Leadership Practice Matrix (40%)

Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
<i>Exemplary</i> on Teaching and Learning	At least <i>Proficient</i> on Teaching and Learning	At least <i>Developing</i> on Teaching and Learning	<i>Below Standard</i> on Teaching and Learning
<i>Exemplary</i> on at least 2 other performance expectations	At least <i>Proficient</i> on at least 3 other performance expectations	At least <i>Developing</i> on at least 3 other performance expectations	or <i>Below Standard</i> on at least 3 other performance expectations
No rating below <i>Proficient</i> on any performance expectation	No rating below <i>Developing</i> on any performance expectation		

CATEGORY #2: STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK (10%)

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

To gain insight into what stakeholders perceive about administrators’ effectiveness, for each administrative role, the stakeholders surveyed will be those in the best position to provide meaningful feedback. For school-based administrators, stakeholders solicited for feedback will include teachers and parents, but may include other stakeholders (e.g., other staff, community members, students, etc.).

The surveys will be administered on-line and allows for anonymous responses, all Hebron administrators will collect and analyze stakeholder feedback data at the school and district level with the input of teachers, to identify data that will be used for continuous improvement. Surveys will be administered one time per year, in May and trends from year to year will be analyzed. The May survey data will be used by administrators as baseline data for the following academic year.

Once the school-wide stakeholder feedback goal has been determined by the administrator, the administrator will identify the strategies he/she will implement to meet the target.

ARRIVING AT A STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK SUMMATIVE RATING

Ratings will reflect the degree to which an administrator makes growth on feedback measures, using data from the prior 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 direction provided by the current administration or an identified district/school improvement goal. This is accomplished in the following steps, undertaken by the administrator being evaluated and reviewed by the evaluator:

1. Review baseline data on selected measures,
2. Set 1 target for growth on a selected measure (or performance on a selected measure when growth is not feasible to assess or performance is already high)
3. By May 15, administer surveys to relevant stakeholders
4. Aggregate data and determine whether the administrator achieved the established target
5. Assign a rating, using this scale:

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

CATEGORY #3: SMART GOALS (45%)

Student learning is assessed in equal weight by performance and growth on two locally-determined measures, (SMART goals). Each of the SMART goals will have a weight of 22.5% and together they will account for 45% of the administrator’s evaluation.

LOCALLY-DETERMINED MEASURES – SMART GOALS

Administrators establish two SMART goals on measures they select. In selecting measures, certain parameters apply:

- All measures must align to Connecticut learning standards. In instances where there are no such standards that apply to a subject/grade level or an administrators' assignment, Hebron will use research-based learning standards appropriate for that administrators' assignment (i.e., Standards for Professional Learning, American School Counselors Association, etc.)

Administrators have broad discretion in selecting indicators, including, but not limited to:

- Student performance or growth on district-adopted assessments (e.g., commercial content area assessments).
- Students' performance or growth on school-or classroom-developed assessments in +- subjects and grade levels for which there are not available state assessments.

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

- First, establish student learning priorities for a given school year based on available data.
- The principal uses available data to craft an improvement plan for the school. This is done in collaboration with other stakeholders and includes a manageable set of clear student learning targets.
- The administrator chooses student learning priorities for her/his own evaluation that are (a) aligned to Hebron priorities (unless the school/district is already doing well against those priorities and (b) aligned with the school/district improvement plan.
- The administrator chooses measures that best assess the priorities and develops clear and measurable goals for the chosen assessments/indicators. ensuring that:
 - ◆ The SMART goals are attainable.
 - ◆ There is adequate data that can be collected to make a fair judgment about whether the administrator met the established SMART goals.
 - ◆ The SMART goals 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 being evaluated and the evaluator collect interim data on the SMART goals 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 using the Hebron Administrator Evaluation Summative Rating Form.

To arrive at an overall student learning rating, the ratings are plotted on this matrix:

		SMART Goal 2(22.5%)			
		Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
SMART Goal 1 (22.5%)	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing
	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient	Proficient	Developing
	Developing	Proficient	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	Developing	Developing	Below Standard	Below Standard

CATEGORY #4: TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS (5%)

Teacher effectiveness – as measured by an aggregation of teachers’ SMART goals – is 5% of an administrator’s evaluation.

Improving teacher effectiveness is central to an administration’s role in driving improved student learning outcomes. That is why, in addition to measuring the actions that administrators take to increase teacher effectiveness – from hiring and placement to ongoing professional learning to feedback on performance – the administrator evaluation model also assesses the outcomes of all of that work.

As part of Hebron’s teacher evaluation plan, teachers are assessed in part on their accomplishment of their SMART goals. This is the basis for assessing principals’ contribution to teacher effectiveness outcomes.

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

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION PROCESS

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. We describe an annual cycle for administrators and evaluators to follow and believe that this sequence of events lends well to a meaningful and doable process.

OVERVIEW

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.

SCHOOL YEAR: PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND EVIDENCE COLLECTION

By JULY 30	By AUGUST 31	February 28	June 15	JUNE 30
Orientation and context setting	Goal setting and plan development	Mid-year formative review	Self-assessment	Preliminary summative rating to be finalized in August

Step 1: Orientation and Context-Setting by July 30

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

1. Student learning data are available for review by the administrator.
2. Stakeholder survey data are available for review by the administrator.
3. The superintendent has communicated his/her student learning priorities for the year.
4. 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 by September 15

Administrators will:

1. identify two SMART goals
2. identify one stakeholder feedback target
3. The administrator has developed a school improvement plan that includes student learning goals

Leadership Practice Goal (40%): Administrators will then identify the 2 specific areas of focus for their practice **that will help them accomplish** their SMART goals, and their stakeholder feedback target, choosing from among the elements of the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. Administrators will identify these 2 specific focus areas of growth in order to facilitate a professional conversation about their leadership practice with their evaluator. What is critical is that the administrator can connect improvement in the practice focus areas to the growth of the SMART goals and the stakeholder feedback target, creating a logical through-line from practice to outcomes.

The administrator and the evaluator discuss and agree on the selected outcome goals and practice focus areas.

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

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

The evaluator will establish a schedule of school visits with the administrator to collect evidence and observe the administrator’s work. The first visit will take place near the beginning of the school year to ground the evaluator in the school context and the administrator’s evaluation plan. Subsequent visits will be planned at 2-to 3-month intervals.

A note on the frequency of school site observations:

- 2 observations and/or reviews of practice for each administrator
- 4 observations and/or reviews of practice for administrator in year one of the position in Hebron, or who has received ratings of *developing* or *below standard*.

Step 3: Mid-Year Formative Review:

Midway through the school year there will be a formal conference, with explicit discussion of progress toward student learning targets as well as any areas of performance related to standards of performance and practice. The meeting is also an opportunity to surface any changes in the context (e.g. a large influx of new students) that could impact accomplishments of outcome goals: goals may be changed at this point. 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.

Step 4: Self-Assessment: By June 15, the administrator being evaluated completes a self-assessment on his/her practice on all 18 elements of the Connecticut Leadership Standards. For each element, the administrator being evaluated 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 being evaluated will review his or her progress of their focus areas. The administrator being evaluated submits their self-assessment to their evaluator.

Step 5: Summative Review and Rating: The administrator being evaluated and the evaluator meet by June 15 to discuss the administrator's self-assessment and all evidence collected over the course of the year. This meeting serves as an opportunity to convey strengths, growth areas, and their probable rating. After the meeting, the evaluator assigns a rating, based on all available evidence (see next section for rating methodology). By June 30, 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.

SUMMATIVE ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION RATING

Each administrator shall annually receive a summative rating in one of four levels:

Exemplary: 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

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

- Meeting expectations as an instructional leader
- Meeting expectations in at least 2 other areas of practice
- Meeting and making progress on 1 target related to stakeholder feedback
- Meeting and making progress on 2 SMART goals aligned to school and district priorities
- Having more than 60% of teachers proficient on the student growth portion of their evaluation

Supporting administrators to reach proficiency is at the very heart of this evaluation model.

Exemplary ratings are reserved for performance that significantly exceeds proficiency and could serve as a model for leaders district-wide or even statewide.

A rating of *developing* means that performance is meeting proficiency in some components but not others. Improvement is necessary and expected.

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

Determining Summative Ratings

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

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 leader evaluation rubric and the stakeholder feedback target. As shown in the Administrator Evaluation Summative Rating Form in Appendix C evaluators record a rating for the performance expectations that generates an overall rating for leadership practice. The Stakeholder Feedback rating is combined with the Leadership Practice rating and the evaluator uses the matrix (Appendix C) to determine an overall Practice Rating.

B. OUTCOMES: SMART goals (45%) + Teacher Effectiveness (5%) = 50%

The outcomes rating derives from the two SMART goals and teacher effectiveness outcomes. The Teacher Effectiveness rating is combined with the SMART goals rating and the evaluator uses the matrix to determine an overall Outcomes Rating.

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

The Summative rating combines the practice and outcomes ratings using the matrix below.

If the two areas in any Matrix are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of exemplary for Administrator Practice and a rating of below standard for Administrator Outcomes), then the evaluator and the evaluatee will re-examine the data and/or gather additional information in order to determine the rating for the Matrix

If upon re-examination of the data, the ratings do not change, the evaluator will use the Matrix to determine the rating

Administrator Practice Rating					
		Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Administrator Outcomes Rating	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing
	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient	Proficient	Developing
	Developing	Proficient	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	Developing	Developing	Below Standard	Below Standard

Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

Administrator effectiveness will be based upon a pattern of summative administrator ratings collected over time. All administrators will need to have a rating of Proficient or Exemplary within 2 years of the implementation of the program. Any administrator not rated Proficient or Exemplary will be placed on an individual improvement and remediation plan. (See Professional Assistance and Support System, or PASS, below)

After the first 2 years of implementation of the program, administrators will be required to have no more than one summative rating of Developing during the 2 year period and a summative rating of Proficient or Exemplary in the other year.

Administrators receiving a rating of Developing or Below Standard in any year, will be placed on an individual administrator improvement and remediation plan (Hebron’s Professional Assistance and Support System, or PASS). After one year of the Plan implementation, the administrator must have a summative rating of Proficient or Exemplary to be considered effective.

Resolution of Differences

Should an administrator disagree with the evaluator’s assessment and feedback, the parties are encouraged to discuss these differences and seek common understanding of the issues. The administrator may request a member of the administrative bargaining team participate in the dispute-resolution process if the evaluator and administrator cannot agree on objectives/goals, the evaluation period, feedback on performance and practice, or final summative rating. Resolutions must be topic-specific and timely. The evaluator may choose to adjust the report, but is not obligated to do so. The administrator has the right to attach a statement to the observation report, progress report, or summative evaluation identifying the areas of concern and presenting his/her perspective. Should the process established not result in resolution of a given issue, the determination regarding that issue may be made by the superintendent.

ADMINISTRATOR PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT PLAN (PASS)

(INDIVIDUAL IMPROVEMENT AND REMEDIATION PLAN)

Administrators who receive a summative evaluation rating of “Developing” or “Below Standard” will be required to work with their evaluator (or designated PASS Administrator Performance Remediation Plan Developer) to design an administrator performance remediation plan. The plan will be created within 30 days after the completion of the summative evaluation rating conference. The administrator performance remediation plan will identify areas of needed improvement and include supports that Hebron will provide to address the performance areas identified as needing improvement. After the development of the PASS Administrator Performance Remediation plan, the administrator and evaluator will collaborate to determine the target completion date. Administrators must receive a summative evaluation rating of “Proficient” within a year of the development of his/her PASS Administrator Performance Remediation Plan.

The plan must include the following components:

1. *Areas of Improvement*: Identify area of needed improvement
2. *Rationale for Areas of Improvement*: Evidence from observations that show an area needing improvement.

3. *Performance Expectation*: List performance expectation rated “developing” or “below standard”
4. *Indicators for Effective Leading*: Identify exemplar practices in the area identified as needing improvement
5. *Improvement Strategies to be Implemented*: Provide strategies the administrator can implement to show improvement in performance expectations rated “developing” or “below standard”
6. *Tasks to Complete*: Specific tasks the administrator will complete that will improve the performance expectation.
7. *Support and Resources*: List of supports and resources the administrator can use to improve, e.g. professional learning opportunities, peer observation, colleague mentor, books, etc.
8. *Indicators of Progress*: How the administrator will show progress towards proficient/exemplar in domain through observations, data, evidence, etc.

The plan will be designed and written in a collaborative manner, which focused on the development of a professional learning community supporting colleagues within this level. The administrator and evaluator will sign the plan. Copies will be distributed to all those who will be involved in the implementation of the plan, including the superintendent. The contents of the plan will be confidential.

EVALUATION-BASED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

As our core values indicate, Hebron believes that the primary purpose for professional learning is school improvement as measured by the success of every student. We also believe that professional learning must focus on creating meaningful experiences for all staff members. Designing evaluation-based professional learning is a dynamic process. Working with program goals and data from the educator evaluation process, professional learning is planned to strengthen instruction around identified student growth needs or other areas of identified educator needs.

Educators as well as students learn in different ways and have different learning needs at different points in their career. Effective professional learning, therefore, must be highly personalized and provide for a variety of experiences, including learning teams, study groups, individual study, etc. as well as opportunities for conducting research and collaborating with colleagues on content-based pedagogical activities.

Hebron’s evaluation-based professional learning design has as its foundation the Standards for Professional Learning (Learning Forward, 2011). Each of the tenets of Hebron’s Professional

Learning and Evaluation Program is aligned with at least one, and often several, of the seven Standards for Professional Learning, as follows.

TENETS OF THE HEBRON PLAN: ALIGNING STANDARDS AND PROCESSES:

- ***Evaluation is an educator-centered process:*** We believe that, for evaluation to improve professional practice, it is essential to “make evaluation a task managed by an educator and not a thing done to a worker” (Peterson, 2000, p. 5).
 - Educator reflection on aspects of their leadership practice and its effect on student achievement and teacher effectiveness, on other facets of responsibility to the school community, and on their professional contributions to their field is critical to improved practice for both veteran and novice teachers. [*Standards: Learning Communities; Data; Outcomes*]
 - Educator self-reflection represents the initiation and culmination of the cycle of professional praxis and procedures for evaluation.
 - Educators collect and assemble relevant data related to student outcomes and their professional contributions, and determine how their data can be used in evaluation.

- ***Organizational culture matters:*** The framework and outcomes of systems for the evaluation of administrators must reflect an understanding of the culture of schools as learning organizations (see Schein, 2010; Senge, 2012).
 - It is vitally important to examine the core beliefs that underpin organizational processes such as professional learning and evaluation, as well as teachers’ and administrators’ perception of their roles and effectiveness, to effect positive changes in student learning, growth, and achievement. Further, it is important to evolve the role of principals and administrators from the sole judges and evaluators of teachers and teaching to emphasize their role as instructional leaders who collaborate with teachers.
 - Evaluators and administrators support each other in the pursuit of individual and collective professional growth and student success through rich professional conferences and conversations. [*Standards: Leadership; Resources*]
 - Each school’s core beliefs about student learning are the foundation for evaluation and support systems, and provide a focus for individual and

collaborative reflections on personal practice and organizational functioning. [*Standards: Learning Communities; Implementation*]

- Teachers and administrators collaborate to observe instructional practices in their school and to analyze data on instruction and student performance. [*Standards: Data; Outcomes*]
- Teachers and administrators collaborate to plan, assess, and evaluate professional learning. [*Standards: Leadership; Learning Communities; Implementation; Learning Designs*]

- ***Evaluation and professional learning must be differentiated to increase organizational effectiveness:*** There is a growing research base that demonstrates that individual and collective educator efficacy (defined by Bandura, 1997, as “the group’s shared belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to produce given levels of attainments”), is positively associated with and predictive of student achievement (Allinder, 1995; Goddard, et al., 2000; Moolenaar, et al., 2012; Tschannen-Moran and Barr, 2004)
 - The needs of veteran and novice administrators are different, and evaluation-based professional learning is be designed to meet those needs, inspire and motivate individual and collective efficacy, and build leadership capacity in schools and districts (see Peterson, 2000). [*Standards: Learning Design; Leadership; Resources*]
 - The development of such structures as career ladders, personal professional portfolios, and opportunities are provided for administrators to share their learning from professional activities, findings from their own research or from research-based practices they have applied, classroom-level and professional accomplishments and/or challenges. [*Standards: Data; Outcomes: Learning Communities; Leadership*]

CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Hebron will provide opportunities for administrator career development and professional growth based on the results of the evaluation. Administrators with an evaluation of Proficient or Exemplary will be able to participate in opportunities to further their professional growth, including attending state and national conferences and other professional learning opportunities; mentoring/coaching early-career administrators or administrators new to Hebron; participating in development of administrator improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is developing or below standard; leading Professional Learning Communities for their peers; and, targeted professional learning based on areas of need.

Explanation of Administrator Evaluation Summative Rating Form

Administrator Evaluation Summative Rating Form

This summary rating form is to be completed by the evaluator after the final conference with the administrator. The evaluator will use the preponderance of evidence to assign a rating for each Performance Expectation. The evaluator will also determine progress against the state assessment results (SPI), the two SMART goals, the stakeholder feedback target and the teacher effectiveness results and assign ratings for each.

Instructions for completing Summative Rating Forms

I. Administrator Practice Summative Rating (50%) - Form E

The **Administrator Practice Summative Rating** is based upon 2 measures:

1. Leadership Practice Rating (40%)
2. Stakeholder Feedback Rating (10%)

These two measures are combined and the **Administrator Practice Summative Rating (Form E)** is assigned using the **Summary Administrator Practice Matrix – Form D**

Step 1: To assign the **Summary Leadership Practice Rating** the evaluator:

1. Assigns a rating for each Performance Expectation, using evidence from observations, artifacts and data submitted by the administrator being evaluated – **Form A**
2. Assigns a **Summary Leadership Practice Rating** for all Performance Expectations using the **Summary Leadership Practice Matrix – Form B**

Step 2: To assign the **Stakeholder Feedback Rating** the evaluator:

1. Assigns a rating for the Stakeholder Feedback target, using evidence submitted by the administrator being evaluated, including survey results and analysis – **Form C**

Step 3: To assign the **Administrator Practice Summative Rating** the evaluator:

1. Inputs the results of the **Summary Leader Practice Rating** and the **Stakeholder Feedback Rating** and uses the **Summary Practice Rating Matrix –Form D**—to assign an **Administrator Practice Summative Rating – Form E**.

II. The **Administrator Outcomes Summative Rating (50%)** is based upon 2 measures:

1. Student Learning Indicators Rating (45%)
 - a. State Assessment Results, (SPI) is 22.5%
 - b. 2 SMART goal results is 22.5%
2. Teacher Effectiveness Rating (5%)

These two measures are combined and the **Administrator Outcomes Summative Rating** is assigned using the **Summary Administrator Outcomes Matrix**.

Step 1: To assign the **Summary Student Learning Indicators Rating** the evaluator:

1. Assigns a rating for the **State Assessment Results Rating –Form G (SPI)** using the **SPI Rating Matrix – Form F**.
2. Assigns a SMART goal rating for each SMART goal, based upon evidence submitted by the administrator, using the **SMART Goal Rating –Form H**
3. Assigns a **Summary SMART Goal Rating** using the **Summary SMART Goal Rating Matrix – Form I**
4. Assigns a **Summary Student Learning Indicators Rating – Form K** using the **Summary Student Learning Indicators Matrix – Form J**

Step 2: To assign a **Teacher Effectiveness Rating** the evaluator:

1. Assigns a **Teacher Effectiveness Rating**, based upon the aggregate results of teachers' progress toward meeting their SMART goals, using the **Teacher Effectiveness Rating Matrix – Form L**

Step 3: To Assign the **Administrator Outcomes Summative Rating** the evaluator:

1. Inputs the results of the **Summary Student Learning Indicators Rating** and the **Teacher Effectiveness Rating** and uses the **Summary Outcomes Rating Matrix –Form M**—to assign an **Administrator Outcomes Summative Rating – Form N**

III. The **Final Administrator Summative Rating** is based upon 2 measures:

1. Administrator Practice Summative Rating – 50%
2. Administrator Outcomes Summative Rating – 50%

Step 1: To assign a **Final Administrator Summative Rating** the evaluator:

1. Inputs the results of the Administrator Practice Summative Rating and the Administrator Outcomes Summative Rating and uses the **Final Administrator Summative Rating Matrix** to assign a **Final Administrator Summative Rating**.

FINAL ADMINISTRATOR SUMMATIVE RATING MATRIX

Evaluator uses the **Administrator Practice Summative Rating (50%)** and the **Administrator Outcomes Summative Rating (50%)** to assign a **Final Administrator Summative Rating** using the **Matrix** below.

Administrator Practice Rating					
		Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Administrator Outcomes Rating	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing
	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient	Proficient	Developing
	Developing	Proficient	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	Developing	Developing	Below Standard	Below Standard

EASTCONN Administrator Evaluation Summative Rating Form

Administrator: _____ Evaluator: _____

School/Division: _____

Evaluator will review evidence from observations and other artifacts and data submitted by the administrator being evaluated to arrive at a rating for each of the Performance Expectations. Evaluators will rate at the Performance Expectation level and **NOT** at the Element level. After all of the Performance Expectations are rated, the evaluator will use the **Summary Leadership Practice Matrix** to determine a **Summary Leadership Practice Rating**.

FORM A: Leadership Practice Rating (40%)				
Performance Expectations and Elements	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Performance Expectation 1: Vision, Mission and Goals				
Performance Expectation 2: Teaching and Learning				
Performance Expectation 3: Organizational Systems and Safety				
Performance Expectation 4: Families and Stakeholders				
Performance Expectation 5: Ethics and Integrity				
Performance Expectation 6: Leadership Practice Rating				
Use the Summary Leadership Practice Matrix, (below) to determine an Summary Leadership Practice rating				

FORM B: SUMMARY LEADERSHIP PRACTICE MATRIX

Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)		Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Exemplary on Teaching and learning	At least Proficient on Teaching and learning		At least Developing on Teaching and Learning	Below Standard on Teaching and learning
Exemplary on at least 2 other performance expectations	At least Proficient on at least 3 other performance expectations		At least Developing at least 3 other performance expectations	or
No rating below Proficient on any performance expectation	No rating below Developing on any performance expectation			Below Standard on at least 3 other performance expectations
Summary	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Leadership Practice Rating				

STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK RATING FORM

Evaluator will review all evidence submitted, included results of Stakeholder Feedback surveys to determine an overall rating for this category.

FORM C: STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK (10%)				
Stakeholder Feedback Rating	Exemplary (4) Exceeded target or maintained high level	Proficient (3) Met target	Developing (2) Made progress towards target	Below Standard (1) Made no progress and did not meet target
Feedback Target 1				
Stakeholder Feedback Rating	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)

FORM D: SUMMARY PRACTICE RATING MATRIX

Evaluator will use the results of the **Summary Leader Practice Rating** and the **Stakeholder Feedback Rating** to determine a **Administrator Practice Summative Rating** by using the **Summary Practice Rating Matrix** below.

Summary Leadership Practice Rating (40%)					
Stakeholder Feedback Rating (10%)	Level	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Developing
	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
	Developing	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	Proficient	Developing	Developing	Below Standard

FORM E: Administrator Practice SUMMATIVE Rating (50%)				
ADMINISTRATOR PRACTICE SUMMATIVE RATING	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)

ADMINISTRATOR OUTCOMES SUMMATIVE RATING – 50%

STEP 1: STUDENT LEARNING INDICATORS RATING

STUDENT LEARNING INDICATORS RATING (45%)

Evaluator uses the results of the SPI (22.5%) and progress on the 2 SMART goals (22.5%) to assign an **Summary Student Learning Indicator Rating**. The evaluator will use the **SPI Rating Matrix** to determine an overall rating for this category.

FORM F: SPI Rating Matrix

	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
SPI Progress	>125% of target progress	100-125% of target progress	50-99% of target progress	<50% of target progress
Subgroup SPI Progress	Meets performance targets for all subgroups that have SPI <88 OR all subgroups have SPI > 88 OR	Meets performance targets for 50% or more of sub-groups that have SPI <88	Meets performance targets for at least one sub-group that has SPI <88	Does not meet performance target for any subgroup that has SPI <88

STATE ASSESSMENT RESULTS (SPI) RATING (22.5%)

Evaluator uses the results of the **SPI Rating Matrix** to assign a rating.

FORM G: State Assessment Results (spi) Rating - (22.5%)				
State Assessment Results (SPI)	>3.5	2.5 – 3.5	1.5 – 2.4	<1.5
Rating	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
State Assessment Rating (SPI) (22.5%)				

SMART GOALS RATING (22.5%)

The evaluator reviews data and evidence collected on the 2 SMART goals and assigns a rating for each of these goals. The evaluator uses the **SMART Goals Matrix** to assign a **Summary SMART Goals Rating**.

FORM H: SMART Goals Rating - (22.5%)				
Student Learning Indicators (22.5%)	Exemplary (4) Exceeded goal or maintained high level	Proficient (3) Met goal	Developing (2) Did not meet goal but made progress toward goal	Below Standard (1) Did not meet goal and made little or no progress toward goal
SMART Goal #1				
SMART Goal #2				

Summary SMART Goals Rating - (22.5%)

Use the **Summary SMART Goals Rating Matrix**, (below) to assign a **Summary SMART Goals Rating** for the 2 SMART Goals.

FORM I: Summary SMART Goals Rating Matrix - (22.5%)				
	Exemplary (4) Exceeded goal or maintained high level on 2 s	Proficient (3) Met goal on 1 and made progress on the other	Developing (2) Did not meet goal on either , but made progress toward goal on both s	Below Standard (1) Did not meet goal and made little or no progress toward goal on either
Summary SMART Goals Rating (22.5%)				

SUMMARY STUDENT LEARNING INDICATORS RATING – (45%)

Evaluator uses the **SMART Goals Matrix** to assign a **Summary Student Learning Indicators Rating**.

FORM J: SMART Goals Matrix

		State Assessment Portion (SPI)			
		Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Summary SMART Goals Rating	Exemplary (4)	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing
	Proficient (3)	Exemplary	Proficient	Proficient	Developing
	Developing (2)	Proficient	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard (1)	Developing	Developing	Below Standard	Below Standard

FORM K: SUMMARY STUDENT LEARNING INDICATORS– (45%)

SUMMARY STUDENT LEARNING INDICATORS RATING (45%)				
Summary	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Student Learning Indicators Rating				

Teacher Effectiveness Rating (5%)

Evaluator uses the aggregate results of teachers’ progress toward meeting their smart goals to assign an overall rating for **Teacher Effectiveness** using the **Teacher Effectiveness Rating Matrix** below.

FORM L: Teacher Effectiveness Rating Matrix				
	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
	81-100% of teachers are rated <i>proficient</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student growth portion of their evaluation	61-80% of teachers are rated <i>proficient</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student growth portion of their evaluation	41-60% of teachers are rated <i>proficient</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student growth portion of their evaluation	0-40% of teachers are rated <i>proficient</i> or <i>exemplary</i> on the student growth portion of their evaluation
Teacher Effectiveness Rating	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)

FORM M: Summary OUTCOMES RATING Matrix (50%)

Evaluator uses the **Summary Outcomes Rating Matrix** to assign an **Administrator Outcomes Summative Rating**.

Administrator Student Learning Related Indicators Rating (45%)					
		Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Teacher Effectiveness Rating (5%)	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
	Developing	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard

FORM N: ADMINISTRATOR Outcomes Summative Rating (50%)				
	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Below Standard (1)
Administrator Outcomes Summative Rating				

FORM O: FINAL ADMINISTRATOR SUMMATIVE RATING MATRIX

Evaluator uses the **Administrator Practice Summative Rating (50%)** and the **Administrator Outcomes Summative Rating (50%)** to assign a **Final Administrator Summative Rating** using the **Matrix** below.

Administrator Practice Rating					
		Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
Administrator Outcomes Rating	Exemplary	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing
	Proficient	Exemplary	Proficient	Proficient	Developing
	Developing	Proficient	Proficient	Developing	Below Standard
	Below Standard	Developing	Developing	Below Standard	Below Standard