



SPS PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION PLAN

Approved May 2015

SPS MISSION

Stamford Public Schools prepares each and every student for higher education and success in the 21st century.

COMMITTEE MISSION

The mission of the Evaluation Committee has been to explore, design, and develop an evaluation system that improves instruction and learning through a growth model. The Evaluation Committee has designed an evaluation system that is meant to be a collaborative effort between the evaluator and the person being evaluated, the evaluatee. The committee has strived to facilitate open communication, an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect, helps teachers develop skills of self-reflection and self-assessment and fosters life-long learning for all staff involved. The Evaluation Committee believes that the evaluation system will define and consequently foster the creation of valuable professional development for teachers.

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS 2013

Co-Chairs: Fay Ruotolo, Interim Director Human Resources; Lora Rossomando, President Stamford Education Association
Teachers: Sheryl Berkley; Ashley Bunn; Al Cuiffo; Elizabeth Giancola; Alec Iogman; Louise McMinn; Patty Mould; Tom Moulketis; Betsy Nagurney; Deborah Okun; Guy Semon; Kelly Svendsen; Vin Urbanowski; Ruth Terry Walden
Administrators: Scott Clayton; Matt Forker; Gloria Manna; Tony Ramos; Mike Rinaldi; Michael Sanders; Mark Woodard;
Central Office: Louise Spolowitz; CEA Uniserv Sharon Quinn

PGDE COMMITTEE REVISIONS 2014

Co-Chairs: Lora Rossomando, Stamford Education Association; Louise Spolowitz, Chief Compliance Officer;
Central Office: Stephen Falcone, Michael Arcano, President Stamford Education Association; CEA Representative, Sharon Quinn
Teachers: Sheryl Berkley; Kristin Bivona; Melissa Correa; Al Cuiffo; John Corcoran; Sandra Ehlers; Beth Eiseman; Lisa Forbes; Lawrence Keller; Kim Lapolla; Kelly Lane; Scott Lerner; Louise McMinn; Patty Mould; Tom Moulketis; Betsy Nagurney; Deborah Okun; Sandra Peterkin; Genelle Rabita; Jen Scanlan; Guy Semon; Matthew Shoztic; Raj Sundararajan; Lee Teich; Vin Urbanowski; Ruth Terry Walden; Stacey Zemola
Administrators: Mark Bonasera; Scott Clayton; Natalie Elder; Matt Forker; Tony Ramos; Frank Rodriguez; Michael Sanders and David Tate, Co-Presidents, Stamford Administrative Unit

PGDE COMMITTEE 2015

Co-Chairs: Stephen Falcone, Executive Director Human Resource; Lora Rossomando, Stamford Education Association
CEA Representative: Sharon Quinn
Steering Committee: Co-Chairs: Steven Falcone, Lora Rossomando, Teachers: Sheryl Berkley, Kristin Bivona, Genelle Rabita, Matt Shoztic, Administrators: Mark Bonasera, Scott Clayton, Frank Rodriguez CEA Representative: Sharon Quinn
Full Committee: Teachers: Esther Altamura; Sheryl Berkley; Kristin Bivona; Melissa Correa; Al Cuiffo; Maria DeVito; Kerriann Duffy; Amy Ferrare; Louann Finch; Lisa Forbes; Dagny Forrester; Toni Fox; Salah Jahangir; Scott Jones; Nadine Kerr; Kelly Lane; Scott Lerner; Michelle Mallozzi; Louise McMinn; Sean O'Connell; Juan Pazmino; Sandra Peterkin; Lora Puhl; Genelle Rabita; Michele Scott; Guy Semon; Matthew Shoztic; Raj Sundararajan; Lee Teich; Kate Tobin; Heysha Vasquez; Ruth Terry Walden; Deborah Wilson; Claudia Wolen
Administrators: Angela Asaro; Mark Bonasera; Scott Clayton; Lawrence Keller; Kathy Lane; Gloria Manna; Jason Martin; Jonathan Panzer; Crystal Perry; Frank Rodriguez

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROGRAM GOALS	3
CORE VALUES AND BELIEFS	3
PHILOSOPHY	5
OVERVIEW	5
ELEMENTS	6
FOUR LEVEL MATRIX	6
YEARLY TIMELINE	7
ORIENTATION AND TRAINING PROCESSES	7
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	9
EVALUATION PROCESS	11
MONITORING PROCESS	15
FOUR RATED COMPONENTS OF THE PGDE PLAN	16
TEACHER SECTION	16
TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICE CATEGORIES (40%)	16
REQUIREMENTS/CLARIFICATIONS OF TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICE	18
PARENT FEEDBACK (10%)	20
STUDENT ACADEMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (45%)	21
WHOLE SCHOOL STUDENT LEARNING INDICATORS (5%)	22
ADMINISTRATOR SECTION	22
ADMINISTRATOR LEADERSHIP PRACTICE CATEGORIES (40%)	23
STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK (10%)	25
MULTIPLE STUDENT LEARNING INDICATORS (45%)	25
TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS (5%)	26
SUMMATIVE RATINGS	27
DISPUTE RESOLUTION	28
DEFINITION OF EFFECTIVE AND INEFFECTIVE	29
PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT SYSTEM	30
EVALUATION BASED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING	31
PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT	33

SPS TEACHER PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION PROGRAM GOALS

The purpose is to:

- Improve the performance of educators and promote their holistic professional growth
- Encourage, support, and empower teachers and administrators while promoting school improvement, accountability, and retention of qualified teachers and administrators
- Provide a fair, transparent and equitable evaluation system which provides for and uses specific observations and documentation based on realistic job expectations
- Enhance the learning and success of both the teacher, administrator and the students
- Foster continuing collaborative dialogue around teaching and learning in order to increase student academic growth and development
- Align teacher's competencies, promote a positive school climate, and meet the changing expectations of specific positions
- Establish a shared understanding of "good teaching" between evaluators and evaluatees
- Promote, value, and support teachers by all stakeholders
- Promote collaboration and shared ownership for professional growth, renewal, and employment decisions
- Strengthen the working relationship between evaluatee and evaluator

CORE VALUES AND BELIEFS ABOUT PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

Stamford's Professional Growth, Development and Evaluation Program establishes high standards of performance for teachers and administrators that ultimately leads to improved student learning. As educators grow through our holistic processes, students will benefit from enriched instruction, learn to take greater ownership for their learning, and develop and refine social skills needed to be productive workers and citizens. Professional standards, including *Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching* (2010), *Connecticut's Common Core of Leading*, *Connecticut School Leadership Standards* (2012), the *Standards for Professional Learning* (2012), and *National Pupil Personnel Standards*, provide the foundation for Stamford's Professional Growth, Development and Evaluation Program.

Stamford teachers are committed to ensuring that students achieve and develop 21st century skills that will enable them to become lifelong learners and productive citizens in a global world. This is a shared responsibility among students, teachers, administrators, parents, the community, local board of education, the state board of education, and local and state governments. Effective teachers and administrators are among the most important school-level factors in student learning and effective leadership is an essential component of any successful school.

We believe that an effective teaching and learning system:

- Must reflect and be grounded in the vision and core values of the district and its schools
- Creates coherence among the functions of supervision and evaluation of professional practice, professional learning and support, and curriculum and assessment development
- Understands, adjusts and provides support for the unique tasks and job description of each teacher/administrator
- Creates a comprehensive evaluation process which includes:
 - ✓ on-going inquiry into and reflection on practice
 - ✓ goal-setting aligned with expectations for student learning
 - ✓ information gathered from multiple sources of evidence
 - ✓ analysis of data from multiple sources of evidence
 - ✓ support structures for feedback, assistance, and professional collaboration
 - ✓ research-based professional learning opportunities aligned with the needs of evaluatees
- Increases educator effectiveness and student outcomes; is standards-based, and promotes and is sustained by a culture of collaboration and knowledge-sharing
- Is a reflective, dynamic, ongoing process for both the teacher/evaluatee and administrator/evaluator
- Should be conducted in a respectful, confidential, and professional environment
- Should foster professional dialogue about teacher/evaluatee practice and student learning
- Incorporates peer collaboration as an essential ingredient and provides an environment with the time and opportunity for teachers/evaluatees to share their best practices in both formal and informal settings
- Believes evaluatees are entitled to peer support at any step in the process
- Should be efficient and effectual in terms of time
- Promotes and honors professional judgment and risk-taking in regard to determination of goals and rating of evaluatee performance
- Provides for and understands teachers are at different stages in their careers and therefore need variable growth patterns and support systems to achieve at their optimal level
- Helps teachers/evaluatees align their evaluation student growth goals with district and school goals inclusive of their professional growth needs; goals are also tailored to the unique responsibilities and interests of the teacher/evaluatee
- Must use multiple indicators to assess performance
- Requires objectives to be mutually determined between evaluator and evaluatee
- Requires both the evaluator and evaluatee to collect and analyze data, to brainstorm and provide support to adjust instruction or learning goals, and to analyze results as evidence of teacher/evaluatee and/or student growth
- Maintains confidentiality between the evaluator and the evaluatee throughout the evaluation process
- Is transparent to all stakeholders
- Creates a timely process for resolving disputes in process and disparities in evidence
- Mutually promotes an atmosphere where the evaluator and evaluatee can agree upon final evaluation rating, whenever possible
- Creates and provides for a confidential peer support program for teachers/evaluatees in need of assistance

PHILOSOPHY OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

Evaluation is best viewed as a highly individualized experience that is based on a growth model. It is a continuous reflection on one's practice that leads to a deeper understanding of knowledge and skills. It exhibits a high degree of professionalism and collegiality. As teachers and administrators continually assess student progress, analyze results, and differentiate instruction/service provided to improve student achievement, teachers and administrators demonstrate that they are committed to continuous professional improvement and development. We believe a district that prioritizes continuous growth and development for both the evaluatee and the evaluator with ongoing collaborative dialogue positively affects student achievement.

The intention of this plan is to provide a process to document how teachers and administrators are learning, mastering their practice and are committed to the growth and development of the students they serve.

The Professional Growth, Development and Evaluation Program supports the development of educators at all stages of their careers. It weaves together professional standards with expectations for student learning and ongoing evaluation with access to professional learning and support. For teachers: The Plan's instrument and the *SPS Performance and Practice Rubric (in process)* are designed to align with the processes and professional performance profiles outlined in *Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching* and *Connecticut State Guidelines*. For Administrators: Leadership practice is described in the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards, adopted by the Connecticut State Board of Education in January of 2013. The Common Core of Leadership Evaluation Rubric defines effective leadership practice through six performance expectations. Such alignment promotes the establishment of vocabulary and understandings about teacher/evaluatee practice at all levels, and common and consistent practices among administrators and teachers throughout the district.

Stamford's Professional Growth, Development and Evaluation Program takes many areas into account: school improvement goals, curricular goals, student learning goals, and evidence of educators' contributions to the school as a whole. Performance expectations within our Plan also include those responsibilities that we believe to be key in promoting a positive school climate and the development of a professional learning community.

OVERVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION PLAN PROCESS

Public Act 12-116 presented a new framework for evaluation in Connecticut. In June 2012, the State Board of Education adopted new *Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation* which outlines specific features that every district educator evaluation system must contain. Included in Stamford's Plan is the following:

- The use of a four-level matrix rating system to describe teacher/evaluatee performance: exemplary, proficient, developing, and below standard;
- A yearly evaluation process that includes:
 - ✓ Orientation and training for evaluators and evaluatees
 - ✓ Goal-setting conference each fall
 - ✓ Use of multiple indicators of student academic growth and development to determine 45% of evaluatee's evaluation
 - ✓ Use of observations of performance and reviews of practice to determine 40% of a evaluatee's evaluation
 - ✓ Use of whole school learning indicators or student feedback to determine 5% of a teacher's evaluation
 - ✓ Use of Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes for 5% of an administrator's evaluation
 - ✓ Use of peer or parent feedback to determine 10% of a teacher's evaluation
 - ✓ Use of stakeholder feedback (Parents, teachers and others) to determine 10% of an administrator's evaluation
 - ✓ Mid-year check-in conference and/or adjustments if needed
 - ✓ End-of-the-year self-assessment document
 - ✓ End-of-the-year summative conference
 - ✓ End of the year holistic and mutually determined summative rating and a summative report by evaluator
 - ✓ Local district report to the State Department of Education
- Consistent and ongoing training for evaluators performing evaluations
- Professional learning based on individual or group needs identified through evaluation;
- Process for resolving disputes regarding goal setting, objectives, evidence collection, the evaluation period, feedback, the professional learning and the professional development plan offered;
- Professional Assistance and Support System (PASS) program and eventually a Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program
- Opportunities for career development and professional growth

ELEMENTS OF THE PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION PLAN

FOUR LEVEL MATRIX SYSTEMS

The CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation require the use of the following definitions to describe evaluatee performance:

Exemplary: substantially exceeds indicators of performance

Proficient: meets indicators of performance

Developing: meets some indicators of performance but not others

Below Standard: does not meet indicators of performance

- Performance means progress as defined by specified indicators
- When assigning ratings, evaluators shall factor in an interpretation that is appropriate for beginning level educators (1-4 yrs.).

In order to determine an evaluatee’s summative evaluation rating, the district will rate evaluatee in the following manner:

☞ An *outcomes rating* will be determined, based on multiple indicators of student academic growth and development (45%) and (5%) whole-school **student** learning or teacher effectiveness(administrators) indicators

☞ A *practice rating* will be determined, based on observations of the evaluatee’s performance and practice (40%) and parent or stakeholder (administrators) feedback (10%)

☞ The two ratings will be examined holistically to determine the summative rating.

This rating process will be explained in greater detail in another section of this document.

YEARLY TIMELINE

In the evaluation process, timing is important. Stamford Public Schools is committed to assuring that evaluatees and evaluators have the time they need to conduct evaluation collaboratively and well. There are more specific timelines described in other sections of this document, but the general timelines for the evaluation portion of the PDGE program are as follows:

- Before the first day of school for students, all evaluatees and evaluators will have had a full orientation.
- Ongoing small group training will occur at smaller venues throughout the year and upon request by evaluatees.

<u>Basic Components</u>	<u>Dates:</u>	<u>Teacher</u>	<u>Adm</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Orientation		by first Student Day	Aug 1
<input type="checkbox"/> Data Access for Goal Development		Sept 15	Aug 1
<input type="checkbox"/> Goal Setting Conference		Oct 15	Sept 15
<input type="checkbox"/> Mid -Year Conference		Jan 30	Jan 30
<input type="checkbox"/> Formal or Informal Observations/visits, & Review of Practice		Oct ----- May	
<input type="checkbox"/> Summative Self -Assessment		May 20	May 20
<input type="checkbox"/> Summative Conference		May 20	June 1
<input type="checkbox"/> District Report to Board			June 1
<input type="checkbox"/> District State Reporting Form			June 30

ORIENTATION AND TRAINING PROCESSES

The educators in Stamford Public Schools believe that any evaluation system is only as good as its implementation. The most important factor in sound implementation is the training that all those who use the system receive. Therefore, training will be provided to all educators as follows:

Evaluator Orientation and Ongoing Training/Certification

All evaluators new to the district and new to an administrative position will be provided with an orientation and proficiency workshop on the plan and their role in the implementation of the plan prior to the start of the school year or to beginning the evaluation process (whichever occurs sooner). A trained

sub-committee of evaluators from the PGDE Committee in conjunction with the co-chairs of the PGDE committee will provide the orientation and proficiency workshop to train and calibrate all the new evaluators to the district prior to their role as evaluator. For the proficiency workshop the option to use the CSDE Trainer is available. All of the components of the evaluation guidelines will be addressed, including a determination of proficiency.

As a result of taking part in these workshops, participants will:

- Understand the four components of the evaluation guidelines
- Develop skills in conducting effective observations and providing high quality feedback
- Develop skills in the collection of evidence and the mapping of evidence to the CSDE CCT rubric to determine the component rating in teacher performance and practice
- Achieve proficiency in the observation and evaluation of teachers
- Develop skills in pre-conference dialogue and support
- Develop skills in collaborative dialogue and reaching mutual agreement

All evaluators, those who have participated previously in the SPS PGDE plan and have already completed the proficiency workshop training, as well as the new ones, will receive a day of refresher calibration training provided by the CSDE Trainer prior to the start of school. This will provide an opportunity to refresh skills and improve the ability to collect evidence aligned with the plan Rubric.-Participants will have the opportunity to look at samples of evaluation feedback and other aspects of the evaluation process for discussions leading to a more cohesive understanding and implementation of the PGDE Plan. A sub-committee of the steering committee will present any plan revisions due to state changes in guidelines or by recommendation of PGDE Committee to the SPS Evaluation Plan.

Additionally, the committee will conduct ongoing training in the elements of the evaluation plan and the role of the evaluator in the implementation of the plan throughout the year, on an as needed basis. Topics for the training will include, but are not limited to, interactions with evaluatees, conducting conferences, or any of the components or elements of the plan on an as needed basis as determined by the PGDE committee or as requested by the evaluators. Issues, concerns, discussion time on the PGDE Plan will be an agenda item for all the monthly administrators' meeting.

Evaluatee Orientation and Training

During August, each year, the district will provide a full day thorough updated orientation/training session for all administrators.

Each year, all teachers shall receive a thorough updated orientation/ training session on PGDE provided by the district at the beginning of each school year. This PD shall occur during current negotiated district PD time, prior to the start of school for students. The district shall retain documents as to who received this training.

Orientation sessions, for both teachers and administrators, will explain in detail all aspects of the PGDE process and the responsibilities of the evaluatee and the evaluator. Specific emphasis will be placed on understanding the goal setting conference process and timelines. In addition, professional learning sessions will be offered by a sub-committee of the PGDE committee in conjunction with the co-chairs throughout the year, on an as needed basis, encompassing, use of ProTraxx or other electronic data collection source, developing SLO/s, establishing IAGDs, gathering evidence and understanding rubrics,

preparing documents/forms for conferences, the process for holistically determining ratings in each of the four performance areas, any and all documents that will be used by educators, or any other area requested by the evaluatee, and for administrators; the processes for planning professional learning. (Through in-service sessions, target group sessions, and individual conferences, etc.).

For teachers, these professional learning sessions will be provided on multiple dates, in multiple locations and confirmation of attendance at a session will be in lieu of the teachers' attendance at the required 3rd Wednesday after school meeting in October.

Newly hired teachers and administrators to Stamford will be provided with an introduction to evaluation upon employment prior to the beginning of the school year at the new teacher or new administrator orientation, along with separate sessions provided by the co-chairs and/or a sub-committee of the PGDE Committee to fully train them in the PGDE plan (if hired after the start of the school year above within 20 school days. Plan document is available online to all employees and a hard copy in each office and media center.

The PGDE Committee's intention is to develop a cadre of trained teachers/administrators and evaluators who will conduct training for their respective groups within the district on an ongoing basis.

Based on feedback from the PGDE committee, training to address specific sections/needs that arise throughout the year will be provided. Throughout the school year the district will provide to evaluatees or evaluators additional training/orientation through in-service sessions, target group sessions, and individual conferences upon individual requests, etc.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Definition of Teacher, Administrator and Evaluator

Evaluator refers to all individuals (including school and district personnel) whose job responsibilities include supervision and evaluation of other teachers (092 required). Department Heads have no formal role in the evaluation process.

Teacher (evaluatee), as used in this document, shall mean all certified instructional and non-instructional persons below the rank of Administrator (092 required).

Administrator, as used in this document, shall mean all certified instructional and non-instructional administrators below the rank of Superintendent (requires a 092) as the evaluatee.

Roles and Responsibilities of Evaluators and Evaluatees

The primary purpose of educator professional growth, development and evaluation is to strengthen individual and collective practices to improve student growth. Therefore, evaluators and evaluatees share responsibilities for the following:

- The review and understanding of *Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching* (CCT) and Stamford's Performance and Practice Continuum (in process)
- The review and understanding of *Connecticut's Common Core of Leading* (CCL) and the *Leadership Practice Continuum*

- The review and familiarity with applicable portions of *Common Core State Standards, Connecticut's Frameworks of K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards*, the CMT/CAPT Assessments (and Smarter Balanced Assessments, when available), as well as locally-developed curriculum standards
- Adherence to established timelines; completion of required components in a timely and appropriate manner
- Sharing of professional resources and new learnings about professional practice
- With advance notice, an evaluatee may bring any SPS teacher (other educators by mutual agreement) into any conference in this process in order to strengthen the goal of growth and development.

Evaluator Roles

- Review and understanding of Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching (CCT) and Stamford's Performance and Practice Continuum
- Review and understanding of Connecticut's Common Core of Leading (CCL) and the Leadership Practice Continuum
- Review and familiarity with applicable portions of Common core State Standards, Connecticut's Frameworks of K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards, the CMT/CAPT Assessments (and Smarter Balanced Assessments, when available) as well as locally-developed curriculum standards.
- Adherence to established timelines
- Completion of required components in a timely and appropriate manner
- Sharing of professional resources and new learnings about professional practice
- Review of and familiarity with evaluatees' previous evaluations
- Review of and familiarity with evaluatees' student data
- Provide fair and equitable teaching environment/loads for evaluatees
- Provide fair and equitable schools, departments and job responsibilities for evaluatees
- Provide stability in teaching/administrator assignments from year to year
- Provide adequate and timely access to all data to inform the development of evaluatee's goals and for ongoing analysis
- Participation in collaborative conferences with evaluatees
- Assistance with assessment of goals, student learning indicators (IAGDs), learning activities developed and implemented by evaluatees, and outcomes
- Collect and document relevant data and evidence for evaluation and/or support process
- Analyze and assess performance, make recommendations as appropriate
- Clarify any questions, identify of resources, facilitate peer collaboration and other support as needed
- Provide all reasonable supports to the evaluatee to achieve his or her goals, including but not limited to financial resources, equity among buildings, peer feedback (Instructional Rounds), internal focus walks, administrator PLCs and/or data teams, effective research based curriculum aligned with the common core state standards with supporting classroom materials and professional development for SPS staff.

Evaluatee Roles

- Reflect on previous feedback from evaluations.
- Analyze student data
- Prepare necessary documents prior to conferences
- Collect and document relevant data

- Complete required material in a timely manner
- Engage in inquiry-based professional learning opportunities
- Participate in collaborative conferences with evaluator
- Develop, implement, and self-assess goals, student learning indicators (IAGDs), learning activities, and outcomes
- Reflect back to evaluator the support necessary for success
- Actively participate by requesting clarification of process and/or needed support
- Prepare a self-assessment for summative conference

EVALUATION PROCESS

1. Data Access, Support and Resources for Success

Teachers and administrators will have online access to a copy of the evaluation document along with training that will convey all the key components including but not limited to timelines, roles and responsibilities, stakeholder feedback results, development of SLOs and IAGDs, both the teacher and administrator evaluation rubrics and administrator SLOs. Teachers and administrators will have full access to system data bases. The teachers and administrators will be provided with but not limited to; individual student profiles with relevant student learning data including the school performance index (SPI) rating and other measures the district would like to prioritize such as DRA scores, Lexiles, Connected Math Assessments, Everyday Math Assessments, AP scores, graduation rates, retention rates, CBAS, SBAC, student writing samples, and other curriculum-based measures/resources that may be incorporated into the evaluation.

2. Goal Setting Conference

The goal setting conference is one of the most important conversations that take place between the teacher/administrator and evaluator in the fall.

Teacher

Prior to the conference, the teacher will examine student data from different sources to determine his/her students' learning needs, and connect those to appropriate curriculum, school and district goals. Then the teacher will draft a student learning growth objective (SLO) and IAGDs that are inputted prior to the goal setting conference. Additionally, the teacher should specify a parent feedback action item. During this conference, the teacher and evaluator will mutually agree on the following:

- The teacher's SLO
- The IAGDs that will be used to show progress in student growth and/or development during the year:
- The teacher's Performance and Practice Category and the subsequent decision requirements
- Selection of the proficient to exemplary category
- Review of practice ideas
- Parent Feedback Action Item
- The types of evidence that the teacher and evaluator might bring into the evaluation process
- The appropriate professional growth opportunities that will be provided to support the teacher's Performance and Practice and their Outcome
- If applicable, the development of an assistance plan with evaluator, evaluatee, and SEA president

Administrator

Prior to the conference, 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. Examples of evidence to collect should be focused on practices emphasized on the CT Common Core of Leading and may include student achievement data, surveys, administrator walkthrough data on instructional practices, focus walk feedback, instructional round feedback, administrator and teacher data team reports and minutes, professional development plans and outcomes, other school based factors that are impacting the school, department, and student achievement. The evaluator and evaluatee analyze student learning data provided (see above) and determine mutually agreed upon foci for student learning and consider the context of the school's long term needs and overall performance and draft Student learning objectives (SLOs) that s/he bring the goals to the goal setting conference. These SLOs should be aligned with the School and District Improvement Plan and should be appropriate to support and sustain a multi-year effort. A typical improvement plan lasts 3-5 year plan, with modifications as needed based on yearly outcomes. It is understood that these plans may also be modified at any time during the school year based on indicators of student achievement, feedback and other data. During the conference, the evaluator and evaluatee will mutually agree on the following:

- a) The SLO(s) which should support the SIP and DIP
- b) The Area of Focus for the year which may link to information from past evaluations
- c) The IAGDs that will be used to show student growth and development during the year (see notes/parameters listed in teacher's IAGD above)
- d) Stakeholder Feedback goal and evidence that will be used during the year
- e) The types of evidence that the administrator and evaluator might bring into the evaluation process.
- f) The evaluator and administrator also discuss the appropriate resources and professional development needs to support the administrator in accomplishing the goals. Professional learning activities (e.g., focus walks, instructional rounds, coaching) should be provided by the district so that feedback can be given to the evaluatee from multiple sources. These activities should be scheduled and feedback provided within two weeks of each activity. These and other reasonable supports should be provided by the evaluator to support the evaluatees achievement of their goals. Together, these components – the goals, the practice areas and the resources and supports – comprise an individual's evaluation plan.
- g) The evaluator will establish a schedule of observations with the administrator to collect evidence and observe the administrator's work. The first observation 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 observation/s will be planned at two- to three-month intervals
- h) If applicable, develop an assistance plan with stakeholders.

IAGDs

- a. Fair to Evaluatee: The use of an indicator of academic growth and development for both teachers and administrators is fair when an evaluatee has the professional development, training and financial resources and opportunity to show that his/her school/students has/have made growth and when the indicator is appropriate to the school/teacher's program, curriculum, assignment and other school based factors that are aligned with long term professional growth goals long term school or department goals. Schools and classrooms must have equitable resources and

composition of a class/school must be taken into account when developing and evaluating the SLOs and IAGDs.

- b. Fair to students - The indicator of academic growth and development is used in such a way as to provide students an opportunity to show that they have met or are making progress in meeting the learning objective. The use of the indicator of academic growth and development is as free as possible from bias and stereotype.
- c. Fair to teachers: The use of an indicator of academic growth and development is fair when a teacher has the professional resources and opportunity to show that his/her students have made growth and when the indicator is appropriate to the teacher's content, assignment and class composition.
- d. Fair to administrators: The use of an indicator of academic growth and development is fair when an administrator has the professional development, training, supports, resources and opportunity to show that his/her students have made growth and when the indicator is appropriate to the long term professional growth goals. Schools and classrooms must have equitable resources.
- e. Reliable - Use of the indicator is consistent among those using the indicators and over time.
- f. Valid - The indicator measures what it is intended to measure.
- g. Useful - The indicator may be used to provide the teacher/administrator with meaningful feedback about student knowledge, skills, perspective and classroom experience that may be used to enhance student learning and provide opportunities for teacher/administrator professional growth and development.

3. Performance and Practice

Teacher Performance and Practice Section for details and specific deadlines for your category see page .
Administrator Performance and Practice Section for details and deadlines for your category see page .

To assure that any type of formal observation is given the attention and respect it deserves, no formal observations used as part of the evaluation process will be less than 30 minutes and no formal or informal observation will take place on the last day of school, before a holiday break, during standardized testing periods, or within the last two weeks of the school year. Observations are to be spread out over time, with the expectation of at least a month apart.

4. Mid-Year Check-In Conference

The mid-year check-in is the formal opportunity for the teacher/administrator and evaluator to review and discuss the evaluatee's progress to date, as it relates to SLO/s, IAGDs, review of practice, in addition for administrators - Area of Focus, overall school improvement plan and proposes next steps for professional learning needs and growth of the school or department. Both parties will bring evidence collected to the conference for discussion. At this time, any mutually agreed to decision to adjust the SLO/s, IAGDs, Area of Focus, criteria for success, and/or evidence that will be used in the evaluation may be made and formally recorded. The mid-year conference form will be completed together at the conference. Completed conference form should be delivered within 5 school days.

5. Self-Assessment and End-of-Year Summative Conference

Summative conferences held:

NOTE: Teacher/administrator self-assessment form for discussion must be submitted to the evaluator two full school days before scheduled summative conference. Samples of evidence must be brought to the conference.

The summative conference gives the evaluatee and evaluator an opportunity to review and discuss the evaluatee's progress of Growth and Development over the course of the year, talk about the evaluatees professional growth plan for the following year, and discuss the long term professional growth and development needs of the school, department or evaluatee. Both the evaluatee and evaluator will prepare for the conference by reviewing and collating the evidence each has collected that pertains to the evaluatee's Performance and Practice, Administrators - area of focus, the progress related to the SLO/s, parent/stakeholder feedback action item and whole school student learning indicators (if applicable). Prior to the final summative conference, the evaluatee completes his/her own assessment and reflection of progress and growth. The **End of Year Evaluatee Self-Assessment** is completed by the evaluatee as a self-rating on all four component areas. It provides the opportunity for evaluatee to give brief comments to support the ratings. This document is sent to the evaluator to preview before the summative conference. Similarly, the evaluator has an **End of the Year Summative Form**. During the conference, both parties will share and discuss the evidence from IAGDs for SLO/s, observations, reviews of practice, and data from parent or stakeholder feedback components, etc. Looking at the evidence holistically, the teacher and evaluator will discuss and mutually agree on ratings for the summative form:

- A. The following four components are rated:
 1. Observations of Performance and Practice (40%)
 2. Parent or stakeholder Feedback (Adm.) (10%)
 3. Student Academic Growth and Development (45%)
 4. Whole-School Student Learning Indicators or Teacher Effectiveness Rating (Adm.) (5%)
- B. Combine the Observations of Performance and Practice and Parent or stakeholder (Adm.) Feedback into a single rating taking into account their relative weights. This will represent an overall **Practice Rating** of *Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard*.
- C. Combine the Student Academic Growth and Development and Whole-school Student Learning Indicators or teacher effectiveness rating (Adm.) into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall **Outcome Rating** of *Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard*.
- D. Combine the **Outcomes Rating** and **Practice Rating** into a final mutually agreed holistic rating of *Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard*.

NOTE: A rating can be postponed if either party needs more time to analyze all the evidence, and/or the teacher needs more time to provide more evidence or details in an attempt to reach mutual agreement. The final evaluation rating must be made by May 25th for teachers and June 1 for administrators

E. If evaluator and evaluatee agree, the box indicating agreement should be checked. If evaluator and evaluatee do not agree on a rating, the box indicating disagreement should be checked.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Stamford Public Schools believes that evaluation must be a growth-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 PGDE Committee. (page 28)

LOCAL REPORTING

The district superintendent shall report the status of teacher evaluations to the local or regional Board of Education on before June 1 of each year.

STATE REPORTING

Not later than June 30 each year, each superintendent shall report to the Commissioner of Education the status of the implementation of teacher evaluations, including the frequency of evaluations, aggregate evaluation ratings, the number of administrators and teachers who have not been evaluated and other requirements as determined by the department of education.

PASS – PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT SYSTEM

Teachers who receive summative evaluation ratings of *developing* or *below standard* will be required to participate in a teacher performance assistance plan (page 30)

Administrators who receive a summative evaluation rating of “Developing” or “Below Standard” will be required to work with his/her evaluator (or designated PASS Administrator Performance Remediation Plan Developer) to design an administrator performance remediation plan. (page 30)

PAR - PEER ASSISTANCE AND REVIEW (To be added at a later time, pending funding)

MONITORING PROCESS

The Professional Growth, Development and Evaluation Committee considers an evaluation document an ever-evolving process which should continuously be reviewed, and revised for adherence to the goals and purposes set forth in this document. Additionally, it has the role to develop, implement and monitor the district’s implementation and creation of all the professional learning necessary to create effective teachers and administrators.

The PGDE Committee consists of an SEA Co-Chair, SPS Co-chair (HR Executive Director), teachers from every school (appointed by SEA) and representative administrators (appointed by SAU).

The PGDE Committee has established a steering committee to meet monthly (more if needed) to delve deeper and to review and make recommendations to the larger PGDE Committee for their consensus. Both PGDE Committees’ membership was established by agreement between the Stamford Education Association (SEA) and Stamford Administrators Unit (SAU).

The Professional Growth, Development and Evaluation Committee will meet monthly to develop, modify, monitor, and revise as necessary.

The Professional Growth, Development and Evaluation Committee will also seek feedback from teachers and administrators through both short surveys and focus groups. Short surveys will be developed by the committee to administer to all staff throughout the year. Additionally, focus groups will be held to get more specific feedback; the questions for the focus groups will also be developed by the committee.

EVALUATION BASED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

See page 31

FOUR RATED COMPONENTS OF THE PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION PLAN

TEACHER SECTION:

EVALUATION PRACTICE RATING (50%)

1. TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICE (40%)

2. PARENT FEEDBACK (10%)

1. TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICE (40%)

This is the phase of the evaluation process that includes formal and informal observations, as well as reviews of practice. In preparation for this section of the Goal Setting conference, teachers review the performance category requirements. They should be familiar with the *Connecticut Common Core of Teaching Rubric* and reflect on past evaluation recommendations. Based on reflection, teachers may choose to indicate to their evaluator that they wish to work toward an exemplary rating. They would indicate this during the goal setting conference. (Indication is not necessary to receive a rating of exemplary). If indicators from domains are required to be selected, teachers will be asked to identify them during either the goal setting conference or at the pre-conference for a formal observation. If a review of practice is required, teachers should be prepared to discuss options.

TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICE CATEGORIES

Category 1

- **Teachers new to the district**
- **All first and second year non-tenured teachers.**
 - **3 Formal Observations**
 - If any observation leads to concerns which could lead to non-renewal the teacher will be notified and resources and support provided immediately

Timeline –Completion by the following dates:

Nov. 15 -1st Observation

Dec. 10 -Potential Non-renewal and teacher supports

Feb 1 -2nd Observation
March 15 -3rd Observation
March 20 -Non-renewal must be announced to teacher

Category 2

- **Non-tenured Teachers in years 3 and 4.**
 - **1 Formal Observation**
 - **1 Review of Practice**

Timeline –Completion by the following dates:

Dec. 10 -Potential Non-renewal
Jan. 15 -Observation
March 20 -Non-renewal must be announced to teacher
May 1 - Review of Practice

Category 3

- **All tenured teachers rated *Proficient or Exemplary* will enter a three year observation phase cycle**
 - **Phase 1:**
 - **1 Formal Observation**
 - **1 Review of Practice**

Timeline –Completion by the following dates:

Jan. 15 - Observation
May 1 - Review of Practice

- **Phase 2 (yr 1) and Phase 3 (yr 2):** (Informal cycle is two years of the three year cycle)
 - **3 Informal Observations**
 - **1 Review of Practice**
 - **During the goal setting conference:** Teachers wishing to move from *proficient* to *exemplary* should inform the evaluator and mark the box on the form **Informal Observation Record** indicating this. The evaluator and teacher should discuss the focus areas that would enable the teacher to achieve a rating of *exemplary*. This focus would be noted in the box labeled additional information on the informal form.

Note: Teachers need not have to indicate they wish to move to *exemplary* to receive a rating of *exemplary*.

Timeline – by the following dates:

Dec. 1 - 1st informal Observation
March 24 - 2nd informal Observation
May 1 - 3rd informal Observation
May 1 - Review of Practice

.....

Category 4

- **Teachers designated Developing or Below standard**

- **3 Formal Observations, one of which is an unannounced (if appropriate)**
- **Professional Assistance and Support System (PASS)**

Teacher, evaluator, and SEA President will collaboratively develop a specified improvement plan which does the following: (A) identifies resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the evaluator to address documented deficiencies, (B) indicates a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued, and (C) includes indicators of success, including a summative rating of *proficient* or better at the conclusion of the improvement and assistance plan. This plan must be mutually agreed to by the parties.

Timeline: Completion by the following dates:

Sept 30 - Plan must be collaboratively developed.

Individualized based on the assistance plan but should be completed by **May 1**.

For all non-tenured teachers must be completed by **March 20** if being considered for non-renewal.

REQUIREMENTS / CLARIFICATIONS OF TEACHER PERFORMANCE AND PRACTICE

Rubric

- The PGDE Committee is currently revising the **CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching** to create the **SPS Performance and Practice Continuum**. Prior to the completion of this document, we will be using the current state rubric.
- Evidence does not need to be collected on all indicators in all domains during a formal observation
- Domains 1 and 3 have observable indicators for a formal observation
- Domain 2 has observable indicators for use during the pre-conference
- Domain 4 has observable indicators for reviews of practice; examples could include, but are not limited to, interactions with parents, colleagues, and administration, School or District Data Team meetings, PPTs, IDTs, presentation to colleagues, community engagement activities, etc.

Formal Observations:

- Conducted in-class and should be a full class/period in length (or appropriate setting)
- 3 formal observations for Category I and Category 4 teachers
- 1 observation for Category 2 and Category 3, phase 1 teachers
- 30 minute minimum; two must be full period for Category I and Category 4 teachers
- Pre conference (2 school days in advance)
- Post conference (within 5 school days), draft of written observation notes presented in advance of meeting.
- Written observation feedback form 10 school days after the observation date.
- Collection of evidence:
 - ✓ Category 1 and 4 teachers: use indicators that are observable and applicable to grade, subject, and students in 4 domains by end of year.
 - ✓ Category 2 teachers: use a minimum of one indicator in each domain by end of year; can be mutually agreed upon at goal setting or pre-conference.

- ✓ Category 3 – phase 1 teachers: use a minimum of one indicator (Area of Focus) in each of domains 1 and 3, which shall be mutually agreed upon at goal setting or pre-conference.

Informal Support Process

If an evaluator has concerns with the evaluatee's current teaching practice, as observed during the formal, he/she should discuss the concerns at the post conference and discuss what the evaluator wants to observe in future formal observations and/or may require the teacher to meet in advance of a formal pre-conference to discuss strategies addressing the concerns. If, after the next formal, there are still concerns and the evaluator wishes to further address them, or if the concerns at the first formal are of such a magnitude, he/she can initiate the informal support process by contacting the evaluation facilitator.

Informal Observations

An informal observation of a teacher gives the evaluator the opportunity to get and/or maintain the 'big picture' of a teacher's performance in the classroom (or appropriate setting) to determine whether or not the practice is, generally, *proficient* or *exemplary*, or if the evaluator sees significant changes that would warrant deeper analysis.

During an informal observation, which will last for a minimum of 15 minutes, the evaluator isn't expected to collect hard evidence of the teacher's performance specific to any indicators within the domains of the CCT (unless teacher has formally indicated working toward exemplary or selected an optional focus area). Feedback given to the teacher will be more general, and supportive of growth and development. However, the evaluator must indicate continuation in the informal process after each Informal.

Informal Support Process

If an evaluator has concerns with the evaluatee's current teaching practice, as observed during the informal, he/she may formally or informally discuss the concerns and can discuss what the evaluator wants to observe in future informal observations and/or may require the teacher to meet in advance of an informal to discuss strategies addressing the concerns. If, after the next informal, there are still concerns and the evaluator wishes to further address them, or if the concerns after the first informal are of such a magnitude, he/she can initiate the informal support process by contacting the evaluation facilitator.

- Conducted in class
- 3 informal observations for Category 3 teachers
- 15 minute minimum
- No pre-conference
- A one to two week advance notice is given to the teacher specifying the week window in which the evaluator will observe (advanced notice can be waived if both parties agree during the goal setting conference)
- Teacher can choose to have an optional Focus Area
- Teachers wishing to move from *proficient* to *exemplary* will inform the evaluator on their goal form submitted prior to the goal setting conference. The specific area/s needing improvement and the ways in which they will be viewed that would enable progress toward achievement of *exemplary* will be delineated during the goal setting conference. Note: It is not necessary for teachers to indicate the above in order to receive a rating of *exemplary*.
- No collection of evidence
- Feedback required (verbal or written) within 5 school days
- Informal Observation Record has box for optional comments from the evaluator

- Post conference only if needed

All observations:

To assure that any type of formal/informal in-class observation is given the attention and respect it deserves, no in-class formal/informal observations used as part of the evaluation process will take place on the last day of school before a holiday break, during standardized testing periods, or within the last two weeks of school.

Reviews of Practice

- Conducted in any location
- Mutually agreed to and pre-arranged with teacher as to location and focus
- Can use any evidence that supports a teacher engaging in professionalism, collaboration, and leadership, etc.
- Should emphasize CCT Domain 4
- Can be gathered from District Data Team, School Data team, Instructional Data Team, School Governance Council, PPT, presentation or participant in workshops, coaching/mentoring colleagues, review of lesson plans or other teaching artifacts, active participation in committees, school wide efforts to improve school climate, community engagement, parent or community interactions, etc.

Gathering Evidence in Formal Observations and Reviews of Practice

The activities observed during formal observations or reviews of practice provide evidence of meeting indicators in domains. Specifically, a focus may have been selected prior to the observation and linked to an indicator within a domain. During the observation, the evaluator looks for activities, comments, structure, etc. that demonstrate that the indicator has been addressed in the lesson. Similarly, if no specific focus is set, then the evaluator may align one activity /comment with multiple indicators.

It is also important to note that the teacher is also responsible for adding to the body of evidence about his/her practice. This can include artifacts/data that can be discussed or presented at any conference or during a conversation about teacher practice. The end result is contributions to evidence that serves as a basis for a rating.

2. PARENT FEEDBACK (10%)

Ten percent (10%) of a teacher's evaluation shall be based on parent feedback, including data from surveys and may also include focus group data.

Stamford Public Schools strive 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. The survey instrument to be used may be any statistically reliable source.

At the school level, results are viewed by the School Data Team and the School Governance Council to determine the goal for the school.

Once the school-wide parent feedback goal has been determined, teachers will identify an action item to support achievement of the school-wide goal. At the summative conference the evaluator and evaluatee will mutually determine overall rating of *Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard*.

EVALUATION OUTCOME RATING (50%)

3. STUDENT ACADEMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (45%)

4. WHOLE SCHOOL LEARNING INDICATORS (5%)

3. STUDENT ACADEMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (45%)

In preparation for the Student Academic and Growth part of the Conference with evaluators, teachers will analyze standardized test results, other student data, and review recommendations from past evaluations. Based on that reflection, Student Learning Objective/s with Indicators of Academic Growth and Development are created. The process for assessing student growth using multiple indicators of academic growth and development is developed through mutual agreement by each teacher and their evaluator at the goal setting conference. Teachers who teach semester courses will decide whether the goal selected will be used across both semesters, possible adjusting the IAGDs as needed, or if an additional goal/s is optimal.

Minimum Requirements for SLO (45%):

Teachers teaching a state tested subject

- ✓ Teachers in state tested grades/subjects are:
 - SBAC: ELA and Math, grades 3-8, and 11;
 - CMT Science: grades 5 and 8 (if state mandated)
 - CAPT Science: grade 10 (if state mandated)
 - The state test can be used only if there are interim assessments that align with and lead to that test, and such interim assessments shall be included in the overall determination of growth

1 SLO/goal for student growth and development

- **1 standardized IAGD (22.5%)**; growth determined through the comparison of interim assessments administered over time; a single test score cannot be used to determine growth
- **1 non-standardized IAGD (22.5%)**; growth over time can be determined by a variety of mutually agreed upon criteria or teacher-designed rubrics; examples could include, but are not limited to, written work, oral reports, constructed projects, portfolios, or curriculum based assessments

Note: A teacher may add up to 2 additional IAGDs of which only one can be standardized. Evidence for IAGDs is presented for a sampling of students.

Teachers not teaching a state tested subject

1 SLO/goal for student growth and development.

- **2 non-standardized IAGD (45%)**; growth over time can be determined by a variety of mutually agreed upon criteria or teacher-designed rubrics; examples could include, but are not limited to, written work, oral reports, constructed projects, portfolios, or curriculum based assessments

Note: A teacher may add up to 2 additional IAGDs of which only one can be standardized. Evidence for IAGDs is presented for a sampling of students.

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

Five percent (5%) of a teacher’s evaluation shall be based on Whole School Student Learning Indicators. Stamford Public Schools will define and communicate a process to determine a school-specific Whole School Learning Indicator. The Indicator will be based in part on the School Improvement Plan and, when available, in part on the school performance index (SPI).

The rating for all teachers of *Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard* is based on the aggregate rating of the administrator outcome rating (45%).

ADMINISTRATOR SECTION: **(AS EVALUATEE)**

EVALUATION PERFORMANCE RATING (50%)

- 1. LEADERSHIP PRACTICE (40%)**
- 2. STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK (10%)**

1. LEADERSHIP PRACTICE (40%)

An assessment of an administrator’s leadership practice by direct observation 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 The Common Core Of Leadership Evaluation Rubric defines effective leadership practice through six performance expectations. SPS supports the implementation of effective leadership practices as the primary role and responsibility for all administrators in order to maximize student achievement.

SPS seeks to minimize the impact of other non-school related factors on administrators and teachers thus supporting a true community of learners that is focused on best practices and student learning. All SPS administrators have been trained on the changes to the CCCL as well as the rubric. The training has emphasized the use of observational rubrics to provide feedback, self-reflect, and identify areas of growth and actionable items to attain growth. SPS believes that the evaluation plan is a growth model and that with the use of a rubric, evaluatees have clear expectations and a road map to improvement. The observation process must be honest, supportive, and confidential so that evaluatees develop comfort with the process for continuous improvement and in effect, continuous change. Evaluators should take all reasonable action to support the evaluatee’s achievement of their goals.

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 (20%) as any other Performance Expectation. The other Performance Expectations must have a weighting of at least 5% of the overall evaluation.

These weightings will be consistent for all principals and other SPS administrators. In order to arrive at these ratings, administrators are measured against the Common Core of Leadership 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:

- a. **Exemplary:** Substantially exceeding indicators of performance
- b. **Proficient:** Meeting indicators of performance
- c. **Developing:** Meeting some indicators of performance but not others
- d. **Below Standard:** Not meeting indicators of performance

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 on four of six Performance Expectations. One Performance Expectation must be Teaching & Learning. Evidence will be collected for at least one indicator from each of the four Performance Expectations identified.

Assessing the practice of administrators other than principals and assistant principals: For SPS administrators in non-school roles, administrator practice will be assessed based upon ratings from evidence collected directly from the Common Core of Leadership Evaluation Rubric that are relevant to the role of the administrator.

Leadership Practice Summative Rating

Summative ratings are based on the preponderance of evidence for performance expectations in the Common Core of Leadership Evaluation Rubric. The CCCL are standards that all administrators are familiar with and have been used for evaluation in SPS. 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.

ADMINISTRATOR LEADERSHIP PRACTICE CATEGORIES

Category 1

- **Administrators - Central Office (evaluated by Superintendent and rated proficient or exemplary)**
 - **2 Formal Observations/Visits**

Timeline –Completion by the following dates:

Nov. 15 -1st Observation

March 1 -2nd Observation

Category 2

- **Administrators new to the district**
- **Administrators in a new position.**
 - **4 Formal Observations/Visits**

Timeline –Completion by the following dates:

Nov. 15 -1st Observation

Dec. 15 -2nd Observation
March 1 -3rd Observation
April 1 - 4th Observation

Category 3

- **All other Administrators (rated proficient or exemplary)**
 - **2 Formal Observations/Visits**
 - Additional observations/visits can be conducted upon mutual agreement.

Timeline –Completion by the following dates:

Nov. 15 -1st Observation
March 1 -2nd Observation

Category 4

- **Administrators rated developing or below standard**
 - **4 Formal Observations/Visits**
 - Additional observations as appropriate to the evaluatees needs and/or assistance plan

Informal Support Process

If an evaluator has concerns with the evaluatee’s current practice, as observed during the formal observation/visit, he/she should discuss the concerns at the post conference and discuss what the evaluator wants to observe in future formal observations/visits and/or may require the evaluatee to meet in advance of a formal pre-conference to discuss strategies addressing the concerns. If, after the next formal observation/visit, there are still concerns and the evaluator wishes to further address them, or if the concerns after the initial formal observation/visit are of such a magnitude, he/she can initiate the informal support process by contacting the evaluation facilitator.

To assure that any type of formal observation is given the attention and respect it deserves, no formal observations used as part of the evaluation process will be less than 30 minutes nor take place on the last day of school before a holiday break, during standardized testing periods, or within the last two weeks of the school year.

In instances in which the evaluator conducts more than the required number of observations during the course of the year, the evaluator will review the ratings on the continuums collectively, noting changes in performance, which will be considered when making the final rating. The same would be used for reviews of practice.

2. STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK (10%)

Ten percent (10%) of an administrator’s evaluation shall be based on stakeholder feedback. Stakeholders solicited for feedback includes teachers and parents, but may include other stakeholders. Data can be gathered from multiple sources and may also include focus group data. Stamford Public Schools strive 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.

Once the stakeholder feedback goal is mutually determined and agreed to by the evaluator and evaluatee the administrator/evaluatee will identify an action item for improvement over time.

At the summative conference the evaluator and evaluatee will mutually determine overall rating of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard.

EVALUATION OUTCOME RATING (50%)

3. MULTIPLE STUDENT LEARNING INDICATORS (45%)

4. TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS OUTCOMES (5%)

3. MULTIPLE STUDENT LEARNING INDICATORS (45%)

Forty five percent (45%) of an administrator’s summative rating shall be based on multiple student learning indicators.

Locally-Determined Measures (Student Learning Objectives)

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

SLO CHART

	Requirement SLO 1	SLO 2
Elementary or Middle School Principal	See SLO 1 requirement below	Non-tested subjects or grades
High School Principal	See SLO 1 requirement below	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subject requirement)
Elementary or Middle AP	Non-tested subjects or grades	Broad discretion
High School AP	Graduation (meets the non-tested grades or subject requirement)	Broad discretion
Assistant Directors	(meets the non-tested grades or subject requirement)Indicators may be based on the group of schools, group of students or subject area most relevant to administrator’s job responsibilities, or on district wide student learning results.	Broad discretion
Central Office	See SLO 1 below	(meets the non-tested grades or subject requirement)Indicators may be based on the group of schools, group of students or subject area most relevant to administrator’s job responsibilities, or on district wide student learning results.

One SLO for principals, directors and central office staff must be based on standardized assessments.

- SBAC: ELA and Math, grades 3-8, and 11;
- CMT Science: grades 5 and 8 (if state mandated)
- CAPT Science: grade 10 (if state mandated)

- The state test can be used only if there are interim assessments that align with and lead to that test, and such interim assessments shall be included in the overall determination of growth

The second SLO for principals, directors and central office staff

- All measures must align to Common Core State Standards and Connecticut Content Standards. In instances where there are no such standards that apply to a subject/grade level, districts must provide evidence of alignment to research-based learning standards.
- At least one of the measures must focus on student outcomes from subjects and/or grades not assessed on state-administered assessments.
- For administrators in high school, one measure must include the cohort graduation rate and the extended graduation rate, as defined in the State's approved application for flexibility under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. All protections related to the assignment of school accountability ratings for cohort graduation rate and extended graduation rate shall apply to the use of graduation data for principal evaluation.

For all school-based administrators, selected indicators must be relevant to the student population (e.g., grade levels) served by the administrator's school. Evaluators and Evaluatees have broad discretion in selecting mutually agreed upon indicators, including, but not limited to:

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

Administrators and their evaluators must craft mutually agreed-upon student learning objectives specific to that administrator. The school or district must be able to collect adequate information on any chosen indicator to make a fair judgment about whether the administrator met the established goal.

When setting targets or objectives, the superintendent or designee must include a review of relevant student characteristics (e.g., mobility, attendance, demographic and learning characteristics).

The evaluator and administrator must also discuss the professional resources appropriate to supporting the administrator in meeting the performance targets.

4. TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS OUTCOMES (5%)

Five percent (5%) of an administrator's evaluation shall be based on Teacher Effectiveness Indicators. Stamford Public Schools will define and communicate a process to determine the Teacher Effectiveness Indicators.

SUMMATIVE RATING: Practice Rating 50% and Outcome Rating 50%

At the end of the year and prior to the final summative conference, the evaluatee completes his/her own assessment and reflection of progress and growth. The End of Year Teacher/evaluatee Self-Assessment is completed by the evaluatee as a self-rating on all components. It provides the opportunity for evaluatees to give written comments on the work completed this year. This document is sent to the evaluator to preview prior to the summative conference. Evidence supporting the self-assessment components is brought to the conference.

Similarly, the evaluator has a Feedback Summative Form (Performance and Practice) that includes all of the evidence from completed observations and reviews of practice. It is important to remember that every indicator may not have been observed nor rated (unobserved domains/indicators are left blank). In addition information gathered at the mid-year conference will be reviewed. All of this information can be used as talking points for discussion with the evaluatee at the year-end summative conference.

Holistic Scoring

In order to reach a decision on a rating, all of the evidence and artifacts must be viewed holistically. The concept of this holistic final rating is the cornerstone of the SPS evaluation plan. This approach enables the evaluator to address the growth factor and acknowledge the progress made by a evaluatee who may have received a rating of *developing* in the fall and progressed to *proficient* in the spring. The preponderance of evidence is viewed as a whole prior to any determination of ratings.

Mutual Agreement

As both the evaluatee and the evaluator have their discussion about evidence demonstrating professional growth and development at the final conference, the goal is for mutual agreement on the End of Year Summative Rating Form. All goals are rated; future professional development for the evaluatee is part of the discussion. The evaluator can add optional comments.

The document is completed by the evaluator during the conference and a box is checked indicating whether or not mutual agreement was reached on the rating(s). If the parties have not reached mutual agreement, the evaluator and the evaluatee have the option of re-examining the data and/or gathering additional information in order to reach mutual agreement on the rating. The conference can then be reconvened. The final rating must be submitted within 5 school days from due date.

The completed end of the year Summative Form will be sent to the evaluatee for an electronic signature. The evaluatee will then indicate whether or not mutual agreement was reached during the conference. The evaluatee can add comments and must submit the document. Only after submission may the evaluatee bring the disputed rating to dispute resolution.

In cases where the evaluatee's final evaluation rating is in question, there are 3 primary questions that will be discussed by the teacher and evaluator before the evaluator will make a final evaluation determination:

- Which behavioral descriptions on the rubrics are more pertinent to the evaluatee's assignment?
- Are there other mitigating factors that should be considered, that haven't been considered so far?
- With these two questions in mind, what level of performance does the preponderance of evidence, taken collectively, point to?

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Stamford Public Schools believes that evaluation must be a growth-collaborative process between the evaluator and evaluatee, 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 PGDE Steering Committee.

An Appeal Committee will be established, composed of teachers and administrators from elementary, middle, and high school who currently serve on the PGDE Committee. All those interested in serving on the Appeal Committee will submit an application to their bargaining unit, and be selected by that unit

1. Appeal Committee members shall be educators and administrators who received ratings of proficient or higher on their own evaluations of the year preceding their appointment to the committee. They must maintain that standard throughout their term on the committee.
2. Training in consensus building and dispute resolution shall be provided by the district to all appeal committee members early in the school year in which they have been appointed to the committee. The training will take place during regular school hours.
3. In the first year of implementation, 1/3 the committee will be appointed for a one year term, 1/3 will be appointed for a two year term, and 1/3 for a three year term. Members of the committee may be appointed for additional terms provided their own evaluation rating remains proficient or higher. An appeal committee member can resign from the committee at any point in his/her term. An exit interview will be conducted by the Co-chairs of the PGDE Committee and kept on file for use by the committee for improvements.

Attempts to resolve disputes should begin at the building level. PGDE committee members are available to facilitate this. Any dispute that cannot be resolved at the building level can be filed with the Appeal Committee for resolution through a hearing.

A Hearing Committee, whose members will be selected from the Appeal Committee, will hear the dispute. The Hearing Committee must come to a resolution for the dispute. The Superintendent or designee will serve to resolve any disputes not resolved by the Hearing Committee.

The co-chairs of the Appeal committee will be the same as the Co-Chairs for the PGDE Committee.

Educator Evaluation Appeal Procedure:

To initiate an appeal hearing, either party must submit Appeal Worksheet (I) to both of the Appeal Committee Co-Chairpersons. Within three (3) school days of receipt of the appeal, the Appeal Committee Co-Chairpersons will send copies of the appeal to the other party. Using Appeal Worksheet (II), the Appeal Committee Co-Chairpersons will schedule a joint meeting of the parties involved during the regular work-day, within seven (7) school days of the original receipt of the appeal. Substitutes will be provided for all teachers involved in the process.

When an appeal is brought to the Appeal Committee Co-Chairpersons, the following will occur:

1. A Hearing Committee Membership will consists of four (4) members chosen from the larger Appeal Committee, and one of the co-chairpersons, who will meet with both parties simultaneously. The makeup of the hearing committee will be as follows based on the category of the dispute request;

- **Teacher Disputes:** 2 teachers and 2 administrators
- **Assistant Principal or Assistant Director Disputes:** 2 teachers and 2 administrators (1 administrator must be a principal or director)
- **Principal or Director Disputes:** 1 teacher, 2 administrators and 1 Assistant Superintendent of Schools

The Hearing Committee members may not work in the same school/building as the party filing the dispute, and may not include either of the parties involved in the dispute. The Appeal Committee co-chair chosen to chair the hearing may not do so if the hearing originates from his or her school. A designee will be chosen in that case.

2. At the hearing, the parties will present their concerns, talking with each other only through the committee chair.

3. At the hearing, when the committee is satisfied that they have sufficient information; they will recess to formulate a resolution. Consensus shall be considered a unanimous decision. The Hearing Committee must come to a resolution. The Superintendent or designee will serve as the final decision maker if a resolution cannot be reached.

4. When the Hearing Committee has reached consensus, the chairperson/designee will prepare the written resolution on Appeal Worksheet (III), which will be delivered to both parties by the committee chair within three (3) school days. The decision of the Hearing committee is final.

DEFINITION OF INEFFECTIVE AND EFFECTIVE

- Evaluatee effectiveness will be based upon a pattern of summative ratings collected over time.
- Any evaluatee having a summative rating of *developing* or *below standard* after 1 year of being evaluated may be placed in PASS.
- Evaluatee's may be deemed ineffective if they receive two consecutive summative *below standard* ratings and if after two consecutive years on PASS have not received a summative rating of *proficient*.

PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT SYSTEM (PASS)

TEACHER PROFESSIONAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT PLAN (PASS)

Teachers who receive summative evaluation ratings of *developing* or *below standard* will be required to participate in a teacher performance assistance plan. They will work with their local association president (or designee) and evaluator (or designated Teacher Performance Assistance Plan Developer or PAR) to develop a detailed plan. Teachers are expected to receive a higher summative evaluation rating than where they began within a year of the Teacher Performance Assistance Plan being developed. The plan will be created within 30 days after the start of the next school year. The PASS plan will identify areas of needed improvement and include supports that the district will provide to address the performance areas identified as needing improvement.

The plan must include the following components:

1. Areas of Improvement: identify area/s of needed improvement
2. Rationale for Areas of Improvement: evidence from evaluation that shows an area/s (domains and indicators if applicable) needing improvement
3. Indicators for Effective Teaching: identify exemplary practices in the area/s needing improvement
4. Improvement Strategies to be Implemented: provide strategies that the teacher can implement to show improvement that will result in a rating of proficient or exemplary
5. Tasks to Complete: specific tasks the Teacher will complete that will improve the rating
6. 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.
7. Teacher mentor: colleague (upon mutual agreement) will work to support the teacher's goals
8. Indicators of Progress: how the teacher will show progress toward *proficient/exemplary* in identified area(s) through observations, data, evidence, etc.

The plan will be designed and written in a collaborative manner, focusing on the development of a professional learning community supporting colleagues within this level. The teacher, the local association president or designee, and the evaluator or designee will sign the plan. Copies will be distributed to all those who will be involved in the implementation of the plan. The contents of the plan will be confidential.

After one year of participating in PASS, the teacher receiving support in PASS will be expected to have a summative rating of *proficient or exemplary*. Teachers who do receive a summative rating of *proficient or exemplary* after one year of PASS may be placed on an additional year of PASS.

Teachers will not be placed on PASS for more than 2 consecutive years unless mutual agreement is reached to extend the plan. Any mitigating circumstances must be considered.

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 his/her 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 resources, support and other strategies that SPS will provide to address the performance areas identified as needing improvement. Supports, resources and other strategies must be provided within 30 days after the formulation of the plan. After the development of the PASS Administrator Performance Remediation plan, the evaluator and evaluatee will collaborate to determine the target completion date. A summative rating of proficient or better and other indicators of success to be determined collaboratively with evaluator, evaluatee and evaluatees bargaining unit representatives must be achieved at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan which must be in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued.

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 evaluatee can implement to show improvement in performance expectations rated “developing” or “below standard.”
6. **Tasks to Complete:** Specific tasks the evaluatee will complete that will improve the performance expectation.
7. **Support and Resources and other strategies:** List of supports and resources or other strategies the district will provide and the evaluatee can use to improve, e.g. professional learning opportunities, peer observation, colleague mentor, books, etc.
8. **Indicators of Progress:** How the evaluatee 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. The contents of the plan will be confidential.

For administrators rated Exemplary, the following career development and professional growth opportunities would be available: observation of peers; mentoring/coaching administrators new to SPS or new to a role; participating in development of educator Professional Assistance and Support System plans for peers whose performance is developing or below standard; leading Professional Learning Communities for their peers; and, targeted professional development based on areas of need.

After one year of participating in PASS, the administrator receiving support in PASS will be expected to have a summative rating of Proficient or Exemplary. Administrators who do receive a summative rating of Proficient or Exemplary after one year of PASS may be placed on an additional year of PASS. No administrators will be placed on PASS for more than 2 consecutive years.

EVALUATION BASED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

The PDGE Committee along with the district administrators for professional learning will be working on restructuring the design, contents and delivery options for professional learning for certified teachers. One

critical piece we are developing will focus on a creating a diverse menu of categories containing relevant and timely topics that allow teachers and/or evaluators to select or develop professional learning courses that address growth and development established through the evaluation process. In addition, the committee will be working on developing a summer institute to delve deeper, broaden learning areas, etc., for all teachers and especially for those who may not be able to find time for extended professional learning during the regular school year.

As our core values indicate, SPS 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.

SPS's evaluation-based professional learning design has as its foundation the Standards for Professional Learning (Learning Forward, 2011). Each of the tenets of SPS'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 SPS 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 for administrators, 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 and 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 evaluatees 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 and teachers are different, and evaluation-based professional learning is 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 and 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*]

Informal Support Process

An informal support process was developed to outline supports and resources for evaluatees whose performance practice is of concern. If an evaluator has concerns with the evaluatees current performance practice, he/she can initiate the informal support process by contacting the evaluation facilitator. The process delineates the professional learning, support, resources and opportunities to show improvement that will be provided to the evaluatee.

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Stamford Public Schools has been fortunate to have begun the work in career development and professional growth through numerous grants received over the years. As we work toward developing a twenty-first century staff, our strategy is to address the growth and development of individual teachers.

Professional Growth:

SPS has already established Instructional Data Teams for all teachers in every building, as well as in central office. These teams meet weekly to discuss student data, current practice, share resources, etc., as they affect the students they teach. Almost a third of current teachers have been trained to be leaders and trainers in IDTs. SPS has also established and imbedded the use of data teams in every school. These teams provide each building with information to develop their *School Improvement Plan*, guide the work

of the School Governance Council, and provide teachers with timely, specific information by which to inform their practice.

Another important piece of the work toward professional/career development has been the use of walkthroughs whereby certified teachers and administrators have the opportunity to look at practices as a whole, and their impact on student learning.

Career Development:

The other aspect is personal career development. SPS teachers currently have district opportunities to reach out beyond the classroom experience in order to grow professionally. Positions such as coaches in math and literacy, SRBI facilitators and trainers, IEP /special education specialists, Administrative Interns, Department Heads, District Content Leaders, district department heads, curriculum associates to specific areas, PD developers, technology trainers, etc., are available to all qualified teachers. Additionally, Stamford teachers can participate in the Aspirant Leadership programs, as well as the Urban Leadership program. The district plans to continue to create and expand growth opportunities for all.

One of the main tasks of the PGDE Committee will be to ensure that teachers can participate in programs that are tailored to their abilities, needs, and aspirations. The committee will consider ways for teachers to substitute professional development opportunities provided by the district for offerings outside the district that will enhance their growth as teacher.

In addition:

Teachers

Teachers 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 of their choice.

Administrators

SPS 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.

For administrators rated Exemplary, the following career development and professional growth opportunities would be available: observation of peers; mentoring/coaching early-career administrators or administrators new to SPS; 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 development