

**LITCHFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

***Litchfield Educator Evaluation and Development Plan***

**(LEED)**

Approved Connecticut State Department of Education 6/21/13  
Adopted Litchfield Board of Education 7/17/13

Litchfield Public Schools  
*Evaluation and Professional Development Committee*

Dean Birdsall	Science Teacher, Litchfield High School
Kristen Della Volpe	President Litchfield Administrators Association; Principal, Litchfield High School
Seth Newton	School Psychologist, Litchfield Public Schools
Stephanie Kubisek	Assistant Principal, Litchfield High School
	Special Education Teacher, Litchfield High School
Jennifer Murphy	Principal, Litchfield Intermediate School
Mark Obolewicz	Music Teacher, Litchfield Intermediate School
Alisa Patasuis	Third Grade Teacher, Center School
Lynn Rice Scozzafava	President Litchfield Education Association; English Teacher, Litchfield High School
Sherri Turner	Principal, Center School
Dr. Herbert Pandiscio	Interim Superintendent of Schools
Michele Mongeau	Acting Director of Special Services

**LITCHFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT  
EDUCATOR EVALUATION AND SUPPORT**

<b>Stages of Development</b>	<b>Professional Appraisal Years 1 and 2</b>	<b>Professional Growth</b>	<b>Professional Intervention</b>
	May also include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff transferring to a new level or teaching under a new or different certification</li> <li>• New staff from out of district</li> <li>• Staff who are in need of improvement (<i>Developing</i>)</li> </ul>	Certified teachers with 3+ years of experience who receive and maintain Proficient or Exemplary summative rating.	Certified teachers who receive Below Standard summative rating.  Or  Certified teachers who receive Developing summative ratings two consecutive years.
<b>Orientation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orientation on evaluation process no later than October 1</li> </ul> <p>To begin the process, the principal or designee provides the teacher with materials outlining the evaluation process and other information as appropriate and meets and reviews these materials. The orientation shall not occur later than November 15 of a given school year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Orientation on evaluation process no later than October 1</li> </ul> <p>To begin the process, the principal or designee provides the teacher with materials outlining the evaluation process and other information as appropriate and meets and reviews these materials. The orientation shall not occur later than November 15 of a given school year.</p>	In addition to all requirements regarding Orientation, Goal Setting, Mid-year Review and End of Year Summative Review in Professional Appraisal (years 1 and 2) or Professional Growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notification in writing by the evaluator of intent to place individual in Professional Intervention</li> <li>• For teachers beginning the year in this phase: initial and planning conference by October 15 or within 30 days of a teacher's beginning employment or return.</li> <li>• Create a 90-day Improvement Plan that includes:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum of 2 in class formal observations within 90 school days of placement in Professional</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Goal Setting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goal setting conference by October 15</li> </ul> <p>Each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goal setting conference by October 15</li> </ul> <p>Each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator,</p>	

	<p>will select at least four (4) goals -- one SLO with at least two IAGDs, one teacher performance goal, one parent feedback goal, and one whole-school student learning indicator. For each SLO, each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select two (2) Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD) and evidence of the IAGD based on the range of criteria used by the district.</p> <p>One half (22.5%) of IAGDs shall be based on district-determined standardized formative and summative assessments; one half (22.5%) of IAGDs shall be based on non-standardized measures.</p>	<p>will select at least four (4) goals -- one SLO with at least two IAGDs, one teacher performance goal, one parent feedback goal, and one whole-school student learning indicator. For each SLO, each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select two (2) Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD) and evidence of the IAGD based on the range of criteria used by the district.</p> <p>One half (22.5%) of IAGDs shall be based on district-determined standardized formative and summative assessments; one half (22.5%) of IAGDs shall be based on non-standardized measures.</p>	<p>Intervention with at least one pre and post conference with written and verbal feedback (may include observations by an alternate certified evaluator)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details of assistance/ resources (may include peer mentors)</li> <li>• Classroom observations/ conferences</li> <li>• Details of performance evaluation criteria</li> <li>• Target date for summary evaluation</li> <li>• One additional in-class formal observation with a pre and post conference and written and verbal feedback during the school year.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Mid-Year Review</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-year review Progress/ Modification Conf. by March 15</li> </ul> <p>Evaluators and teachers will review progress toward all of the goals at least once during the school year, which is to be considered the midpoint of the school year, using available information, including agreed upon indicators. This review may result in revisions to the strategies or approach being used and/or teachers and evaluators may</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-year review Progress/ Modification Conf. by March 15</li> </ul> <p>Evaluators and teachers will review progress toward all of the goals at least once during the school year, which is to be considered the midpoint of the school year, using available information, including agreed upon indicators. This review may result in revisions to the strategies or approach being used and/or teachers and evaluators may</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement and Remediation Plans shall be developed in consultation with the teacher and his/her exclusive bargaining representative.</li> <li>• Improvement and Remediation Plans will be reviewed and revised at the end of 90 days if teacher does/does not demonstrate desired improvement.</li> </ul>

	mutually agree on mid-year adjustment of student learning goals to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignment).	mutually agree on mid-year adjustment of student learning goals to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignment).	
<b>End of Year Summative Review</b>	<p>Teacher Self-Assessment – The teacher reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the principal or designee. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the Goal-setting conference.</p> <p>End-of-year conference: The evaluator and the teacher will meet to discuss all evidence collected to date for all goals. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating based on the Four Level Matrix rating system defined later in this document (pg. 10) and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.</p> <p>The performance levels shall be defined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemplary – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance</li> <li>• Proficient – Meeting indicators of performance</li> <li>• Developing – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others</li> </ul>	<p>Teacher Self-Assessment – The teacher reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the principal or designee. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the Goal-setting conference.</p> <p>End-of-year conference: The evaluator and the teacher will meet to discuss all evidence collected to date for all goals. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating based on the Four Level Matrix rating system defined later in this document (pg. 10) and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.</p> <p>The performance levels shall be defined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemplary – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance</li> <li>• Proficient – Meeting indicators of performance</li> <li>• Developing – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Below standard – Not meeting indicators of performance</li> </ul> <p>If state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating, a final rating may be revised when state test data are available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Below standard – Not meeting indicators of performance</li> </ul> <p>If state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating, a final rating may be revised when state test data are available.</p>	
<b>Observations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of three in-class formal observations, in addition to informal observations, per year including a pre-conference for at least two of the observations and a post-conference with oral and written feedback.</li> <li>• Post Conference may include a review of student work samples</li> <li>• First observation with pre-/post- conference and written feedback completed by November 1.</li> <li>• Second observation with post- conference and written feedback by February 1.</li> <li>• Third observation (or more if necessary) with post-conference and written feedback by April 1.</li> <li>• Support specialist observations will be made in appropriate settings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One formal, in-class observation, followed by timely feedback, a minimum of every three years (on a 3-year cycle) or at the administrator’s discretion</li> <li>• When no formal observation is planned, three informal, in-class observations, followed by timely feedback</li> <li>• One review of practice every year</li> <li>• Support specialist observations will be made in appropriate settings</li> <li>• Examples of non-classroom observations or reviews of practice include but are not limited to: observations of data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, review of lesson plans or other teaching artifacts.</li> </ul>	

	Observations shall be rated across the four performance levels of the CSDE (CCT) Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014 or the CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015.	Observations shall be rated across the four performance levels of the CSDE (CCT) Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014 or the CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015.	
<b>Professional learning, career development and growth</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attend all district or building professional learning opportunities</li> <li>Participate in grade level/discipline specific or intra-school PLCs, lesson study, professional book clubs, peer observation and reflection, data teams, etc.</li> <li>Participate in TEAM/mentoring as appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attend all district or building professional learning opportunities <b>OR</b> propose individualized professional learning plans.</li> <li>Participate in grade level/discipline specific or intra-school PLCs, lesson study, professional book clubs, peer observation and reflection, data teams, etc.</li> <li>Participate in TEAM/mentoring as appropriate</li> <li>Serve as district/building teacher leaders, mentor/cooperating teachers, grade level or data team leaders, etc.</li> </ul>	

### 4-level matrix rating system

The performance levels shall be defined as follows:

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

Effectiveness and ineffectiveness are defined as follows:

Non-tenured teachers shall generally be deemed effective if said educator receives at least two sequential *proficient* ratings, one of which must be earned in the fourth year of a non-tenured teacher's career or in the final year before tenure is attained. A *below standard* rating shall only be permitted in the first year of a beginning teacher's career. There should be a trajectory of growth and development as evidenced by a subsequent rating of *developing* or higher in year two and sequential *proficient* ratings in years three and four.

A post-tenure educator shall generally be deemed ineffective if said educator receives at least two sequential *developing* ratings or one *below standard* rating at any time.

Tenured or non-tenured teachers who demonstrate a summative performance rating that is *Below Standard* will be considered ineffective and placed on Professional Intervention. The teacher must meet the standards for *Developing* within 90 days and *Proficient* within one year to be considered effective.

Tenured teachers who demonstrate a summative performance rating that is *Developing* for two consecutive years will be considered ineffective and placed on Professional Intervention. The teacher must meet the standards for *Proficient* within one year to be considered effective.

Tenured teachers who previously demonstrated *Proficient*, followed by a summative performance rating that is *Developing* for one year, and who demonstrate *Proficient* the following year will be considered effective.

Non-tenured teachers who have a summative performance rating that is *Developing* in their first year of teaching in Litchfield, will be placed on Professional Intervention and must meet the standards for *Proficient* in the next calendar year to be considered effective.

Teachers who have a summative performance rating of *Proficient* or *Exemplary* will be considered effective.

The EPDC acknowledges that disputes are usually resolved at the building level. However, when the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on disputes regarding objectives, the evaluation period, feedback on the professional development plan, or final summative rating, the EPDC will have responsibility for overseeing the dispute resolution process. Therefore, the EPDC will establish an Appeal sub-committee. EPDC members who wish to do so will serve as the members Appeal Committee; additional teachers and/or administrators will be added specifically to the Appeal Committee if need be so that the elementary, intermediate and high schools are appropriately represented. Additional teachers who are interested in serving on the Appeal Committee will submit an application to their bargaining unit, and be selected by that unit. All who are accepted onto the Appeal Committee will have evaluation ratings of at least proficient or higher in the year prior to their appointment to the committee. Any dispute that cannot be resolved at the school level can be filed with the Appeal Committee for resolution through a hearing

following the timelines provided in the LEA contract. The dispute will be heard by a minimum of four selected members of the Appeal Committee with the number of teachers and administrators always being equal. The Appeal Committee members may not work in the same school as the party filing the dispute, and may not include either of the parties involved in the dispute. If the Appeal Committee has difficulty reaching a decision regarding the dispute, they may request the assistance of a neutral third party. The neutral third party must be mutually agreed upon by the superintendent and president of the respective bargaining unit. The Appeal Committee must come to a resolution for the dispute. Should resolution not be achieved, the determination regarding the issue will be made by the superintendent.

In order to determine summative rating designations for each teacher, districts shall:

- Rate teacher performance in each of four categories – indicators of student academic growth and development (45%); observations of teacher performance and practice (40%); parent or peer feedback, which may include surveys (10%); and whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback, which may include surveys (5%).
- Combine the indicators of student growth and development rating and whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “outcomes rating” of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard.
- Combine the observations of teacher performance and practice rating and the peer or parent feedback rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “practice rating” of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard.
- Combine the outcomes rating and practice rating into a final rating. A summative rating category of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard will be assigned.

## Goal Categories

Student outcomes and achievement: Forty-five percent (45%) of a teacher’s evaluation shall be based on attainment of goals and/or objectives for student growth, using multiple indicators of academic growth and development to measure those goals/objectives.

Each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select at least four (4) goals -- one SLO with at least two IAGDs, one teacher performance goal, one parent feedback goal, and one whole-school student learning indicator. For each SLO, each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select two (2) Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD) and evidence of the IAGD based on the range of criteria used by the district.

One half (22.5%) of IAGDs shall be based on district-determined standardized formative and summative assessments; one half (22.5%) of IAGDs shall be based on non-standardized measures.

For 2015-2016, forty-five percent of academic growth and development shall be determined through comparison of data across assessments administered over time.

*For the 2015 – 2016 school year, the use of state test data is suspended. Subsequent to 2015-2016, and where available and applicable, state tests for those teaching tested grades and subjects or another standardized indicator may be used. The state test can be used only if there are standardized interim assessments leading to that test, and such interim assessments shall be included in the overall score for those teaching tested grades and subjects.*

Teacher performance and practice: Forty percent (40%) of a teacher’s evaluation shall be based on observation of teacher practice and performance (see “Stages of Teacher Development” grid). Observations will be rated according to the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014/CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2015 delineating the four performance levels. Note: ongoing training will be provided to evaluators on the observation and evaluation process, and how to provide high-quality feedback.

Parent feedback: Ten percent (10%) of a teacher’s evaluation shall be based on parent feedback collected by a third party company (e.g. Survey Monkey), through anonymous, reliable and valid surveys. Ratings may be based on evidence of teacher’s implementation of strategies to address areas of need as identified by the survey results. The parent or peer feedback rating shall be among four performance levels: Exemplary (exceeds goal), Proficient (met goal), Developing (partially met goal), below standard (did not meet goal).

Whole school student learning indicator: Five percent (5%) of a teacher’s evaluation shall be based on whole-school student learning indicators as established by the School Performance Index (SPI) or District Performance Index (DPI). A teacher’s indicator rating shall be represented by the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the administrators’ evaluation rating- not the SPI alone.

The two ratings are combined using the following matrix to determine a summative rating:

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

Career Development and Growth: The District will provide or support opportunities for career development and professional growth based on performance identified through the evaluation process. Examples of opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring/coaching early-career teachers; participating in development of teacher improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is developing or below standard; leading Professional Learning Communities for their peers; differentiated career pathways; and targeted professional development based on areas of need.

## Proficiency/Calibration of Evaluators

The district will provide all evaluators with training in observation and evaluation, and how to provide high-quality feedback. Each evaluator must demonstrate proficiency on an ongoing basis in conducting teacher evaluations. The district will work with Education Connection for the provision of such training.

## Professional Intervention Plan

Teacher:

Evaluator:

School:

Date:

Persons in Attendance: (representation is optional)

Specific area / behavior that does not meet the standard:

Anticipated Timeline: 90 Days

Expected outcomes

Actions to be taken	Resources needed	Evidence collected	Timeline for completion	Person Responsible for Action
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				

Teacher's signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator's signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Mid-Plan Conference

Date:

Persons in Attendance: (representation is optional)

Notes during conference and changes to plan:

Teacher's signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator's signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## End-of-Plan Conference

Date:

Persons in Attendance: (representation is optional)

Notes during conference:

Teacher status at end of plan period:

\_\_\_\_\_ Fully addressed and returned to "Proficient" rating

\_\_\_\_\_ Partially addressed; plan continues/changes attached with follow-up date (within 90 days) to review status of plan, determined by evaluator

\_\_\_\_\_ Little or no movement; move to dismiss.

Teacher's signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator's signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_