

Summary of the Connecticut Educator Evaluation Guideline Requirements

DIRECTIONS: This document provides a comprehensive list of the required elements and guidance for meeting requirements as outlined within the Guidelines for Educator Evaluation. Please use this as a reference guide when completing the online checklist.

IN PREPARATION FOR IDENTIFYING THE TEACHER AND ADMINSTRATOR ELEMENTS WITHIN A LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY (LEA) PLAN, THE FOLLOWING PRELIMINARY INFORMATION WILL BE REQUESTED AT THE START OF THE ONLINE CHECKLIST:

- Superintendent Contact Information and an Alternate Contact Person for Educator Evaluation and Support.
- Superintendent Electronic Signature and acknowledgement of whether mutual agreement was reached between the Professional Development and Evaluation Committee (PDEC) and the local or regional board of education with respect to the version of the LEA's 2015-16 Educator Evaluation and Support Plan submitted to the CSDE.
- The method that will be used to manage the LEA's educator evaluation and support data for 2015-16.
- The rubric(s) that will be used to observe performance and practice for teachers, administrators, and student educator and support specialists within the LEA in 2015-16.
- Whether complementary observers will be used as part of the 2015-16 educator evaluation and support process.
- The type of Educator Evaluation and Support Plan that will be used in 2015-16, based on the following options:
 - The LEA will use the state model, SEED, for 2015-16
 - The LEA will use a **LEA-developed plan** (as defined below).

*NOTE: A plan is considered **LEA-developed** if there is at least one variation from any of the elements/components of the SEED model as described in the SEED Handbook 2015.*

To complete the online checklist, you must indicate if there is a change in each teacher and administrator element listed on the following pages. Please **highlight the areas where the changes can be found in the document in order to expedite the review process. Only those substantive changes need to be highlighted. Any minor changes made due to copy editing need not be highlighted. If you have any questions about whether you need to highlight a specific change, feel free to contact the CSDE Education Consultant assigned to your region.**

TEACHER ELEMENTS (pages 2-8)

ADMINSTRATOR ELEMENTS (pages 9-15)

Summary of the Connecticut Educator Evaluation Guideline Requirements			
<i>TEACHER ELEMENTS (pages 2-8)</i>			
<i>ADMINISTRATOR ELEMENTS (pages 9-15)</i>			
GUIDELINE REQUIREMENT Guideline References Included Below	TEACHER ELEMENTS EDUCATOR EVALUATION ONLINE CHECKLIST ITEM #	CHANGE	CONDITIONS NEEDED TO MEET REQUIREMENTS
<i>EVALUATION PROCESS & TIMELINE ELEMENTS 2.2(1)(a) Orientation on Process 2.7 Orientation Programs</i>	<i>1a. ORIENTATION</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Change</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No Change</i>	<i>Annual Orientation is specifically addressed as a required step. All teachers are provided with adequate and appropriate information/materials on the evaluation process, and there is opportunity to meet and review these materials. Clear timeline is provided for the full cycle of the evaluation process, including general timing of each step throughout the year. Orientation shall not occur later than November 15 of a given school year. All steps must conclude by the end of the school year.</i>
<i>2.2(1)(b) Goal-Setting Conference 2.2(1)(c) Evidence Collection and Review</i>	<i>1b. GOAL-SETTING PROCESS</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Change</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No Change</i>	<i>The Goal-Setting Conference is specifically addressed as a required step. Opportunity is provided for evaluators and teachers to discuss information relevant to the evaluation process and to set goals. The teacher collects evidence about his/her practice and the evaluator collects evidence about the teacher's practice to support the review.</i>
<i>2.2 (2) Mid-Year Check-In</i>	<i>1c. MID-YEAR CHECK-IN</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Change</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No Change</i>	<i>The Mid-Year Check-In is specifically addressed as a required step.</i>

			<p><i>Opportunity is provided for evaluators and teachers to review progress toward goals/objectives at least once during the school year, using available information, including agreed upon indicators.</i></p> <p><i>Opportunity is provided for revisions to the strategies or approaches being used and/or for teachers and evaluators to mutually agree upon mid-year adjustments to student learning goals, if warranted.</i></p>
<p>2.2 (3) End-of-Year Summative Review</p> <p>2.2(3)(a) Teacher Self-Assessment</p> <p>2.2(3)(b) End-of-Year Conference</p>	<p>1d. END-OF-YEAR/SUMMATIVE REVIEW</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p>Both the Teacher Self-Assessment and the End-of-Year Summative Review are addressed as required steps.</p> <p><i>Opportunity is provided for both a teacher self-reflection and a final summative discussion between the teacher and evaluator.</i></p> <p><i>Opportunity is provided for the teacher to collect evidence of student progress toward meeting the student learning goals/objectives and submit to evaluator.</i></p> <p><i>Opportunity is provided for the teacher and evaluator to discuss the extent to which students met the learning goals/objectives.</i></p> <p><i>A process is described for how the evaluator will rate the teacher based on criteria for four levels of performance.</i></p>
<p>2.1 Four-Level Matrix Rating System</p>	<p>1e. FOUR-LEVEL MATRIX RATING SYSTEM</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p>Determination of a summative rating is aligned to one of four performance evaluation designators: Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Below Standard.</p> <p>Determination of summative rating aligns with guidelines, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rating in each of four categories. 2. Determination of an “outcomes” rating composed of the indicators of student growth and development rating (45%) and the whole-school student learning indicator or student feedback rating (5%). 3. Determination of a “practice” rating composed of the performance and practice rating (40%) and the peer or parent feedback rating (10%).

			4. Combination of outcomes rating and practice rating into a final rating.
2.3(2)(b) Observations of Teacher Practice and Performance (40%)	2a. OBSERVATION PROTOCOL/SCHEDULE	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p>Observation model is standards-based.</p> <p>Observation model is aligned to the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching.</p> <p>Observations must be rated using rubrics that have four performance levels.</p> <p>Observation protocol involves multiple in-class visits throughout the year, including a combination of formal, informal announced, and unannounced observations.</p> <p>Minimum criteria: Year 1 and 2 teachers receive at least 3 formal in-class observations. 2 must include pre-conference and all must include a post-conference.</p> <p>Teachers who receive a performance rating of below standard or developing receive a number of observations appropriate to their individual plan, but no fewer than 3 formal in-class observations. 2 must include a pre-conference and all must include a post-conference.</p> <p>Teachers who receive a performance rating of proficient or exemplary receive a combination of at least 3 formal observations/reviews of practice, at least 1 of which must be a formal in-class; to be agreed upon by teacher and evaluator.</p> <p>Flexibility Option: Teachers who receive and maintain a performance evaluation designation of proficient or exemplary are evaluated with a minimum of 1 formal in-class observation no less frequent than every 3 years and 3 informal in-class observations in all other years. One review of practice shall be completed every year.</p> <p>Descriptions of non-classroom observations/reviews of practice include, but are limited to observations of data team meetings,</p>

			<p>coaching/mentoring other teachers, review of lesson plans or other teaching artifacts.</p> <p>A process for providing timely written and verbal feedback for all observations is described.</p>
2.3(2)(b)(3) Rubrics	2b. OBSERVATION RUBRIC	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	Rubric for observation is provided, includes four performance levels and is aligned to the CCT.
		<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	Rubric(s) is included in plan.
2.3(2)(f) Training in Observation and Evaluation	2c. EVALUATOR TRAINING	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	Describes evaluator training in observation and evaluation and how to provide high-quality feedback.
	2d. EVALUATOR PROFICIENCY/CALIBRATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	A process is described for how evaluators will demonstrate proficiency on an on-going basis.
2.3(1) 45% Goals and Objectives Using Multiple Indicators of Growth and Development (45%)	3a. GOALS/OBJECTIVES--INDICATORS of ACADEMIC GROWTH and DEVELOPMENT (IAGDs) (45%)	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p>The process for assessing student growth using multiple indicators of academic growth and development is developed through mutual agreement by each teacher and his or her evaluator at the beginning of the year (or mid-year for semester courses).</p> <p>One half (or 22.5%) of the IAGDs used as evidence of whether goals/objectives are met shall be based on the state test for those teaching tested grades and subjects or another standardized indicator for other grades and subjects where available, and shall not be determined by a single, isolated test score, but shall be determined through the comparison of data across assessments administered over time, including the state test for those teaching tested grades and subjects where available. A state test can be used only if there are interim assessments that lead to that test, and such interim assessments shall be included in the overall score for those teaching tested grades and subjects. Those without an available standardized indicator will select, through mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute-resolution procedure as described in section 1.3, an additional non-standardized indicator.</p> <p><i>NOTE: For the 2015-16 academic year, the required use of state test data is suspended, pending federal approval.</i></p>

			<p>For the other half (22.5%) of indicators of academic growth and development, there may be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A minimum of one non-standardized indicator (e.g. performances rated against a rubric, portfolios rated against a rubric, etc.). b. A maximum of one additional standardized indicator, if there is mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute resolution procedure as described in 1.3.
<p>2.3 (4) Parent or Peer Feedback (10%)</p>	<p>3b. PARENT OR PEER FEEDBACK (10%)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p>Ten percent (10%) of a teacher’s evaluation is based on Parent or Peer Feedback including surveys.</p> <p>Any survey used to capture Parent or Peer Feedback is anonymous and demonstrates properties of fairness, reliability, validity and usefulness.</p> <p>A provision is included for school governance council to assist in the development of whole-school surveys to align with school improvement goals.</p> <p>A clear explanation of how the Parent or Peer feedback will be captured, reviewed and summarized. Results from surveys addressed by teachers should align with student improvement goals.</p> <p>For parent surveys, ratings are based on one of two options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evidence from teacher-developed student level indicators of improvement in areas of need as identified by the school level survey results; or b. Evidence of teacher’s implementation of strategies to address areas of need as identified by the survey results. <p>The parent or peer feedback rating is across four performance levels.</p>
<p>2.3(3) 5% Whole-School Student Learning Indicator</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p>	<p>3c. WHOLE-SCHOOL STUDENT LEARNING INDICATOR(S) OR STUDENT FEEDBACK (5%)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p>For districts using the Whole-School Student Learning Indicators, ratings are represented by the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the administrator’s (45%) evaluation rating.</p>

<p>2.3(3)(b) Student Survey Protocol (as applicable)</p>			<p>For districts using Student Feedback, survey is anonymous, and demonstrates properties of fairness, reliability, validity and usefulness.</p> <p>A provision is included for school governance council to assist in the development of whole-school surveys to align with school improvement goals.</p> <p>Surveys use age and grade-level appropriate language and administration protocol.</p> <p>Results from surveys addressed by teachers align with student learning goals.</p> <p>For whole-school student surveys, ratings are based on one of two options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evidence from teacher developed student level indicators of improvement in areas of need as identified by the school level survey results; or b. Evidence of teacher’s implementation of strategies to address areas of need as identified by the survey results. <p>Either the Whole-School Student Learning Indicator OR the Student Feedback rating shall be among four performance levels.</p>
<p>OTHER REQUIRED ELEMENTS</p>			
<p>2.8 Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness</p>	<p>5a. DEFINITION OF EFFECTIVENESS/INEFFECTIVENESS</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p>District defines effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system.</p>
<p>2.4 Evaluation-Based Professional Learning</p>	<p>5b. EVALUATION-INFORMED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p>District describes how it plans to provide professional learning opportunities for teachers, based on the individual or group of individuals’ needs that are identified through the evaluation process.</p> <p>Learning opportunities are clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process as it relates to student learning results, observations of professional practice, and/or the results of stakeholder feedback.</p>

<p>2.5 Individual Teacher Improvement and Remediation Plans</p>	<p>5c. IMPROVEMENT AND REMEDIATION PLAN(S)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p>District demonstrates that it will create plans of individual teacher improvement and remediation for teachers whose performance is developing or below standard, designed in consultation with such teacher and his/her exclusive bargaining representative.</p> <p>Plan identifies resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies, 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 includes indicators of success including a summative rating of proficient or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.</p>
<p>1.3(3) Dispute-Resolution Process</p>	<p>5d. DISPUTE-RESOLUTION PROCESS</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p>Plan describes a process for resolving disputes in cases where the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on objectives, the evaluation period, feedback or the professional development plan.</p> <p><i>The process includes the superintendent as the final decision maker when a resolution cannot be reached. (see illustrative example in 1.1(3) Dispute-Resolution Process, May 7, 2014)</i></p>
<p>2.6 Career Development and Professional Growth</p>	<p>5e. CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p>Plan describes opportunities for career development and professional growth based on performance identified through the evaluation process.</p> <p>Examples include, but are not limited to: observation of peers, mentoring/coaching early-career teachers, leading Professional Learning Communities for their peers, differentiated career pathways.</p>

Summary of the Connecticut Educator Evaluation Guideline Requirements

TEACHER ELEMENTS (pages 2-8)

<i>ADMINISTRATOR ELEMENTS (pages 9-15)</i>			
GUIDELINE REQUIREMENT Guideline References Included Below	ADMINISTRATOR ELEMENTS EDUCATOR EVALUATION ONLINE CHECKLIST ITEM #	CHANGE	CONDITIONS NEEDED TO MEET REQUIREMENTS
3.2(1)(a)Orientation	1a. ORIENTATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p>Annual Orientation is specifically addressed as a required step.</p> <p><i>Plan addresses how the local or regional board of education or a regional educational service center for the school district will offer annual orientation programs regarding the administrator evaluation and support system.</i></p> <p><i>It is evident that the superintendent or designee will provide the administrator with materials outlining the evaluation process, including the rubric used for assessing administrator practice, the instruments to be used to gather feedback from stakeholders and their alignment to the rubric, and the process and calculation by which all evaluation elements will be integrated into the overall rating.</i></p> <p><i>A clear timeline is provided for the full cycle of the evaluation process, including general timing of each step throughout the year.</i></p> <p><i>All steps must conclude by the end of the school year.</i></p>
3.2 Goal-Setting Process 3.2(1)(b) Goal-Setting Conference	1b. GOAL-SETTING PROCESS	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p>The Goal-Setting Conference is specifically addressed as a required step that takes place at the start of the school year.</p>
3.2(3) Mid-Year Formative Review	1c. MID-YEAR CHECK IN (Administrator) FORMATIVE REVIEW	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p>The Mid-Year Formative Review is specifically addressed as a required step.</p> <p><i>Opportunity is provided for superintendent or designee and administrator to discuss progress toward student learning targets, as well as, any areas of performance related to standards of performance and practice.</i></p>

<p>3.2(4) End-of-year Summative Review</p>	<p>1d. END-OF-YEAR/SUMMATIVE REVIEW</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p>Both the Administrator Self-Assessment and the End-of-Year Summative Review are addressed as required steps.</p> <p>Administrator is required to review all information and data collected during the year and to complete a Self-Assessment for review by the evaluator.</p> <p>The plan states that, following the End-of-Year Conference, the superintendent will assign a summative rating and generate a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.</p> <p>Note: If state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating, it should be noted that a final rating may be revised before September 15th when state test data are available.</p>
<p>3.1 Four-Level Matrix Rating System</p>	<p>1e. FOUR-LEVEL MATRIX RATING SYSTEM</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p>Annual summative evaluations provide each administrator with a summative rating aligned to one of four performance evaluation designators: Exemplary, Proficient, Developing And Below Standard.</p> <p>Determination of summative rating aligns with Guidelines and includes the following requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rating of administrator performance in each of four categories; 2. Determining an “outcomes” rating composed of the multiple student learning indicator rating (45%) and the teacher effectiveness outcomes rating (5%); 3. Determining a “practice” rating composed of the performance and practice rating (40%) and the stakeholder feedback rating (10%); and 4. Combining the outcomes rating and the practice rating into a final rating that equally weights the outcomes and practice ratings.
<p>3.3(3) Observation of Practice Elements 40% Observation Protocol</p>	<p>2a. OBSERVATION PROTOCOL/SCHEDULE</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p>Performance ratings will be based on evidence collected about leadership practice as described in the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.</p>

			<p><i>Performance ratings distinguish among at least four levels of performance and clearly identify administrator leadership actions related to improving teacher effectiveness, including conducting teacher evaluations.</i></p> <p><i>Observation protocol distinguishes between observations required for principals, assistant principals and central office administrators in alignment with Guidelines and include the following requirements:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. At least 2 school site observations for any administrator.</i> <i>2. At least 4 school site observations for any administrators who are new to their district, school, the profession, or who have received ratings of developing or below standard.</i> <p><i>For principals, the district weights the Teaching and Learning Standard at least twice as much as any other standard. The other standards of practice have a weighting of at least 5% of the overall evaluation.</i></p> <p><i>The plan requires weights to be determined at the goal-setting conference.</i></p> <p><i>The evaluator is required to provide feedback on administrator performance during the mid-year conference and end-of-year conference.</i></p>
<p>3.3(3) Rubric</p>	<p>2b. OBSERVATION RUBRIC</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>Change <input type="checkbox"/>No Change</p>	<p><i>Performance ratings will be based on evidence collected about leadership practice as described in the Common Core of Leading-Connecticut School Leadership Standards and meet the following criteria:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Alignment to the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.</i> <i>2. Clearly distinguishes among at least four levels of performance.</i>

			<p>3. <i>Clearly identifies administrator leadership actions related to improving teacher effectiveness, including conducting teacher evaluations.</i></p> <p><i>*Note: For central office administrators, a rubric is not required. Districts may generate ratings from evidence collected directly from the Common Core of Leading-Connecticut School Leadership Standards.</i></p> <p><i>In rating administrators against the rubric, the evaluator is required to identify a performance rating with written evidence to support the rating for each leadership standard and the evaluator must identify the strengths and growth areas of the administrator.</i></p> <p><i>Districts selecting or designing rubrics other than the state-developed rubric, include the rubric in the plan.</i></p>
3.3(3) Training	2c. EVALUATOR TRAINING	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p><i>The district will provide all evaluators of administrators with training focused on the administrator evaluation system, including training on conducting effective observations and providing high-quality feedback.</i></p> <p><i>The district addresses a plan to conduct the training or sets the expectation that evaluators will participate in a state-sponsored training.</i></p> <p><i>*Districts selecting or designing rubrics other than the state-developed rubric shall provide training of evaluators focused on the language of the rubric and its use in practice.</i></p>
3.3(2) Goals/Objectives	4a. GOALS/OBJECTIVES—LOCALLY-DETERMINED INDICATORS (45%)	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p><i>22.5% of the administrator’s evaluation is based only on student performance and/or growth on the state-administered assessments in core content areas that are part of the state’s school accountability system and includes:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year.</i> <i>2. SPI progress for student subgroups.</i> <p><i>NOTE: For 2015-16, the required use of state test data is suspended, pending federal approval.</i></p>

			<p>22.5% of the administrator's evaluation is based on at least 2 locally-determined indicators of student learning. At least 1 of which includes student outcomes from subjects and/or grades not assess on state-administered assessments.</p> <p>Locally determined indicators are required to align to Connecticut learning standards.</p> <p>For administrators in high schools, selected indicators include the cohort graduation rate and the extended graduation rate.</p> <p>For all school-based administrators, selected indicators are required to be relevant to the student population served by the administrator's school.</p> <p>Turnaround schools or schools in review, indicators used for administrator evaluation are required to align with the performance targets set out in this school's mandated improvement plan.</p>
3.3(4) Stakeholder Feedback Feedback Instrument(s) System	4b. STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK (10%)	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p>Stakeholders solicited for feedback include teachers and parents and may include others.</p> <p>Central office administrators are rated based on feedback from the stakeholders whom the administrator directly serves.</p> <p>More than half of the rating of a principal on stakeholder feedback is based on an assessment of improvement over time.</p> <p>A clear plan is described for gathering feedback that ensures the instrument(s) for gathering feedback are based on elements and indicators within the Connecticut Leadership Standards, will be kept anonymous and will demonstrate properties of validity and reliability.</p>
3.3(2) Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes	4c. TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS OUTCOMES (5%)	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p>5% of the an administrator's summative rating is based on teacher effectiveness outcomes as measured by:</p> <p>a. improving the percentage (or meeting a target of a high percentage) of teachers who meet the student learning objectives outlined in their performance</p>

			<p><i>evaluations (If this approach is used, districts should ensure that the process for setting student learning objectives/goals is rigorous); and/or</i></p> <p><i>b. other locally-determined measures of teacher effectiveness.</i></p> <p><i>For assistant principals, measures of teacher effectiveness focus only on those teachers they are responsible for evaluating.</i></p> <p><i>*If the assistant principal's job duties don't include teacher evaluation, then the teacher effectiveness rating for the principal will apply.</i></p>
OTHER REQUIRED ELEMENTS			
3.8 Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness	5a. DEFINITION OF EFFECTIVENESS/INEFFECTIVENESS	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	The district defines effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the evaluation system.
3.4 Evaluation-Based Professional Learning	5b. EVALUATION-INFORMED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p>The district articulates how it plans to provide professional learning opportunities for administrators based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process.</p> <p>Learning opportunities are clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process as it relates to student learning results, observations of professional practice, the results of stakeholder feedback and useful and timely feedback and improvement opportunities and includes the provision of useful and timely feedback and improvement opportunities.</p>
3.5 Individual Administrator Improvement and Remediation Plans	5c. IMPROVEMENT AND REMEDIATION PLAN(S)	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p>District demonstrates that it will create plans of individual administrator improvement and remediation for administrators whose performance is developing or below standard, designed in consultation with such administrator and his or her exclusive bargaining representative and includes the following:</p> <p>a. resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies;</p>

			<p>b. indicates a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same school as the plan is issued; and</p> <p>c. indicators of success including a summative rating of proficient or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.</p>
1.3(3) Dispute-Resolution Process	5d. DISPUTE-RESOLUTION PROCESS	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p>Plan includes a process for resolving disputes in cases where the evaluator and administrator cannot agree on objectives, the evaluation period, feedback or the professional development plan.</p> <p><i>The process includes the superintendent as the final decision maker when a resolution cannot be reached. (See illustrative example in 1.1(3) Dispute-Resolution Process, May 7, 2014)</i></p>
3.6 Career Development and Professional Growth	5e. CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH	<input type="checkbox"/> Change <input type="checkbox"/> No Change	<p>Plan describes opportunities for career development and professional growth based on performance identified through the evaluation process.</p>