WESTBROOK: 2014-15 Evaluation and Support Plan

BOE - Approved

September 9, 2014

WESTBROOK EDUCATOR DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE PLAN

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the Westbrook Educator Evaluation and Professional Development Program is to set upon the Westbrook Board of Education approved mission to *"Educate, Challenge and Inspire"* all students toward their highest levels of achievement. Westbrook teachers, student support professionals, and administrators recognize their mission as cyclical and based on constant progress monitoring. The educator evaluation and professional development program is designed to meet State of Connecticut high standards for the performance of educators leading to and evidenced by improved student learning.

WESTBROOK educators promote the success of all students by supporting and living our mission in our practice and recognize that the performance and practice of educating and serving all students must be based on recognized professional standards of practice and ethics. To that end, the WESTBROOK Educator Development and Performance Plan has been derived from Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED), the TEAM new teacher modules, current research on best practices, and the practical experience and insight of the educators in this organization. While each WESTBROOK school is unique, the overarching common set of expectations for practice and performance attempts to set guidelines and expectations that cut across all school settings. Although individual roles and goals are taken into account, this set of expectations aligns evaluation practices throughout the school district. This document addresses: 1) teacher evaluation, and 2) student support personnel evaluation, i.e. Guidance Counselor, School Psychologist, and School Social Worker. Library-Media Specialist

To that end, our document is framed around the contents of Connecticut State Department of Education publications and district-wide Goals and Standards.

1. *Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching* (CCT) revised 2014 which defines effective teaching performance and practices through the lens of Domains 1 – 4 of the original CCT.
2.
3. *State of Connecticut and Westbrook Curricular Goals and Standards (Common Core State Standards where available),* which establish student content and performance standards across all disciplines by grade span, (preK, K-1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-7, 8-10, 11-12) and schools. (Website)

4. *Connecticut's Guidelines and Standards for Comprehensive School Counseling (Website)*

5. *Connecticut's Guidelines for the Practice of School Psychology (Website)*

6. *Connecticut's Practice Guidelines for the Delivery of School Social Work Services (Website)*

7. *Westbrook District and School Improvement Goals and Curriculum Standards (Website)*

Using these documents as the foundation for teacher evaluation and professional development establishes a critical link between effective teaching and increased student learning.

The WESTBROOK Educator Development and Performance Plan is grounded in a theory of action of growth and continuous improvement. It is grounded in the theory that improvement in teaching is derived from work in the key components of the "instructional core" that is "the teacher and the student in the presence of content." (City, Elmore, Fiarman and Teitel, 2009, p. 22).   The instructional core provides the basic framework for how to intervene in the instructional process so as to improve the quality and level of student learning. The authors assert:

> …There are only three ways to improve student learning at scale. The first is to increase the level of knowledge and skill that the teachers bring to the instructional process. The second is to increase the level and complexity of the content that students are asked to learn. And the third is to change the role of the student in the instructional process. That's it. If you are not doing one of these three things, you are not improving instruction and learning. Everything else is instrumental. That is, everything that's not in the instructional core can only affect student learning and performance by somehow influencing what goes on inside the core." (p. 24).

At WESTBROOK we also acknowledge that changes in context can affect the teaching/learning process and outcomes.

The Instructional Core (A Framework for Improvement)

The Teacher:

Our definition of teacher expectations is clearly defined in our rubric for effective teaching described later in this document. In the instructional core, the teacher

brings himself or herself into the classroom. Parker Palmer asserts: "Good teachers join self and subject and students in the fabric of life" (p. 11) He argues that "good teaching cannot be reduced to technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of the teacher." (p. 10)

> Good teachers possess a capacity for connectedness. They are able to weave a complex web of connections among themselves, their subjects, and their students so that students can learn to weave a world for themselves. The methods used by these weavers vary widely: lectures, Socratic dialogues, laboratory experiments, collaborative problem solving, creative chaos. The connections made by good teachers are held not in their methods but in their hearts—meaning heart in its ancient sense, as the place where intellect and emotion and spirit and will converge in the human self." (p. 11)

In this model, the educator is an integral part of the instructional core as measured by more than the dictates of content goals attainment, but as much by how what they believe and what they do, is evident in their consistent practice. The technical aspects of educator practice from planning forward are entwined with the person and is grounded in reflection.

As we work to develop our educators, the following key questions must be integral and guide the evaluation process:

> How will this affect teachers' knowledge and skills?
> How will this affect the level of content in classrooms?
> How will this affect the role of the student in the instructional process?
> How will this affect the relationship between the teacher, the student, and content?
> (City, et al, p. 27)

To that end, the evaluation of the practice of educating as stated above is based on the *Connecticut Common Core of Teaching* (2010) (website) and *Connecticut's School Leadership Standards (website)*, as well as our specific goals evident in each schools' improvement plans and it is intended to support professional growth in practice at all career stages.

The Content:

The Westbrook evaluation program is predicated on the expectation that all educators make decisions toward teaching relevant content that is both standards-based and at the most rigorous level. While Westbrook written curriculum provides the blueprint for both content delivery and all students' individual grade-level learning needs, Westbrook educators are expected to be current in their respective

disciplines and to be focused on changes in state and national expectations in those disciplines. This evaluation program is aligned with the prescriptive value of professional development which includes the exploration of content/discipline research and adaptations.

The Student:

What students are expected to know, understand, and be able to do are defined in our national, state, and local curricula. In the instructional core, we examine more precisely what it is students are asked to do, the tasks they are given, the level of difficulty of those tasks and the depth of knowledge that is expected of them. We examine how student learning is scaffolded and how and when we move toward the release of responsibility to students for their own learning. We consider their ability not only to answer questions, but also to ask the questions themselves. This element of the instructional core is not just about the tasks that students are given, but also about how the tasks address who students are, their needs, their difficulties, and their interests. It is about how the tasks serve to engage and challenge, and change students "in the presence of content."

The Context:

The instructional core does not exist in a vacuum. All Westbrook education programs in operation take place in a community setting. The community setting in each school involves professionals, parents/guardians as well as town entities. Westbrook educators do acknowledge that all difference (cultural, socio-economic, etc.) must be addressed in their practice. To that end, educator development and evaluation must create a framework that requires the recognition of diverse contexts in the individual or special needs of students. In its final analysis, the cyclical nature of the Westbrook evaluation program requires evidence of reflection, multiple measures resulting in data to inform reflection and educator learning from that reflection that is evident in future decisions.

Guiding Principles

In accordance with the mandates of the Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED), the Westbrook program is predicated on the following guiding principles:

- Student learning should drive the ongoing development and implementation of teacher evaluation and professional development; educators must be committed to learning, we must be students of our students;

- Educators are responsible for collecting data using multiple measures to analyze students' learning and achievement and to use that data in planning and instruction;
- The gaps between expectations for student performance and actual student performance guide the content of teacher evaluation and professional development;
- Professional growth of educators is critical to the process of increased student learning in our schools;
- School improvement is more effective and coherent when teacher evaluation and school improvement processes are integrated with an ongoing systematic professional development process;
- Consideration of where an educator is in his/her career cycle plays a vital role in effective evaluation and professional development;
- An effective evaluation plan requires a clear definition of teaching and learning and a system to assess it;
- A learning climate is created when clearly defined expectations of performance and criteria for measuring performance exist for both the teacher and the evaluator;
- We build professional community (collegial, collaborative relationships) between and among teachers and evaluators and in doing so create an optimum climate for intellectually, emotionally and physically safe teaching and learning;
- Teachers' engagement in learning is most effective when they are involved in the process of discovering innovations in teaching and in collegial sharing, *empowered* to build a plan that will support their goals, *encouraged* to question current assumptions and explore new findings while gaining expertise, and *responsible* for agreed upon outcomes (Glasser).

Definition of Persons Evaluating and Evaluated in the Westbrook Plan

Evaluator refers to all individuals rated proficient to evaluate within these program guidelines whose job description includes supervision and evaluation of other educators. Persons to be evaluated in this program shall mean all certified persons below the rank of Superintendent.

Superintendent's Role in the Evaluation Process

1. Arbitrate disputes
2. Allocate and provide funds or resources to implement the plan
3. Serve as liaison between the Board of Education and the evaluation process
4. Be responsible for insuring that the Professional Development Committee receives information regarding school and program improvement and individual

professional growth goals for use in planning district staff development programs*.*

Responsibility for Evaluation

Building Principal

- All Certified Regular Education Staff

Director of Special Services

- Special Education and Related Services Staff

Superintendent

- Principals
- Director of Specials Services
- Curriculum Coach
- Curriculum Leaders
- Business Manager

Goals of Program

The purpose of the new evaluation model is to evaluate educator performance fairly and accurately and to help each educator strengthen his/her practice to improve student learning. The process of evaluation has four purposes: to increase student learning, to promote effective teaching, to enhance school improvement, and to provide for accountability in the educational system.

The WESTBROOK Educator Development and Performance Plan connects to student achievement and aligns with professional development and school improvement. The purpose of the new evaluation model is to evaluate teacher performance fairly and accurately and to help each teacher strengthen his/her practice to improve student learning outcomes. This evaluation plan relies on four design principles.

The following four design principles are interdependent; each is critical in determining that evaluations meet the needs of all educators: teachers, student support professionals, school leaders and students.

1 Focus on Student Learning

Research continues to show that high quality engaging classroom instruction has a greater impact on student learning than any other school-level factor. The WESTBROOK Educator Development and Performance Plan aims to improve student learning outcomes through effective instruction and support for student and educator learning in intellectually, emotionally and physically safe environments. Furthermore, through the use of a variety of data sources, educators will organize, plan, and set goals that meet the needs of the individual student and the class. Educators will be held accountable for the use of various types of assessment data throughout the school year to evaluate student progress and to

make adjustments to their practice toward improved teaching and learning outcomes.

2 Multiple Measures of Performance Data

The WESTBROOK Educator Development and Performance Plan uses multiple measures to determine whether educator performance expectations have been met. Each measure within the plan has been specifically weighted in accordance with the Connecticut SEED system that allows both educators and administrators to understand how each component contributes to the final summative evaluation rating.

3 Evaluator Obligation to Measure Outcomes with Fidelity

The WESTBROOK evaluation process must have a meaningful impact on school and district improvement as well as educator effectiveness to be reliable and valid. The ability to support, develop and retain Westbrook talent is the job of the school leader. Therefore, evaluators will be held responsible for evaluating all *fairly, accurately and consistently* while taking steps to impact overall student achievement and impact achievement gaps. Administrators will adhere to all rating definitions and scoring rubrics, will be rated proficient in the use of the evaluation process and the corresponding data management systems.

All evaluators will be required to complete proficiency and calibration activities as needed. Evaluators will also attend two additional support sessions during the school year. To ensure consistency and fairness in the evaluation process, all evaluators must meet the proficiency standard prior to conducting teacher observations. Possible activities will include the following:

1. calibration activities requiring evaluators to demonstrate their ability to: recognize bias; identify evidence from classroom observations, conferences and non-classroom reviews of practice that is appropriate to specific indicators and domains; gather and analyze a comprehensive set of data to assign appropriate ratings at the domain level;
2. follow-up face-to-face professional learning to enhance evaluator conferencing and feedback skills and debrief on calibration as needed.

4 Support, Professional Development, and Regular Feedback

The Westbrook plan encourages Administrators/Evaluators and designated instructional leaders to observe professional practice in many circumstances. It is prescriptive in its requirement that Administrators/Evaluators will engage in

regular conversations with educators to discuss overall performance and student progress to establish, clarify and/or adjust school improvement goals to create and sustain student achievement and an appropriate climate for learning, to establish, clarify and/or adjust professional goals and to provide support for goals' attainment.   The Administrators/Evaluators will have regular conversations with individual educators and collectively to discuss overall classroom performance and student progress; to establish professional goals and developmental needs; and to provide the support available to meet those needs.

Core Requirements/Law

Sections 51 through 56 of PA 12-116, signed into law by Governor Dannel P. Malloy on May 15, 2012 and amended by sections 23 and 24 of PA 12-2 of the June 12 special session, requires the State Board of Education to adopt, on or before July 1, 2012 and in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC), guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program. The PEAC have renamed these "core requirements". The WESTBROOK evaluation system was developed pursuant to these statutory requirements. The complete revised general statute is located in the appendix.

WESTBROOK DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE PLAN

The WESTBROOK plan includes multiple measures to assess a teacher's performance comprehensively. Based on our core guiding principles and beliefs, professional collaboration is central. Collaborative teaming forms the foundation of our practice. Teams begin with student learning data and use it to design, redesign, and modify instructional practices together. A team may examine individual student work generated from common assessments (both formative and summative), locally determined assessments, as well as district and state assessments as starting points.   Each school has designated opportunities for staff to engage in professional collaboration. Their job, no matter what the structure, is to adhere to the reflective practice cycle, to examine student learning data together, to engage in collaborative planning for high quality curricular and instructional design, to deliver that instruction, then to examine the results of that instruction. The process applies, whether teachers are setting individual student learning goals or collective whole school goals.

This process is shaped by the district and school improvement goals and requires ongoing professional learning to help keep educators current and strategically effective. Professional development is inherent in this process in ways not limited to traditional internal or external professional development sessions, but also includes modeling, coaching, feedback, instructional rounds, and discussing student work examples. Professional development is driven by student learning data and results in this plan.

The WESTBROOK Educator Development and Performance Plan is therefore grounded in the work to create a palate of continuous improvement strategies and confirmation of those practices that should be sustained.   The processes and structures described herein rely upon both collaborative and individual work.

Steps in the Process

The steps in the process of teacher development are summarized below in accordance with Connecticut's SEED system mandates. It includes, at a minimum, the following steps in the process:

1. **Orientation: At the start of the school year** (no later than Oct. 15)
   All teachers receive an orientation to the program, its processes and expectations, including their roles and responsibilities in the process and the standards that are used to assess teaching and learning. District and school improvement priorities and student learning objectives or goals should be announced so that they can be reflected upon in future goal setting meetings.

Orientation will be offered at faculty and PLC meetings or other appropriate forums with individual follow-up as needed.

2. **Goal Setting Conference: By October 30th**
    The CT SEED system timeline provides for implementation and evidence collection of an individual plan to occur from September – December.
    Reflection: In advance of the goal (SLO) setting meeting, educators should examine student data, prior year evaluation results and feedback, and other relevant school or stakeholder data to establish individual goals. Two SLOs/goals to address student learning and achievement should be written. Each should comprise student performance (growth and development component) and be valued together at 45% of the summative evaluation rating. Forms A & B
    Goals related to whole school student learning and parent feedback will comprise 15% of the final summative rating. Observation of educator performance and practice as discussed earlier in this plan will comprise 40% of the summative evaluation rating. Forms C & D
    Goal Setting Conference: The educator and evaluator meet to discuss the proposed SLOs/goals and arrive at mutual agreement about them. The goals for the year must be informed by data and evidence by the combined collection of both educator and evaluator. Evaluators may require changes to goals and objectives if they are not aligned with district and school improvement priorities or meet established curriculum and standards requirements.

This chart exemplifies a completed goal; one which addresses each form field:

A Complete Goal	Definition	Reflection/Preparation
The Rationale	Goal is defined with regard to why it was chosen. It should connect with district/school improvement goals and addresses student learning needs as evidenced by data on student performance and achievement as addressed above – standardized assessments, local assessments, perceptual data, behavioral data.	Consider the baseline data and background information. What did I use to write/establish this goal? Have I considered the strength and weaknesses of my students with regard to content standards (CCSS if available)? An educator might also consider this goal in the context of affecting whole school learning.
Student Learning Objective	The objective itself must define, **what** you are projecting your students will achieve. It should be	Consider what impact your practices including preparation, planning, strategies may have

	written as a specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and timely (S.M.A.R.T.) goal. The SLO/goal must be relevant to most if not all students, and as such should be *"ambitious"* and reference at least one year's worth of progress.	resulted in the growth of your students toward achieving your stated SLO/goal growth projection. This SLO/goal should, therefore, be specific to what you want to achieve with your students.
Action Steps	The goal must be specific to how you and your students will achieve this goal. It should address your next steps, a plan of action that includes what you will do, and what you expect the students will need to do.	Consider how you will direct progress toward meeting this goal. Think about the standards you are working toward and map the strategies will you use, and the support you will need. Identify what Professional Development you will need.
Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD)	Consider the evidence you will use. How are you and your evaluator going to know if there is progress toward achievement of this SLO/goal? What standardized (1 required if available) and non-standardized metrics are you using? Remember the SLO/goal must be S.M.A.R.T. What other indicators you are using to measure your students growth and development.	What is your actual target of performance growth for your students? What data are you going to consider now in preparation to meet your new targets?

3. **Observations of Practice: Ongoing**
   The administrator observes educator practice using a rubric, and conducts conferences related to those observations. The administrator provides a rating on the rubric.
4. **Ongoing Data Collection Related to Performance and Practice: Ongoing**
   The educator collects data related to the student outcomes and learning goals as well as data regarding practice and performance as required by the rubric.
5. **Interim Mid-year Check-in Conference: January/February**

   Educator and evaluator will hold at least one mid-year conference. The conference should focus on processes and progress toward meeting the goals established in the goal-setting conference. Evidence about practice and student learning data should be reviewed. It is important to note that local/formative assessment data and perceptual data may be a part of this conversation. Other student indicators may be taken into account such as behavioral data, participation and engagement elements (absences, referrals),

student engagement in other kinds of school activities impacting their achievement and the educator's assessment of their students' learning needs/styles. This is conversation that should reference both empirical and anecdotal information. Educators and evaluators may mutually agree to revisions of strategies, approaches or targets to accommodate other changes in the goals.

6. **End of Year Summative Review: By End of School Year**

   Self-Assessment (by May 15): Educator reviews and reflects on all information and data collected during the year related to the goals and completes a self-assessment for review by the evaluator. The educator completes a self-assessment prior to this meeting for the administrator's review and thereby creates the forum for discussion. The self-assessment should be viewed as the lead-off discussion points and should be crafted in accordance with the fields addressed in SLO/goal proposals and should be evidence itself of the educator's reflections on the SLO/goals they have chosen. Educators are asked to describe the results they have noted (positive or negative), provide their evidence and describe what contributing practice factors impacted those results. Educators are asked to consider what they have learned and how they will use that knowledge going forward. They should consider what types of Professional Development or support they perceive would be helpful to future goals attainments. (Form L)

End of Year Conference: Educator and Evaluator meet to discuss all of the evidence collected to date and goals attainment. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation. The summative report may be revised based on additional assessment data collected during the summer.

Evaluators review the evidence and the teacher's self-assessment and assign one of four points to each goal: Exceeded (4 points), Met (3 points), Partially Met (2 points), or Did Not Meet (1 point).

Exceeded	All or most students met or substantially exceeded the target(s) contained in the indicator(s).
Met	Most students met the target(s) contained in the indicators within a few points on either side of the target(s).
Partially met	Many students met the target(s) but a notable percentage missed the target by more than a few

	points. However, taken as a whole, significant progress towards the goal was made.
Did not meet	A few students met the target(s) but a substantial percentage of students did not. Little progress toward the goal was made.

7. **Final Summative Rating**
   After all data, including state test data, are available, the evaluator may adjust the summative rating (before September 15th)if the state test data have a significant impact on the final rating.

It is expected that the process is actively engaged in by both educator and evaluator: establishing goals based on student learning data, engaging in collaborative processes to create or review curriculum, design instruction and engage in high quality instruction. It is expected that the educator will bring this process into their repertoire of practice strategies.

This chart is a brief summary of the responsibilities.

Areas of Evaluation	Educator Responsibility	Administrator Responsibility
Observation of educator performance and practice (40%)	• Self-reflection on standards • Identification of professional learning needs	• Pre and Post Conferences • Observations of practice - see chart p.19 • Summative Rating
Parent feedback (10%)	• Mutual goal setting and strategies	• Data collection • Mutual goal setting • Summative rating
Whole school student learning or student feedback (5%)	• Mutual goal setting and strategies	• Data collection • Mutual goal setting • Summative rating
Student learning/achievement measures (45%)	• Two (2) student learning goals • Fall, mid-year, end of year conferences to write/adjust SLOs/goals • Data collection/reflection • Mutual goal setting	• Fall, mid-year, end of year conferences • Mutual goal setting • Summative rating
Final Rating (100%)		• Final Summative Rating

Summative Teacher Development and Performance Review:

The Core Requirements of the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation require that districts weight the components of the educator's annual summative evaluations and ratings as follows:

Educator Performance and Practice	Student Outcomes and Learning
40% Observation of educator performance and practice	45% Student learning/achievement measures
10% Parent feedback	5% Whole school student learning or student feedback
= 50%	= 50%
100% = Summative Rating	

All educators will be evaluated in four categories, grouped into two major focus areas: Performance and Practice based on student learning outcomes. The specifics of each portion of the plan are outlined below.

Student Outcomes and Learning

45% Student Learning/Achievement Measures

The process for assessing student growth uses multiple indicators of academic growth and development. The educator will create a minimum of two goals (Student Learning Objective or SLO) for student growth and will use standardized tests (in those content areas where state standardized indicators are available) to comprise 22.5% of the rating. A non-standardized indicator should be used for the other 22.5%. (For non-state tested grade levels or subject areas or where state standardized indicators are not available, non-standardized indicators may be used for all 45%.)

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

One half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goals/objectives are met shall not be determined by a single, isolated standardized test score, but shall be determined through the comparison of data across assessments administered over time, including the state test for those

teaching tested grades and subjects or another standardized indicator for other grades and subjects where available. *(The required use of state test data is suspended, pending federal approval, for the 2014-15 academic year.)* A state test can be used only if there are interim assessments that lead to that test an d 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 an additional non-standardized indicator.

The final student growth and development rating for a teacher is the average of their two SLO scores. For example, if one SLO was Partially Met, for 2 points, and the other SLO was met, for 3 points, the student growth and development rating would be 2.5 [(2+3)/2]. The individual SLO ratings and the student growth and development rating will be shared and discussed with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference. ***Evaluators are strongly urged to use their professional judgment, not just an algorithm to determine the final summative rating.***

> NOTE: For SLOs that include an indicator based on state standardized tests, results may not be available in time to score the SLO prior to the June 30 deadline. In this instance, if evidence for other indicators in the SLO is available, the evaluator can score the SLO on that basis. Or, if state tests are the basis for all indicators, then the teacher's student growth and development rating will be based only on the results of the SLO that is based on non-standardized indicators.

> However, once the state test evidence is available, the evaluator is required to score or rescore the SLO, then determine if the new score changes the teacher's final (summative) rating. If the new results change the rating, the evaluator shall call a conference with the teacher to review the results and their impact. The evaluation rating can be amended at that time as needed, but no later than August 15.

> ### 5% Whole School Student Learning (Form K)

Westbrook educator's goals must be connected to the district and school improvement priorities as evidenced by the School Performance Indicator (SPI).

> *Whole-School Student Learning Indicator*

> An educator's indicator rating is equal to the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the Administrator's evaluation rating at the school. This is based on the school performance index (SPI), which correlates to the whole-school student learning, an established goal in the Administrator's evaluation. Administrators may opt to consider some

whole school responses from students on Spring administered climate surveys as they are developed in accordance with BOE adopted national standards reflecting teaching and learning environments.

Educators will establish a goal relative to whole school learning collectively, as a school or individually. A summative rating, using the following scale will be discussed and finalized during the End-of-Year Conference.

Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Did not meet the goal	Partially met the goal	Met the goal	Exceeded the goal

Teacher Performance and Practice

<u>40% Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice</u>

Forty percent (40%) of a teacher's evaluation will be based on observation of teacher practice and performance, using the Connecticut SEED system rubric based on the *Common Core of Teaching*. The CCT and its state approved rubric are found in the appendices of this document.

Westbrook educators' performance will be assessed within the 4 domains of the state's newly revised CCT rubric (May 2014). The rubric is consistent with Connecticut's TEAM program of mentorship in the professional development of new educators. The rubric parallels the tenets of the TEAM modules and moves from the platform of reflective practice to advance educators' practices and student achievement. Like TEAM, the CCT rubric seeks documentation of the evidence of growth instructional practice and allows the presence of collaborative planning and practice in which students may be successful.

Evaluators will rate educator practice by reviewing data that is collected on an ongoing basis through the formal and informal observation process, dialogue with the educator, in the review of the products of practice such as lesson plans and in the review of student work to reach a summative rating. Educators should be a part of this process and self-assess using the CCT and state's rubric to share in reflection with their evaluator and the process of conferencing formally and informally (invaluable to the educator's practice and their students' achievement).

The following Domains are described as they will be assessed:

CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014

Evidence Generally Collected Through In-Class Observations	Evidence Generally Collected Through Non-Classroom/Reviews of Practice
Domain 1 - Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning Teachers promote student engagement, independence and interdependence in learning and facilitate a positive learning community by: 1a. Creating a positive learning environment that is responsive to and respectful of the learning needs of all students. 1b. Promoting developmentally appropriate standards of behavior that support a productive learning environment for all students. 1c. Maximizing instructional time by effectively managing routines and transitions	**Domain 2 - Planning for Active Learning** Teachers plan instruction to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by: 2a. Planning of instructional content that is aligned with standards, builds on students' prior knowledge and provides for appropriate level of challenge for all students. 2b. Planning instruction to cognitively engage students in the content. 2c. Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to monitor student progress.
Domain 3 - Instruction for Active Learning Teachers implement instruction to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by: 3a. Implementing instructional content for learning. 3b. Leading students to construct meaning and apply new learning through the use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies. 3c. Assessing student learning, providing feedback to students and adjusting instruction.	**Domain 4 - Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership** Teachers maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration and leadership by: 4a. Engaging in continuous professional learning to impact instruction and student learning. 4b. Collaborating to develop and sustain a professional learning environment to support student learning. 4c. Working with colleagues, students and families to develop and sustain a positive school climate that supports student learning.

See Appendix for the complete CCT Rubric

OBSERVATION REQUIREMENTS:

The observation minimal requirements of the Westbrook evaluation process will be as follows:

Year 1 and 2 teachers receive at least 3 formal in-class observations. Two of 3 include pre-conference and all include a post-conference.

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. Two of the 3 must include a preconference and all include a post-conference. Educators may be observed in practice in other settings as deemed appropriate by the administrator.

Teachers who receive and maintain a performance evaluation designation of proficient or exemplary shall be evaluated with a minimum of 1 formal in-class observation no less frequent than every year, 1 review of practice every year and 1+ informal in-class observations.

Educator Experience/ Ratings	1st and 2nd year teachers or others with below standard or developing ratings	3rd year and non-tenured teachers with proficient or exemplary ratings	Tenured teachers with proficient or exemplary ratings
Observation requirements	3 formal 2+ informals* appropriate to individual plans	1 formal 1 review of practice 1+ informals appropriate to individual plans	1 formal 1 review of practice 1+ informals appropriate to individual plans

*For classroom teachers, formal observations must be "classroom" observations. Informal observations are classroom based. Beyond the required number these will be supplemented with observations of practice in settings outside the classroom and review(s) of practice. For certified educators that serve in student support /clinical roles, observations will be conducted in the most appropriate settings as determined by the evaluator and the evaluatee and shall be evaluated using the appropriate alternate rubric for student support personnel. See Appendices on website.

Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

Teacher effectiveness will be based upon a pattern of summative teacher ratings collected over time. In order to be deemed effective, teachers will need to have a

summative rating of <u>Proficient</u> or Exemplary. Teachers are required to be effective within two years of being evaluated using this plan. Teachers who are not deemed effective by these criteria will be deemed ineffective.

Any teacher having a summative rating of Developing or Below Standard after one year of being evaluated with this plan may be placed on an individual improvement plan.

* Observations/reviews of practice (informals) may include educator practice in other areas of responsibility such as data team meetings, coaching/mentoring other educators, facilitating or delivering professional development to educators, as well as examining artifacts of practice such as lesson plans, data collections, or other artifacts relevant to their instructional assignments.

In all observations of practice and corresponding artifacts examination, the evaluator will use the State of Connecticut's CCT rubric through which they will provide feedback and host conversations with the educator. Professional dialogue is a necessary part of the observation cycle. The feedback process is valuable and required for each observation. An evaluative rating will be assigned for performance and practice at the summative conference. Administrators are expected to gather and analyze evidence for all of the indicators identified and assign the rating at the domain level. Once assigned, the summative rating will be assigned according to the rubric below.

Summative Rating Guidelines for Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice

Rating	Criteria
Exemplary	Minimum of three exemplary ratings and no rating below proficient
Proficient	Minimum of three proficient ratings and no rating below standard
Developing	Minimum of two proficient ratings and not more than one rating below standard
Below Standard	Two or more ratings below standard

<u>10% Parent Feedback</u>

Ten percent (10%) of an educator's evaluation will be based on whole school parent feedback, including data from surveys. Surveys will be used to capture parent feedback that is anonymous and demonstrates purposeful fairness and validity.

The National School Climate Center's Comprehensive School Climate Inventory (CSCI) will be used as a source of data for this indicator. Westbrook will use the whole school approach to the parent survey in order to support goal setting within this category at the beginning of the school year, based on the scales of the surveys administered in late spring of each year. Administrators will set whole school goals, connected to each administrator's targets and educators will design strategies that they feel will contribute to goal attainment. Those strategies should take into consideration the educator's specific instructional assignments and their target goal. Feedback from parents in surveys will be aggregated and reviewed with comparisons year to year. Both educators and evaluators are asked to use their collective judgment in setting the improvement targets. Administrators/evaluators must base ratings on the areas of need identified by the whole school survey results and include evidence of the educator's use of strategies to address areas in need of improvement or areas that need to be sustained that are identified by survey results.

Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Did not meet the goal	Partially met the goal	Met the goal	Exceeded the goal

Summative Ratings

The WESTBROOK Development and Performance Plan uses the four- level matrix rating system that is now required by the State of Connecticut's SEED evaluation system for all educators.

The four areas discussed earlier are as follows:

Student Learning Achievement Measures (45%)

Exceeded	All or most students met or substantially exceeded the target(s) contained in the indicator(s).
Met	Most students met the target(s) contained in the indicators within a few points on either side of the target(s).
Partially met	Many students met the target(s) but a notable percentage missed the target by more than a few points. However, taken as a whole, significant progress towards the goal was made.
Did not meet	A few students met the target(s) but a substantial percentage of students did not. Little progress toward the goal was made.

Whole school student Learning (5%)

Below Standard	Developing	Accomplished	Exemplary
Did not meet the goal	Partially met the goal	Met the goal	Exceeded the goal

Teacher Performance and Practice (40 %)

Rating Guidelines for Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice by CCT Domain

Rating	Criteria
Exemplary	Minimum of three exemplary ratings and no rating below accomplished
Proficient	Minimum of three accomplished ratings and no rating below standard
Developing	Minimum of two accomplished rating and not more than one rating below standard
Below Standard	Two or more ratings below standard

Parent Feedback (10%)

Below Standard	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
Did not meet the goal	Partially met the goal	Met the goal	Exceeded the goal

These four areas are totaled as follows for the summative rating:

Teacher Performance and Practice	Student Outcomes and Learning
40% Observation of teacher performance and practice	45% Student Learning/achievement measures
10% Parent feedback	5% Whole school student Learning or student feedback
= 50%	= 50%
100% = Summative Rating	

In the aggregate the yearly summative evaluations must provide each Westbrook educator with a rating that is one of four performance evaluation designations: ***Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, Below Standard***.

The performance levels are 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

WESTBROOK evaluators will rate each educator's performance in each of the four categories as follows:

A. Performance
    a. Student learning/achievement metrics
    b. Whole school student learning
    c. Observation of teacher performance and practice
    d. Parent feedback
B. Combine the student learning/achievement measures and whole school student learning into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights. Arrive at an overall "Student Outcomes and Learning Rating"
C. Combine the Observation of teacher performance and practice rating and parent feedback rating, taking into account their relative weights. This will represent a "Teacher Performance and Practice Rating"
D. Identify the rating for each focus area and follow the respective column and row to the center of the table. The point of intersection indicates the summative rating. If the two focus areas are highly discrepant then the evaluator would examine the data and gather additional information in order to arrive at a rating.

Teacher Performance and Practice Rating				
		Exemplary	**Proficient**	**Developing**	***Below Standard***
Student Outcomes and Learning Rating	**Exemplary**	Exemplary	Exemplary	Proficient	*Gather Further Information*
	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	Proficient	*Gather further information*
	Developing	Proficient	Developing	Developing	Below Standard

	Below Standard	_Gather further information_	Below Standard	Below Standard	Below Standard

Westbrook administrators will complete state required evaluation training that will confirm their ability to use their professional judgment in determining a summative rating as above. Beginning teachers shall generally be deemed effective if the teachers receive at least two sequential "proficient" ratings, by the fourth year of a beginning teacher's career. It is expected for those teachers who receive tenure to have final summative ratings of "proficient" or "exemplary" in accordance with Connecticut's SEED system ratings and the Core requirements of the sanctioned rating system.

Westbrook Extended Evaluation Plan

When a tenured Westbrook educator's performance is rated in summation at Developing or Below Standard that individual will be required to work with their evaluator and WEA President (or designee) to design an intensive assistance professional development plan. The plan will be created within 30 days after the completion of the summative evaluation rating conference. Educators whose performance outcomes continue to warrant ratings below "Proficient" are not automatically assigned to the same Extended plan. As all educators' instructional assignments are made with the approval of the Superintendent of Schools, the Superintendent will recommend their assignment to an Extended Plan or recommend dismissal to the Board of Education.

Evaluation Criteria: The evaluation criteria are derived from the components of the Westbrook Development and Performance Plan:

Teacher Performance and Practice

  a. Observation of teacher performance and practice
  b. Parent feedback

Student Outcomes and Learning

  a. Student Learning/achievement measures
  b. Whole school student Learning or student feedback

Methods: The methods to evaluate are the same as those described above and include some of the following, depending on the areas of need:

 • Observations in a range of settings

- Examination of artifacts/student work
- Reflective conversations with supervisors, coaching
- Constructive, ongoing feedback
- Assistance and support from evaluator or designee
- Comprehensive goal setting

Time period: The timeframe for improvement is for teachers in the "Developing" category, there are 180 days (one year) to achieve a rating of "Proficient". For teachers with a rating of "Below Standard", the timeframe is 90 days or (1/2 year) to achieve a "Developing" rating and one year to achieve an "Proficient" rating.

Accountability: Documentation of evaluation criteria will include summative ratings supported by evidence. It may include strengths, areas needing improvement and recommended strategies for meeting any IAGD next steps. It may also include a recommendation regarding continued employment. Professional development in the form of in-service trainings, coaching, etc. should be part of this process.

Peer support: The primary support for staff in this format will be the administrator. Others, including peers, may provide additional supervision or assistance.

Evaluator: The evaluator for staff in this format will be an administrator.

Dispute-Resolution Process

When there is disagreement between evaluator and evaluate with respect to the evaluation process, efforts should be made to resolve the issue at the lowest possible level, potentially including other parties to assist in mediating the disagreement

In cases where mediation does not result in agreement between the evaluator and evaluatee (on goals/objectives, the evaluation period, feedback, or the professional development plan) a process is established as follows:

- The dispute will be referred to a subcommittee of the PDEC
  - The dispute resolution committee will consist of one representative from the PDEC selected by the superintendent, one representative of the PDEC selected by the collective bargaining unit, and one neutral party as mutually agreed upon between the superintendent and collective bargaining unit representative.
- In the event that the designated committee does not reach a unanimous decision, the issue shall be considered by the superintendent whose decision shall be binding.