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### TEACHER EVALUATION

### Introduction

Colchester’s Professional Growth and Evaluation Plan is aligned with the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation. It is based on research of best practice in educator evaluation, and was developed by the Colchester Professional Learning and Growth Committee and revised in April, 2018.

### Purpose and Rationale of the Evaluation System

When teachers succeed, students succeed. Research has proven that high-quality teachers are the most important factor in student success. To support our teachers, we have defined excellent practice and results, and will give accurate, useful information about teachers’ strengths and development areas, and provide opportunities for growth and recognition. The purpose of this evaluation model is to fairly and accurately evaluate teacher performance and to help each teacher strengthen his/her practice to improve student learning.

### Core Design Principles

The following principles guided the design of the teacher evaluation plan:

* *Consider multiple, standards-based measures of performance*

An evaluation system that uses multiple sources of information and evidence results in a fair, accurate and comprehensive picture of a teacher’s performance. Our plan defines four categories of teacher effectiveness: student learning (45%), teacher performance and practice (40%), parent feedback (10%) and school-wide student learning (5%).

* *Promote both professional judgment and consistency*

Assessing a teacher’s professional practice requires evaluators to constantly use their professional judgment. No rubric or formula, however detailed, can capture all of the nuances in how teachers interact with students, and synthesizing multiple sources of information into performance ratings is inherently more complex than checklists or numerical averages. Our plan aims to minimize the variance between school leaders’ evaluations of classroom practice and support fairness and consistency within and across schools.

* *Emphasize growth over time*

Summative ratings are intended to measure a teacher’s improvement in professional practice and the student outcomes he/she is striving to reach. This plan encourages teachers to focus on continually improving their practice.

* *Foster dialogue about student learning*

This model hinges on improving the professional conversation between and among teachers and administrators who are their evaluators. The dialogue focuses on what students are learning and what teachers and their administrators can do to support teaching and learning. We consider student growth and improvement over the school year the most critical aspect of this analysis.

* *Encourage aligned professional development, coaching and feedback to support teacher growth*

Novice and veteran teachers alike deserve detailed, constructive feedback and professional development, tailored to the individual needs of their classrooms and students. Our plan promotes a shared language of excellence to which professional development, coaching and feedback can align to improve practice.

* *Ensure feasibility of implementation*

Launching this plan requires hard work. Educators will need to develop new skills and to think differently about how they manage and prioritize their time and resources. The model aims to balance high expectations with flexibility for the time and capacity considerations.

**We believe a comprehensive teacher evaluation system must include:**

* Enhancement of professional practices
* Analysis of data
* Student feedback
* Impact on classroom, school, and community
* Identification of areas of strength
* Supports for improvement (including assistance from peers)
* Variety of outcomes in addition to test scores – to highlight student growth.
* Collaborative elements
* A teacher-driven purpose
* Suggestions to improve instruction
* Ideas to improve student learning
* Input from colleagues/peers in addition to administration
* Professional growth measures
* Observation of students’ learning
* Student feedback
* Teacher reflection on students’ learning
* Purposeful observation
* Reflection
* Professional learning and collaboration
* Continual refinement of professional practice

### Theory of Action: Professional Learning

***If*** *we as educators expand our understanding, refine our professional practices, analyze and reflect on student learning data and map student progress toward established standards,*

***Then*** *we will design and implement differentiated instruction to accommodate individual needs and provide timely and explicit feedback to students and families,*

***And then*** *our students will be the designers, producers, and evaluators of their own learning and they will maximize their opportunities and successes.*

Colchester Educators Believe…

* Teacher evaluation should be a process, not an annual event, which focuses on the teachers’ effectiveness in continually improving student learning.
* Creating a growth plan that is supportive and well understood by the teacher and aligned with the learning mission of the school promotes school-wide growth and learning.
* Teacher evaluation can best measure teacher effectiveness if it measures what the teacher deems as important; it must have a useful purpose for the teacher.
* Teacher evaluation can best measure teacher effectiveness if it “pushes” teachers to expand their understandings and refine their professional practices in order to help students become the designers, producers, and evaluators of their own learning.
* Teacher evaluation can best measure teacher effectiveness when it incorporates self and peer reflection, promotes examination of student work, and includes observation using research-based measures.
* Comprehensive teacher evaluation expands professional practices by promoting effective student learning through collaboration of colleagues, analysis of student learning data, and student feedback.
* Teacher evaluation must be based on a system that supports teachers in creating high expectation for all students, a positive academic and social climate, engaging opportunities, and civic-mindedness.
* Teacher evaluation can best measure teacher effectiveness by making it relevant to both teacher and student needs, validating a teacher’s strengths, recognizing how these can be used more efficiently, identifying weaknesses, and providing scaffolding towards improvement.
* The best measure of teacher effectiveness involves peer-driven analysis of professional practice, data- based assessment of the input of those practices on student growth, and qualitative reflection of how well our practices create an environment of learning.
* The best measure of teacher effectiveness supports teacher growth, facilitates collaboration, encourages teacher reflection, and evaluates the effectiveness of instruction as measured by student growth.
* Teacher evaluation must include purposeful observation and a deep knowledge of effective teaching practices.

### Evaluation and Support System Overview

The evaluation and support system consists of multiple measures to paint an accurate and comprehensive picture of teacher performance. All teachers will be evaluated in four categories, grouped in two major focus areas: Teacher Practice and Student Outcomes.

1. **Teacher Practice Related Indicators:** an evaluation of the core instructional practices and skills that positively affect student learning. This focus area is comprised of two categories:
	1. **Observation of teacher performance and practice (40%)** as defined in the Common Core of Teaching (CCT) Rubric for Effective Teaching, which articulates four domains and twelve indicators of teacher practice
	2. **Parent feedback (10%)** on teacher practice through surveys
2. **Student Outcomes Related Indicators:** an evaluation of teachers’ contribution to student academic progress at the school and classroom level. This focus area is comprised of two categories:
	1. **Student growth and development (45%)** as determined by the teacher’s Student Learning Objective (SLO) and 2 Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs).
	2. **Whole-school measures of student learning (5%)** as determined by aggregate student learning indicators

Scores from each of the four categories will be combined to produce a summative performance rating of Distinguished, Accomplished, Developing or Not Demonstrated. The performance levels are defined as:

**Distinguished** – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance

**Accomplished** – Meeting indicators of performance

**Developing** – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others

**Not Demonstrated** – Not meeting indicators of performance

Specialists will use rubrics created by the Professional Development and Evaluation Committee in the following areas:

* Therapeutic Specialists (speech pathologists, social workers, psychologists)
* Specialists (Literacy and Math Specialists)
* School Counselors
* Library Media Specialists

### Teacher Evaluation Process and Timeline

The annual evaluation process between a teacher and an evaluator is anchored by three performance conversations at the beginning, middle and end of the year. The purpose of these conversations is to clarify expectations for the evaluation process, provide comprehensive feedback to each teacher on his/her performance, set development goals and identify development opportunities. These conversations are collaborative and require reflection and preparation by both the evaluator and the teacher in order to be productive and meaningful.

A teacher who is hired after the start of the school year shall be placed on the non-tenured teacher observation cycle. The number of observations may be prorated at a minimum of one (1) observation for every sixty (60) days remaining in the academic year, as mutually agreed upon by the teacher and evaluator. The teacher will meet with his or her evaluator to set performance and practice, parent feedback, and student growth and development goals. The teacher and evaluator shall set goals that are achievable in the time remaining in the academic year. Long-term substitutes will not be evaluated using Student Learning Outcome, Parent Feedback, or Whole School Indicator goals.



Goal-Setting and Planning:

Timeframe: Target is October 15; must be completed by **November 15**

1. *Orientation on Process* – To begin the evaluation process, evaluators meet with teachers, in a group or individually, to review the evaluation process and their roles and responsibilities within it. In this meeting, they will discuss parent feedback goals for the year, and they will establish time set aside for the types of collaboration required by the evaluation process. New staff members will receive an orientation at the New Teacher Academy in August.
2. *Teacher Reflection and Goal-Setting* – Teachers examine student data, prior year evaluation and survey results and the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching to draft a student learning goal for the school year. The teacher may collaborate in grade-level or subject-area teams to support the goal-setting process.
3. G*oal-Setting Conference* – The evaluator and teacher meet to discuss the teacher’s proposed SLO and IAGDs in order to arrive at mutual agreement. Additional dialog about the teacher’s practice may be used to establish a performance and practice area of focus, based on evidence from the previous year. The evaluator may request revisions to the proposed goals and objectives if they do not meet approval criteria.

Mid-Year Check-In:

Timeframe: **January and February**

1. *Reflection and Preparation* – The teacher and evaluator collect and reflect on evidence to date about the teacher’s practice and student learning in preparation for the check-in.
2. *Mid-Year Conference* – The evaluator and teacher check in at mid-year to review progress on student learning goals, and performance to date. The mid-year conference is the time for addressing concerns and reviewing results for the first half of the year. Evaluators can deliver mid-year formative information on components of the evaluation framework for which evidence has been gathered and analyzed. If needed, teachers and evaluators can mutually agree to revisions on the strategies or approaches used and/or mid-year adjustment of student learning goals to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignment). They also discuss actions that the teacher can take and supports the evaluator can provide to promote teacher growth in his/her development areas. For tenured teachers who have been rated *Accomplished* or *Distinguished* and who do not wish to change their SLO’s, a face-to-face meeting is optional upon mutual agreement of the evaluator; however mid –year reflections and uploads of documents must occur. **Administrators will complete a review of practice and provide feedback to teachers at this point in the year**; teachers will complete a reflection to include an assessment of their progress on performance and practice goals, professional learning, parent communication, collaboration with colleagues, and other experiences beyond the classroom.

End-of-Year Summative Review:

Timeframe: May and June; must be completed by **June 30**

1. *Teacher Self-Assessment* – The teacher reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the evaluator. This self- assessment may focus on the areas for development established in the goal-setting conference.
2. *Scoring* – The evaluator reviews submitted evidence, self-assessments and observation data to generate ratings. The category ratings generate the final, summative rating. After all data, including student achievement data, are available, the evaluator may adjust the summative rating. Such revisions should take place as soon as data are available and before September 15.
3. *End-of-Year Conference* – The evaluator and the teacher meet to discuss all evidence collected to date, and a review of practice is finalized. After discussing category ratings, the evaluator assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation before June 30.

### Primary Evaluators

The primary evaluator for most teachers will be the school principal or assistant principal, who will be responsible for the overall evaluation process, including assigning summative ratings. District administrators may assist the primary evaluator by conducting observations, collecting additional evidence, reviewing student learning smart goals and providing additional feedback.

Primary evaluators will have sole responsibility for assigning final summative ratings.

### Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing

All evaluators are required to complete extensive training on the evaluation model. The district will provide calibration opportunities throughout the year to support administrators in implementing the model across their schools. This comprehensive training and support will ensure that evaluators are proficient in conducting teacher evaluations.

At the request of a district or employee, the Superintendent of Schools or other district administrator will review evaluation ratings that include dissimilar ratings in different categories (e.g., include both *Distinguished* and *Not Demonstrated* ratings). In these cases, the third party will determine a final summative rating.

### SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT

As a standalone, evaluation cannot hope to improve teaching practice and student learning. However, when paired with effective, relevant and timely support, the evaluation process has the potential to help move teachers along the path to distinguished practice.

### Evaluation-Informed Professional Learning

We learn and grow by honestly co-assessing current performance, setting clear goals for future performance, and outlining the supports needed to close the gap. Every teacher will identify professional learning needs with his/her evaluator; this serves as the foundation for ongoing conversations about the teacher’s practice and impact on student outcomes. The professional learning opportunities identified for each teacher should be based on the individual strengths and needs that are identified through the evaluation process. The process may also reveal areas of common need among teachers, which can then be targeted with school-wide professional development opportunities, book study groups, shared videos, and other supports.

### Improvement Support

If a tenured teacher’s performance is rated as *Developing* in any domain, the administrator, with the teacher, will identify a plan including resources, support, and other strategies to be provided to address documented deficiencies. The support plan is intended to provide short-term assistance to address a concern in its early stage. Teachers may avail themselves of support from Colchester professional colleagues, union representatives, or mentors as they embark on the plan.

Because Colchester staff members pride themselves in being lifelong learners and reflective practitioners, it is expected that teachers will avail themselves of the support provided by administrators. An ongoing list of resources will be maintained for teacher reference both on the district web site and in Appendix B. Administrators may indicate a timeline for implementing such resources and other strategies in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued.

### Career Development and Growth

Rewarding distinguished performance identified through the evaluation process with opportunities for career development and professional growth is a critical step in both building confidence in the evaluation system itself and in building the capacity of all teachers.

Examples of such opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring early-career teachers; participating in development of teacher improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is *Developing* or *Not Demonstrated*; leading Professional Learning

Communities; differentiated career pathways; and focused professional development based on goals for continuous growth and development.

### Remediation and Intensive Assistance Plans

If a tenured educator’s performance is rated as *Not Demonstrated* in any domain or overall performance is rated *Developing* or *Not Demonstrated,* the educator will receive remediation assistance designed in consultation with the teacher and the union representative. The support is intended to assist an educator who is having difficulty constantly demonstrating proficiency, and may include specialized professional development, increased supervisory observations and /or other strategies.

An educator will receive intensive assistance when he/she does not meet the goal of the remediation plan. The support is intended to build the educator’s competency.

Intensive assistance plans will be developed collaboratively and will:

* Identify targeted supports in consultation with the teacher, which may include specialized professional development, collegial assistance, administrative assistance, increased supervisory observations and feedback, and/or special strategies aligned to the improvement outcomes.
* Clearly delineate goals linked to specific indicators and domains within the observation of practice framework rubric that specify what the teacher must demonstrate at the conclusion of the plan in order to be considered “*accomplished.”*
* Indicate a timeline for implementation in the course of the same school year as the plan is developed.
* Include indicators of success, including a rating of *accomplished* or better at the end of the plan.

### Intensive Support and Teacher Effectiveness

Intensive support plans will be developed by the evaluator in consultation with the teacher for any tenured teacher receiving a summative rating or observation of practice rating of *Not Demonstrated* or *Developing.*  The plan may include: additional observations of practice either formal or informal, suggestions for professional growth, and release time for observations of colleagues, among other supports. The teacher may invite Colchester colleagues, union representation, or mentors to meetings where such a plan is developed. Ratings of *Developing* in either summative or Teacher Observation of Practice over two years may be grounds for dismissal based on Colchester’s definition of teacher effectiveness.

### Dispute Resolution Process

After the teacher has brought concerns to the evaluator, if there is no resolution, a panel, composed of the Director of Teaching and Learning, Colchester Federation of Teachers President and a neutral third person evaluated under the Colchester teacher evaluation plan, and as mutually agreed upon by the evaluator and teacher, shall meet to resolve disputes. Disputes may occur where the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on the objectives/ goals, the evaluation period, feedback on performance and practice, or final summative rating. Resolutions must be topic-specific and timely. The end result will be documented and placed in the teacher’s file, with a copy sent to the Superintendent of Schools.

Should the process not result in resolution of the issue, a determination will be made by the Superintendent of Schools.

### TEACHER PRACTICE RELATED INDICATORS

The teacher practice related indicators portion of the Colchester Teacher Evaluation model

evaluates the teacher’s knowledge of a complex set of skills and competencies and how these are applied in a teacher’s practice. It is comprised of two categories:

* Teacher Performance and Practice, which counts for 40%; and
* Parent Feedback, which counts for 10%. These categories will be described in detail below.

### Category #1: Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)

The Teacher Performance and Practice category of the model is a comprehensive review of teaching practice against a rubric of practice, based on multiple observations. It comprises 40% of the summative rating. Following observations, evaluators provide teachers with specific feedback to identify teacher development needs and tailor support to those needs.

***Teacher Practice Framework***

The CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching represents the most important skills and knowledge that educators need to successfully educate each and every student. The CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching is aligned with the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching and includes Common Core State Standards throughout the domains. Rating levels on the rubric have been adapted for this plan. A copy of the rubric appears at the end of the document.

The CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching is organized into 4 domains, each with 3 indicators. 40% of a teacher’s final evaluation is based on their performance across these domains. The domains represent essential practice and knowledge and receive equal weight when calculating the summative Performance and Practice rating.

***Observation Process***

Observation Process

Feedback based on observations help teachers to reach their full potential. All teachers deserve the opportunity to grow and develop through observation and timely feedback. The type of observations included in this growth plan are defined below.

A **scheduled formal observation** will last at least thirty (30) minutes and be scripted and rated by the evaluator. The observation will be accompanied by a pre observation conference and the upload of lesson plans, as well as a post observation conference and the upload of a teacher reflection and relevant student work/assessment data. The evaluator will provide written feedback to the teacher documented in EdReflect within one (1) week of the teacher’s upload of pertinent documents.

A **non-scheduled formal observation** will last at least thirty (30) minutes and be scripted and rated by the evaluator. The observation will be accompanied by a post observation conference and the upload of a teacher reflection and relevant student work/assessment data. The evaluator will provide written feedback to the teacher documented in EdReflect within one (1) week of the teacher’s upload of pertinent documents.

An **informal observation** will be a scheduled or unscheduled observation that lasts at least 10 minutes. The observation will not be rated, but will be accompanied by written (e.g., email, scripted notes, a quick note left in the teacher’s mailbox) and/or verbal feedback (e.g., a post conference; a conversation in the hallway) to the teacher.

Non-tenured Teachers

Each non-tenured teacher will be observed formally three (3) times per year.  Of the three (3) formal observations, two (2) will be scheduled formal observations and one (1) will be a non-scheduled formal observation. Each non-tenured teacher will also engage in at least one (1) non-classroom review of practice with his or her evaluator. The summative ratings from the formal observations during the teacher’s last year of non-tenure will remain in place for the first year of his or her tenure.

Tenured Teachers

Cycle One

Tenured teachers on cycle one will be responsible for scheduling one (1) formal observation with his or her evaluator. The tenured teacher will also engage in at least one (1) non-classroom review of practice with his or her evaluator. The summative ratings from the formal observation during cycle one will remain in place for cycles two and three. If an evaluator sees a cause for concern in classroom practice, he or she may determine the need for additional observations.

Cycles Two and Three

Tenured teachers on cycle two or three will be informally observed at least three (3) times in the classroom. The tenured teacher will also engage in at least one (1) non-classroom review of practice with his or her evaluator. If an evaluator sees a cause for concern in classroom practice, he or she shall perform an additional informal observation. If, after additional informal observation, the evaluator continues to see a cause for concern, the evaluator shall meet with the teacher and may determine the need to perform one or more scheduled or non-scheduled formal observation(s). Ratings from the formal observation(s) will replace the ratings that were carried-over from cycle one.

A teacher who is deemed effective at the end of his or her period of non-tenure in district shall be placed on cycle three in the first year of his or her tenure. A tenured teacher who is deemed effective and experiences a change in his or her teaching assignment, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, will be placed on cycle three in the next year.

A tenured teacher whose summative ratings in the previous year is ***Not Demonstrated*** or ***Developing*** will have one (1) scheduled formal observation, two (2) non-scheduled formal observations, and one (1) non-classroom review of practice in the next year. A tenured teacher whose summative rating in the previous year is rated as ***Accomplished*** or ***Distinguished*** will move on to the next observation cycle.



Pre-conferences and Post-Conferences

Pre-conferences are valuable for giving context for the lesson and information about the students to be observed and for setting expectations for the observation process. A pre-conference can be held with a group of teachers, or can be an online sharing of lesson plans.

Post-conferences provide a forum for reflecting on the observation against the CCT Rubric and for generating action steps that will lead to the teacher's improvement. A good post-conference:

* begins with an opportunity for the teacher to share his/her self-assessment of the lesson observed;
* cites objective evidence to paint a clear picture for both the teacher and the evaluator about the teacher’s successes, what improvements will be made, and where future observations may focus;
* involves written and verbal feedback from the evaluator; and
* occurs within two days of the observation.

Non-Classroom Reviews of Practice

Interactions with teachers that are relevant to their instructional practice and professional conduct may contribute to their performance evaluations. These interactions may include, but are not limited to, reviews of lesson/unit plans and assessments, planning meetings, data team meetings, professional learning community meetings, call-logs or notes from parent-teacher meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, and attendance records from professional development or school-based activities/events.

Teachers will upload information regarding their professional practice and administrators will hold an official review of practice at the mid-year and summative conference. Other reviews of practice are ongoing during the year, as evaluators interact with educators at data team meetings, PLCs and other school events.

Feedback

The goal of feedback is to help teachers grow as educators and become more effective with each and every one of their students. With this in mind, evaluators should be clear and direct, presenting their comments in a way that is supportive and constructive. Feedback should include:

* specific evidence and ratings, where appropriate, on observed components of the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support;
* prioritized commendations and recommendations for development actions;
* next steps and supports the teacher can pursue to improve his/her practice; and
* a timeframe for follow up.

Providing both verbal and written feedback after an observation is ideal, but not required.

***Teacher Performance and Practice Goal-Setting***

Teachers may develop practice and performance goals aligned to the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching if they wish to obtain feedback in a specific area.

Goals should have a clear link to student achievement and should move the teachers towards *Accomplished* or *Distinguished* on the CCT Rubric. Careful examination of the rubric prior to an observation will ensure that teachers understand what effective instruction entails.

Progress towards goals and action steps for achieving progress should be referenced in feedback conversations following observations throughout the year. Goals and action steps can be formally discussed during the Mid-Year Conference and the End-of-Year Conference.

***Teacher Performance and Practice Scoring***

Individual Observations

Evaluators are not required to provide an overall rating for each observation, but they should provide ratings and evidence for the components that were observed. During observations, evaluators will take evidence-based notes, capturing specific instances of what the teacher and students said and did in the classroom. Evidence-based notes are factual (e.g., the teacher asks: Which events precipitated the fall of Rome?) and not judgmental (e.g., the teacher asks good questions). Once the evidence has been recorded, the evaluator can align the evidence with the appropriate component(s) on the rubric and then make a judgment about which performance level the evidence supports.

**Summative Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice Rating**

Primary evaluators must determine a final teacher performance and practice rating and discuss this rating with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference. Each domain of the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching carries equal weight in the final rating. The final teacher performance and practice rating will be calculated by the evaluator in a three-step process:

1. Evaluator holistically reviews evidence collected through observations and interactions (e.g., team meetings, conferences) and uses professional judgment to determine indicator ratings for each of the 12 indicators.
2. The software system averages indicators within each domain to a tenth of a decimal to calculate domain- level scores of 1.0-4.0.
3. The software system averages domain scores to calculate an overall Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice rating of 1.0-4.0.

Each step is illustrated below:

1. Evaluator holistically reviews evidence collected through observations and reviews of practice and uses professional judgment to determine indicator ratings for each of the 12 indicators.

By the end of the year, evaluators should have collected a variety of evidence on teacher practice from the year’s observations and interactions. Evaluators then analyze the consistency, trends and significance of the evidence to determine a rating for each of the 12 indicators. Some questions to consider while analyzing the evidence include:

* + **Consistency:** What rating have I seen relatively uniform, homogenous evidence for throughout the semester/year? Does the evidence paint a clear, unambiguous picture of the teacher’s performance in this area?
	+ **Trends:** Have I seen improvement over time that overshadows earlier observation outcomes? Have I seen regression or setbacks over time that overshadows earlier observation outcomes?
	+ **Significance:** Are some data more valid than others? (Do I have notes or ratings from “meatier” lessons or interactions where I was able to better assess this aspect of performance?)

Once a rating has been determined, it is then translated to a 1-4 score. See example below for Domain 2:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Domain 2** | **Indicator Rating** | **Evaluator’s Score** |
| **2a** | *Developing* | 2 |
| **2b** | *Developing* | 2 |
| **2c** | *Accomplished* | 3 |
| **Average Score** |  | 2.3 |

1. Indicators are scored within each domain to a tenth of a decimal to calculate domain- level scores:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Domain** | **Averaged Domain-Level Score** |
| **1** | 2.3 |
| **2** | 2.6 |
| **3** | 3.0 |
| **4** | 2.8 |
| **Average Score** | 2.7 |

1. Domain scores are averaged to calculate an overall observation of Teacher Performance and Practice rating of 1.0-4.0.

Steps 2 and 3 will be performed by using tools/technology that calculate the averages for the evaluator.

The summative Teacher Performance and Practice component rating and the indicator ratings will be shared and discussed with teachers during the End-of-Year Conference. This process can also be followed in advance of the Mid-Year Conference to discuss formative progress related to the Teacher Performance and Practice rating.

### Category #2: Parent Feedback (10%)

Feedback from parents will be used to help determine the remaining 10% of the Teacher Practice Indicators focus area.

The process described below focuses on:

1. conducting a whole-school parent survey (meaning data is aggregated at the school level);
2. determining school-level parent goals based on the survey feedback;
3. teacher and evaluator identifying **one** related parent engagement goal and identifying effective parent communication strategies;
4. collecting evidence of the teacher’s implementation of strategies to improve the parent goal.
5. determining a teacher’s summative rating. This parent feedback rating shall be based on four performance levels.
6. Administration of a Whole-School Parent Survey

Parent surveys will be conducted and aggregated at the whole-school level to ensure adequate response rates from parents.

Parent surveys will be administered in a way that allows parents to feel comfortable providing feedback without fear of retribution. Surveys will be confidential and survey responses will not be tied to parents’ names. The parent survey should be administered yearly and trends analyzed from year-to-year. Parent surveys will be anonymous and demonstrate fairness, reliability, validity and usefulness.

1. Determining School-Level Parent Goals

Principals and teachers will review the parent survey results at the beginning of the school year to identify areas of need and set general parent engagement goals based on the survey results. Ideally, this goal-setting process would occur between the principal and teachers (possibly during faculty meetings) in August or September so agreement could be reached on improvement goals for the entire school.

1. Selecting a Parent Engagement Goal and Improvement Targets

After these school-level goals have been set, teachers will determine through consultation and mutual agreement with their evaluators strategies they would like to pursue as part of their contribution to the school’s parent engagement goal. Possible strategies include improving communication with parents, helping parents become more effective in support of homework, improving parent-teacher conferences, sending more regular correspondence to parents such as sending bi-weekly updates to parents, developing a new website for their class, and so on. Part of the evaluator’s job is to ensure (1) the goal is related to the overall school improvement parent goals.

1. Measuring Progress on Growth Targets

A teacher will measure and demonstrate progress on growth targets by measuring how successfully they implement the strategy

1. Arriving at a Parent Feedback Rating

The Parent Feedback rating should reflect the degree to which a teacher successfully implements the strategies to accomplish the school Parent Feedback Rating established based on the post survey. This is accomplished through a review of evidence provided by the teacher and application of the following scale:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Distinguished (4)** | **Accomplished (3)** | **Developing (2)** | **Not Demonstrated (1)** |
| Exceeded the goalTeacher successfully implemented several strategies to address the area of need and brings data to the end of year meeting.School Exceeded its goal | Met the goalTeacher successfully implemented strategies to address the area of need and brings data to the end of year meeting.School met its goal. | Partially met the goalTeacher successfully implemented some strategies to address the area of need or addressed the area of need with some, not all parents. Teacher brings some data to the end of year meeting .School met its goal, but teacher did not address the need or school partially met its goal. | Did not meet the goalTeacher implemented few strategies to address the area of need or brings no data to the end of year meeting. School met its goal but teacher did not contribute or school did not meet its goal. |

### STUDENT OUTCOMES RELATED INDICATORS

The Student Outcomes Related Indicators captures the teacher’s impact on students. Every teacher is in the profession to help children learn and grow, and teachers already think carefully about what knowledge, skills and talents they are responsible for nurturing in their students each year. As a part of their evaluation process, teachers will document those aspirations and anchor them in data.

Student Related Indicators includes two categories:

* + Student growth and development, which counts for 45%; and
	+ Whole-school student learning counts for 5% of the total evaluation rating. These categories will be described in detail below.

### Category #3: Student Growth and Development (45%)

***Overview of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)***

Each teacher’s students, individually and as a group, are different from other teachers’ students, even in the same grade level or subject at the same school. For student growth and development to be measured for teacher evaluation purposes, it is imperative to use a method that takes each teacher’s assignment, students and context into account. **Student Learning Objectives (SLOs)** is the approach for measuring student growth during the school year. SLO’s are carefully planned, long-term academic goals. They should reflect high expectations for learning and improvement and aim for mastery of content or skill development.

SLO’s are measured by **Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs),** which include specific targets for student growth. Research has found that educators who set high quality targets often realize greater improvement in student performance. Teachers may develop goals through collaboration with colleagues in the same grade level or teaching the same course. SLO’s will serve as a reference point throughout the year as teachers document their students’ progress toward achieving the IAGD targets.

The SLO process will support teachers in using a planning cycle that will be familiar to most educators:

SLO Phase I: Learn about this year’s students

SLO Phase 2: Set goals for student learning

SLO Phase 3: Monitor students’ progress

SLO Phase 4: Assess student outcomes relative to goals

The four SLO phases are described in detail below:

**PHASE 1: REVIEW THE DATA**

Teachers examine their rosters and multiple sources of data about their students’ performance to identify an area of need. Determining where students are at the beginning of the year is a key aspect of this step. Teachers may use initial performance samples (writing, pre-assessments), student scores on previous standardized assessments, results from non-standardized assessments, results of diagnostic assessments, artifacts from previous learning, IEPs and 504 plans, data related to ELL and gifted students, and attendance and behavior data. It is important that the teacher understand both the individual student and group strengths and challenges.

**PHASE 2: SET AT LEAST ONE SLO**

1. Decide on a Student Learning Objective, core areas, domain, knowledge and skills students are expected to acquire. Each should address a central purpose of the teacher’s assignment and pertain to a large portion of his/ her students. Each should reflect high expectations for student learning.
2. Select IAGD’s – specific evidence with a quantitative target demonstrating whether the SLO was met. The SLO must have 2 IAGDs, one using standardized data, if available, and one using non-standardized data.

Colchester will not require that 22.5% of a teacher’s summative rating incorporate state test data. T he 45% student growth and development component will be comprised of 22.5% standardized assessments for those grades and subjects where available and appropriate, and the other 22.5% will be based on one non- standardized indicator.

If there are no standardized assessments available and appropriate, the educator’s entire 45% student learning outcomes will be based on non -standardized indicators in the 2015-16 school year.

A **standardized assessment** is characterized by the following attributes:

* Administered and scored in a consistent – or “standard” – manner;
* Aligned to a set of academic or performance “standards;”
* Broadly-administered (such as district-wide);
* Commercially-produced; and
* Often administered two or three times per year.

Since indicator targets are calibrated for the teacher’s particular students, teachers with similar assignments may use the same evidence for their indicators, but they would be unlikely to have identical targets. For example, all 2nd grade teachers in a district might use the same reading assessment as their IAGD, but the performance target and/or the proportion of students expected to achieve proficiency would likely vary among 2nd grade teacher

1. *Provide Additional Information*

During the goal-setting process, teachers and evaluators will document the following:

* + - Selected student population
		- Learning content aligned to relevant standards
		- Interval of instruction for the SLO
		- Baseline data that was used to set each IAGD
		- Assessments teacher plans to gauge students’ progress
		- Instructional strategies
1. *Submit SLOs to Evaluator for Approval*

SLOs are proposals until the evaluator approves them. While teachers and evaluators should confer during the goal-setting process to select mutually agreed-upon SLOs, ultimately, the evaluator must formally approve all SLO proposals.

SLOs will be examined relative to the above criteria so that SLOs across subjects, grade levels and schools are rigorous and comparable.

**PHASE 3: MONITOR STUDENT PROGRESS**

Once SLOs are approved, teachers should monitor students’ progress towards the objectives. They can, for example, examine student work products, administer interim assessments and track students’ accomplishments and struggles. Teachers can share their interim findings with colleagues during collaborative time, and they can keep their evaluator apprised of progress. Progress and action steps for achieving progress should be referenced in feedback conversations throughout the year.

If a teacher’s assignment changes or if his/her student population shifts significantly, the SLOs can be adjusted during the Mid-Year Conference between the evaluator and the teacher.

**PHASE 4: ASSESS STUDENT OUTCOMES RELATIVE TO SLOs**

At the end of the school year, the teacher should collect the evidence required by their indicators and upload evidence to the data management software system for review by their evaluator. Along with the evidence, teachers will complete and submit a self-assessment which asks teachers to reflect on the SLO outcomes by responding to the following four statements:

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

Evaluators will review the evidence and the teacher’s self-assessment and assign one of four ratings to each SLO: Exceeded (4 points), Met (3 points), Partially Met (2 points), or Did Not Meet (1 point). These ratings are defined as follows: (A teacher with a very small case load, under 10 students, will determine the percentage of students jointly with the evaluator.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Exceeded (4)** | 90% or more of the students met the target contained in the indicator with some students exceeding the target. |
| **Met (3)** | 80% or more of the students met the target(s) contained in the indicators within a few points on either side of the target. |
| **Partially Met (2)** | Many students (60-79%) met the target, but a notable percentage missed the target by more than a few points. However, taken as a whole, some progress towards the goal was made. |
| **Did Not Meet (1)** | A few students but less than 60% met the target; a substantial percentage of students did not. Little progress toward the goal was made. |

The individual SLO ratings will be shared and discussed with teachers at the End-Of-Year Conference.

NOTE: In the event that standardized results are not be available in time to score the SLO prior to the June 30 deadline, if evidence for other indicators in the SLO is available, the evaluator can score the SLO on that basis. The evaluation rating can be amended at that

time as needed, but no later than September 15. See Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring for details.

### Category #4: Whole-School Student Learning Indicator

A teacher’s indicator rating shall be equal to the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the administrator’s evaluation rating at that school. Pending U.S. Department of Education’s approval of Connecticut’s request for flexibility on the use of student test data in 2014-15, Colchester will not require that the administrator’s student learning component incorporate SPI progress. Therefore, this rating will be based on the administrator’s aggregate progress on SLO targets, which will correlate to the full student learning rating on an administrator’s evaluation (equal to 45% component of the administrator’s final rating).

### SUMMATIVE TEACHER EVALUATION SCORING

***Sum******mative Scoring***

The individual summative teacher evaluation rating will be based on the four categories of performance, grouped in two major focus areas: Student Outcomes Related Indicators and Teacher Practice Related Indicators.

TEACHER SUMMATIVE RATING

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| STUDENT OUTCOMES | Student Growth and Development 45% |
| Whole School Student Learning 5% |
| TEACHER PRACTICE | Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice 40% |
| Parent Feedback 10% |

Every educator will receive one of four ratings:

**Distinguished** – Substantially exceeding indicators of performance

**Accomplished** – Meeting indicators of performance

**Developing** – Meeting some indicators of performance but not others

**Not Demonstrated** – Not meeting indicators of performance The rating will be determined using the following steps:

1. Calculate a Teacher Practice Related Indicators score by combining the observation of

teacher performance and practice score and the parent feedback score

1. Calculate a Student Outcomes Related Indicators score by combining the student growth and development score and whole-school student learning indicator
2. Use Summative Matrix to determine Summative Rating

Each step is illustrated below:

1. Calculate a **Teacher Practice Related Indicators** rating by combining the observation of teacher performance and practice score and the parent feedback score.

The observation of teacher performance and practice counts for 40% of the total rating and parent feedback counts for 10% of the total rating. Simply multiply these weights by the category scores to get the category points, rounding to a whole number where necessary.

The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Score (1-4)** | **Weight** | **Points (score x weight)** |
| Observation of Teacher Performance and Practice | 2.8 | 40 | 112 |
| Parent Feedback | 3 | 10 | 30 |
| **TOTAL TEACHER PRACTICE RELATED INDICATORS POINTS** | **142** |

**Rating Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Teacher Practice Indicators Points** | **Teacher Practice Indicators Rating** |
| 50-80 | Not Demonstrated |
| 81-126 | Developing |
| 127-174 | Accomplished |
| 175-200 | Distinguished |

1. Calculate a **Student Outcomes Related Indicators** rating by combining the student growth and development score and whole-school student learning indicator.

The student growth and development category counts for 45% of the total rating and the whole-school student learning indicator counts for 5% of the total rating. Simply multiply these weights by the category scores to get the focus area points. The points are then translated to a rating using the rating table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Score (1-4)** | **Weight** | **Points** |
| Student Growth and Development (SLO) | 3.5 | 45 | 158 |
| Whole School Student Learning Indicator | 3 | 5 | 15 |
| **TOTAL STUDENT OUTCOMES RELATED INDICATORS POINTS** | **173** |

**Rating Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points** | **Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating** |
| 50-80 | Not Demonstrated |
| 81-126 | Developing |
| 127-174 | Accomplished |
| 175-200 | Distinguished |

1. Use the Summative Matrix to determine Summative Rating

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. For the example provided, the Teacher Practice Related Indicators rating is *Accomplished* and the Student Outcomes Related Indicators rating is *Accomplished*. The summative rating is therefore *Accomplished*. If the two focus areas are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of

*Distinguished* for Teacher Practice and a rating of *Not Demonstrated* for Student Outcomes), then the evaluator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to make a summative.

***Summative***

***Rating MMatrix***

***Teacher Practice Related Indicators Rating***

**Distinguished Accomplished**

**Developing**

**Not**

**Demonstrated**

**Distinguished Distinguished Distinguished Accomplished** *Gather*

*further information*

**Accomplished Distinguished Accomplished Accomplished**

**Developing**

**Developing**

**Accomplished Accomplished**

**Developing**

**Developing**

**Not**

**Demonstrated**

*Gather*

*further information*

**Developing**

**Developing**

**Not**

**Demonstrated**

Adjustment of Summative Rating Summative ratings must be completed for all teachers by June 30 of a given school year. Should data not be available at the time of a final rating, a rating must be completed based on evidence that is available. The evaluator may recalculate the teacher’s summative rating and submit the adjusted rating no later than September 15 in the event that data is unavailable in June. These adjustments should inform goal setting in the new school year.

***Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating***

### Definition of Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness

Non-tenured teachers shall generally be deemed effective if the educator receives at least two sequential *Accomplished* summative ratings, one of which must be earned in the fourth year of a beginning teacher’s career. A *Not Demonstrated* rating may be permitted in the first year of a novice teacher’s career, assuming a pattern of growth of *Developing* in year two and two sequential *Accomplished* ratings in years three and four.

Superintendents shall offer a contract to any educator deemed effective at the end of year four. This shall be accomplished through the specific issuance to that effect.

A post-tenure educator shall generally be deemed effective if said educator receives summative *Accomplished* ratings and the observation of practice for the school year is rated *Accomplished.* Two summative *Developing* ratings or one summative *Not Demonstrated* rating at any time would deem the educator **Ineffective.**

If after one formal classroom observation a post-tenure teacher is rated *Developing,* an additional observation may be provided. By mid-year the teacher will receive intensive support and will create a mutually-developed individualized plan for improvement if the classroom observation score remains *Developing.*

###

### Colchester Teacher Evaluation Committee Members, 2014-15

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Names** | **Role** | **School** |
| Katherine Shaughnessy | Director of Pupil Services | District |
| Barbara Gilbert | Director of Teaching and Learning | District |
| Linda Iacobellis | Assistant Principal | Bacon Academy |
| Christine Troup | Reading Specialist | Bacon Academy |
| Carol Hale | Math Teacher | Bacon Academy |
| Jo-Ann Campbell | Technology Education teacher | Bacon Academy |
| Garrett Dukette | Administrative Intern | Bacon Academy |
| Amity Goss | Assistant Principal | Colchester Elementary |
| Tammy Boyd | Classroom Teacher | Colchester Elementary |
| Katherine Wonderly | School psychologist | Colchester Elementary |
| Susan Hawkins | Classroom Teacher | Colchester Elementary |
| Lorraine Tierney | Speech Pathologist | Colchester Elementary |
| Linda Rhodes | Assistant Principal | Colchester Elementary |
| Deborah Sandberg | Principal | Jack Jackter Intermediate |
| Patty Tedford | Math Teacher | Jack Jackter Intermediate |
| Rose Poirier | Special Education Teacher | Jack Jackter Intermediate |
| Jennifer Totten | Classroom Teacher | Jack Jackter Intermediate |
| Maddalena Scrivano | Math teacher | William Johnston Middle |
| Marcy Lavoie | Social Studies Teacher | William Johnston Middle |
| Michele Lane | Information Technology | William Johnston Middle |
| Frank Newman | Math Specialist | William Johnston Middle |
| Frank Gionfriddo | Special Educator; Union  | William Johnston Middle |

### Appendix A: SLO Development Guide

|  |
| --- |
| **Teacher: Reviewer:****SLO Title: Date:** **Content area: School:** |
| **SLO Development Rubric** |
| **SLO Focus Statement***What will you teach in the SLO? What is the expectation for student improvement related to school improvement goals?* |
| SLO focus statement describes a broad goal for student learning and expected student improvement. Reflects high expectations for student improvement and aims for mastery of content or skill development.  |
| **Baseline – Trend Data***What data were reviewed for this SLO? How does the data support the SLO?* |
| Identifies ***source(s)*** of data about student performance, including pre-assessment, trend data, historical data, prior grades, feedback from parents and previous teachers, and other baseline dataSummarizes student data to ***demonstrate specific student need*** for the learning content tied to specific standards ***(including strengths and weaknesses)*** |
| **Student Population***Who are you going to include in this objective? Why is this target group/student selected?* |
| Justifies why this class and/or targeted group was selected, ***as supported by data comparing the identified population of students to a broader context of students*** (i.e., other classes, previous year’s students, etc.)Includes a large proportion of students including specific target groups where appropriate |
| **Standards and Learning Content***What are the standards connected to the learning content?* |
| SLO is a goal for student learning that identifies ***big and core*** ideas, domains, knowledge, and/or skills students are expected to acquire***for which baseline data indicate a need******Aligns to specific*** applicable standards (Connecticut Core Standards, SBAC Claims, National or industry standards) |
| **Interval of Instruction***What is the time period that instruction for the learning content will occur?* |
| Specifies ***start and stop dates*** which includes the majority of the course length |
| **Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs)/Growth Targets***What are the quantitative targets that will demonstrate achievement of the SLO?* |
| Sets individual or differentiated growth targets/IAGDs for a large proportion of students that are rigorous, attainable, and ***meets*** or ***exceeds*** district expectations (rigorous targets reflect both greater depth of knowledge and complexity of thinking required for success) Baseline and trend data support established targets.1 growth target is based on standardized test data where available.Describes characteristics of student population ***with numeric specificity*** including special needs relevant to the IAGD (e.g., I have 6 English language learners, 4 students with reading disabilities…) |
| **Assessments***How will you measure the outcome of your IAGD?* |
| Identifies ***by specific name*** the pre-assessments, post-assessments, and/or performance measures Aligns ***most*** of the assessment items or rubric criteria to the learning content tightlyAssessment or performance measure is designed to assess student learning objectively.Includes ***a majority*** of constructed-response items ***and*** higher order thinking skills Performance measures allow all students to demonstrate application of their knowledge/skills Indicates that there are clear rubrics, scoring guides, and/or answer keys for all items |
| **Instructional Strategies***What methods will you use to accomplish this SLO? How will progress be monitored? What professional learning/supports do you need to achieve this SLO?* |
| Identifies and describes the key instructional philosophy, approach, and/or strategies to be taken during instruction***States*** how formative assessments will be used to guide instruction***Identifies*** professional learning/supports needed to achieve the SLODefines how each educator contributes to the overall learning content when more than one educator is involved in the SLO |
| **Overall Rating for SLO will be based on the average of the two IAGDs.** |

### Appendix B: Lesson Plan Template

**Lesson Plan Template**

Date and Time of Observation:

Big Idea / Essential Question/ Purpose of the Lesson in student-friendly terms:

1. Alignment with Standards (list the 2-4 relevant standards you will address in the lesson):
2. Sequence of this lesson within the unit:
3. Students’ prior knowledge leading to expected differentiation and grouping

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grouping (with data as evidence) | type of differentiation |
| (low) | (scaffolding) |
| (high) | (extensions) |

1. Strategies used to engage students (include literacy strategies such as learning academic or content vocabulary, text structure, or strategies for reading content-specific text):
2. Tasks and questions to engage students (what students will be doing):
3. Instructional resources to support cognitive engagement (materials used):
4. Criteria for student success (what students will know and be able to do):

Students will:

1. Assessment of student learning (how you will know students “got it” and can apply it):

Formative Assessment(s)

Summative Assessment(s)

Self-Assessment

### Appendix C: List of Supports by Domain

This list will be updated on an ongoing basis and posted on the district web site.

**Domain 1: Classroom Environment**

*Day One and Beyond (2003) Teach Like a Champion (2010)*

*Tools for Teaching,* Fred Jones (2007)

*Discipline with Dignity (2008)* [*The*](https://www.responsiveclassroom.org/article/punishment-vs-logical-consequences) *Daily Five (2006)*

*The CAFÉ Book (2009)*

*Positive Behavior Support web site* [*www.pbis.org*](http://www.pbis.org/)

*The First Days of School—How to be an Effective Teacher (2009)*

**Domain 2: Planning**

*Assignments Matter (2012)*

*Connecting Mathematical Ideas (2005) Academic Conversations (2011) Pathways to the Common Core (2012) Learning Targets (2012)*

*Better Learning through Structured Teaching Total Participation Techniques (2011) Building Academic Vocabulary (2005) Essential Questions (2013)*

*Quality Questioning (2005) Strategies that Work (2007) What’s the Big Idea? (2010)*

*Why Didn't I Learn this in College?(2009)*

**Domain 3: Instruction and Assessment of Learning**

Article about the value of, types and techniques of questioning in the classroom: <http://www.fno.org/apr03/qtech.html>

Research on the value of questioning in the classroom: <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/3/cu5.html>

Introduction to Socratic Questioning: <http://okra.deltastate.edu/~bhayes/socratic.html>

A Taxonomy of Socratic Questions: <http://wwwed.fnal.gov/trc/tutorial/taxonomy.html>

Several types of questioning types are described in the article, “A Questioning Toolkit,” in the online periodical, From Now On: <http://www.fno.org/nov97/toolkit.html>

Advanced Questioning Techniques (explains some of the types of questions): <http://www.businesspotential.com/adquest.htm>

Examples of questions that help you frame discussions and evoke quality thinking are available here: <http://academic.pg.cc.md.us/~wpeirce/MCCCTR/questi~1.html>

Web-based PowerPoint presentation on questioning techniques and types: <http://www.petech.ac.za/robert/questioning/>

Levels and Types of Questions: <http://pigseye.kennesaw.edu/~rouyang/ece4473/q-techni.html>

Questions for Teachers (with video clips—you may have to download QuickTime to view/hear the video clips):

<http://www.deil.uiuc.edu/QuestioningTechniques/>

Effective Techniques of Questioning: <http://www.hcc.hawaii.edu/intranet/committees/FacDevCom/guidebk/teachtip/effquest.htm>

Links to various techniques: <http://www.instructordiploma.com/core/102B/questions.htm>

Questions and the Role of Questioning Techniques in the Classroom: <http://www.instructordiploma.com/core/102%20B/jan.htm>

Classroom questions for trainee teachers: <http://www.pgce.soton.ac.uk/it/cm/questioning/>

Sample Videos:

Sequencing questions for high school students when leading them through a text [5 min] <https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/structuring-questioning-in-classroom>

Research-based vocabulary strategy (2 minutes and relates to library media curriculum: fair use, creative commons, etc.)

[https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/teaching-hard-vocabulary-](https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/teaching-hard-vocabulary-words?utm_source=Teaching%2BChannel%2BNewsletter&amp;utm_campaign=3dbb0c0cbb-Newsletter_June_8_2013&amp;utm_medium=email&amp;utm_term=0_23c3feb22a-3dbb0c0cbb-291413249)  [words?utm\_source=Teaching+Channel+Newsletter&utm\_campaign=3dbb0c0cbb-](https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/teaching-hard-vocabulary-words?utm_source=Teaching%2BChannel%2BNewsletter&amp;utm_campaign=3dbb0c0cbb-Newsletter_June_8_2013&amp;utm_medium=email&amp;utm_term=0_23c3feb22a-3dbb0c0cbb-291413249)  [Newsletter\_June\_8\_2013&utm\_medium=email&utm\_term=0c3feb22a-3dbb0c0cbb-291413249](https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/teaching-hard-vocabulary-words?utm_source=Teaching%2BChannel%2BNewsletter&amp;utm_campaign=3dbb0c0cbb-Newsletter_June_8_2013&amp;utm_medium=email&amp;utm_term=0_23c3feb22a-3dbb0c0cbb-291413249)

SIFT method to teach literature: example is grade 8 [5 minutes= <https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/sift-method-analyze-literature>

Grade 6 science climate change (24 min) <https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/climate-change-lesson>

Making sense of symbols, patterns and themes (22 min) AP class <https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/themes-in-english-literature>

Grade 3 lesson (26 min main idea) <https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/3rd-grade-ela-lesson> <http://vimeo.com/album/2192388/video/55951747>

Grade 3 math **[**24 min] <https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/classroom-daily-routines?fd=1>

1st Grade <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AfhIH3NJCfI>

8th Grade

<https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/sorting-classifying-equations-discussion?fd=1>

10th Grade <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XFRClI2q18Y>

*Never Work Harder than Your Students (2009)*

See formative assessment chart on the following page from Illinois Common Core [www.isbe.net/common\_core](http://www.isbe.net/common_core)

<http://wvde.state.wv.us/teach21/FormativeAssessment.html>

*Advancing Formative Assessment in Every Classroom* (2009*)*

*How to Create and Use Rubrics for Formative Assessment and Grading (2013)*

*25 Quick Formative Assessments for a Differentiated Classroom Checking for Understanding*

*Classroom Assessment and Grading Ahead of the Curve*

*Rethinking Homework Fair Isn't Always Equal*

*How to Give Effective Feedback to your Students.* (2008

### Quick Reference Guide: Timeline

**Teacher**

form(s) completed by teacher

*August – October*

* + participate in orientation to the process
	+ gather data to collaboratively set goals with evaluator/team
	+ schedule goal-setting conference with evaluator

*by November 15*

* + orientation completed
	+ goal-setting completed

*January – February*

* + review goals and performance to date
	+ gather progress data to share with evaluator
	+ schedule and participate in mid-year conference with evaluator

*April – June*

* + complete teacher self-reflection
	+ gather further evidence of goal attainment to share with evaluator
	+ schedule end-of-year conference with evaluator

*by June 30*

* end-of-year conference completed

**Administrator**

 form(s) completed by administrator

*August – October*

* provide orientation to the evaluation and development process
* conduct goal-setting conferences

*by November 15*

* orientation completed
* goal-setting completed
* create support plan for teachers rated Developing/ add additional observation

*January – February*

* conduct mid-year conferences

*April – June*

* review teacher self-assessments and evidence of goal attainment
* participate in end-of-year conferences

*by June 30*

* end-of-year conference completed
* final ratings completed

*by September 15*

* adjust final ratings, if data warrants
* confer with any teacher whose final rating is adjusted

###

### Appendix D: Common Core of Teaching Rubric/ Specialist Rubrics