

# Recommendations Regarding **PERMISSIVE PILOT** for Educator Evaluation for Administrators in Central Office Positions



## About the Proposed Adaptations

*These proposed adaptations were developed to align the evaluation and support of central office administrators to the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (June 2012), and to the System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED), intended to be meaningful and purposeful to respective roles of central office administrators within the district. SEED is one model for administrator evaluation and support.*

*This is a draft document. The results of implementation during the Permissive Pilot in 2014–15 will be reviewed by the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC).*

In accordance with PA 12-116, as amended by PA 13-245, Connecticut's System for Educator Evaluation and Development is intended to evaluate all educators below the rank of superintendent and currently includes some provisions for central office administrators. *Connecticut's new system for educator evaluation and support, as well as Connecticut's model, the System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED), was developed primarily for the roles of principal and assistant principal.*

This document provides further guidance for use in evaluating administrators holding CT certification in intermediate administration and supervision (092) and was developed with input from central office administrators representing six central office roles:

**Special Education Leaders**

**Curriculum Leaders**

**Adult Education Leaders**

**Personnel Leaders**

**Athletic Leaders**

**Business and Operations Leaders**

DRAFT

# ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION COMPONENTS

## STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (50%)

- Student Learning (45%)
- Teacher Effectiveness Outcomes (5%)

## ADMINISTRATOR PRACTICE OUTCOMES (50%)

- Leadership Practice (40%)
- Stakeholder Feedback (10%)

*While the **CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards** continues to serve as the foundation for the observation of leadership practice, a guide to the application of the standards has been prepared for six central office administrator roles so that the standards can be illuminated in role-specific practice.*

## SUPPORT AND DEVELOPMENT

*Professional learning shall be clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process related to student learning, observation of practice and performance and/or stakeholder feedback.*

## PROCESS AND TIMELINE

The annual process for an administrator shall apply to central office administrators and include at least:

### Goal-Setting Process

- Orientation on process
- Goal-setting
- Evidence collection

### Mid-Year Formative Review

### End-of-Year Summative Review

- Administrator self-assessment
- End-of-year conference
- Final summative rating

# PROPOSED ADAPTATIONS TO THE STUDENT LEARNING (45%) COMPONENT

GUIDELINES: ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION COMPONENTS	PROPOSED ADAPTATIONS	RATIONALE FOR PROPOSED ADAPTATIONS
<p><b>Forty-five percent (45%)</b> of an administrator’s summative rating shall be based on multiple student learning indicators.</p> <p><b>Twenty-two point five percent (22.5%)</b> of an administrator’s evaluation shall be based only on student performance and/or growth on the state-administered assessments in core content areas that are part of the state’s approved school accountability system. This portion must include: School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year; SPI progress for student subgroups.</p> <p>For 092 holders serving in central office administrative roles, districts shall rate performance based on results in the group of schools, group of students, or subject areas most relevant to the administrator’s job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.</p> <p><b>Twenty-two point five percent (22.5%)</b> of an administrator’s evaluation shall be based on at least <u>two</u> locally-determined indicators of students learning, at least one of which must include student outcomes from subjects and/or grades not assessed on state-administered assessments. Locally determined indicators must align to Connecticut learning standards. In instances where there are no such standards that apply to a subject/grade level, districts must provide evidence of alignment to research-based learning standards.</p> <p>For central office administrators, indicators may be based on results in the group of schools, group of students, or subject area most relevant to the administrator’s job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.</p>	<p><b>Standardized Measures (SM) and Locally-Determined Measures (LDM)</b></p> <p><b>Special Education Leaders:</b> <i>SM</i>–22.5% — based on subgroup of District Performance Index (DPI) <b>or</b> on special education population subgroups on SPIs of schools served; <i>LDM</i>–22.5% — goals address a significant portion of special education students served.</p> <p><b>Curriculum Leaders:</b> <i>SM</i>–22.5% — based on DPI <b>or</b> on SPIs of schools served or subjects served; <i>LDM</i>–22.5% — goals address a significant portion of students served.</p> <p><b>Curriculum Leaders/Technology Directors:</b> <i>SM</i>–0% — based on standardized measures for Technology Directors or other supervisors with no state testing role; <i>LDM</i>–45% — based on locally determined measures for Technology Directors or other supervisors with no state testing role.</p> <p><b>Adult Education Leaders:</b> <i>SM</i> — target related to General Education Diploma (GED) attainment; <i>LDM</i> — two goals measured by standardized or non-standardized measures.</p> <p><b>Personnel Leaders:</b> <i>SM</i>–5% — based on DPI target; <i>LDM</i>–40% — two goals based on attainment of targets that support student learning (e.g., recruitment and retention of high-quality staff, induction of new staff, TEAM Program success, professional development, etc.)</p> <p><b>Athletic Leaders:</b> <i>SM</i>–0%; <i>LDM</i>–45% — one performance goal with measurable target (e.g., coaching skill development, athlete skill growth, increased participation, etc.) and one academic performance goal based on measurable targets for a significant number of students athletes (e.g., percent of student athletes who remain eligible for the entire school year).</p> <p><b>Business and Operations Leaders:</b> <i>SM</i>–0%; <i>LDM</i>–45% — two performance goals based on measurable targets that relate to improvements in the business or operations programs, in areas such as facilities, equitable distribution of resources, etc.</p>	<p>Central office administrators whose primary duties and responsibilities are related to instructional leadership are better able to follow the Guidelines. For those positions in which responsibilities are operational and/or are not primarily related to teaching and learning, the proposed adaptations may apply.</p> <div data-bbox="1486 915 1913 1435" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin-top: 20px;"> <p><b>NOTE:</b> For the 2014–15 academic year, the required use of state test data is suspended, pending federal approval, pursuant to PEAC’s flexibility recommendation on January 29, 2014 and the State Board of Education’s action on February 6, 2014. For 2014–15, the entire student learning component (45%) will be based on locally determined indicators.</p> </div>

# PROPOSED ADAPTATIONS TO THE TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS OUTCOMES (5%) COMPONENT

GUIDELINES: ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION COMPONENTS	PROPOSED ADAPTATIONS	RATIONALE FOR PROPOSED ADAPTATIONS
<p><b>Five percent (5%)</b> of an administrator’s summative rating shall be based on teacher effectiveness outcomes.</p> <p><b>Acceptable measures include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Improving the percentage (or meeting a target of a high percentage) of teachers who meet the student learning objectives outlined in their performance evaluations.</li> <li>b) Other locally-determined measures of teacher effectiveness.</li> </ul> <p>For assistant principals, measures of teachers’ effectiveness shall focus only on those teachers the assistant principal is responsible for evaluating. If the assistant principal’s job duties do not include teacher evaluation, then the teacher effectiveness rating for the principal of the school shall apply to the assistant principal.</p>	<p><b>Special Education Leaders:</b> Based on student learning goal/objective attainment of composite of special education teachers.</p> <p><b>Curriculum Leaders:</b> Based on student learning goal/objective attainment of principals, assistant principals and instructional supervisors served.</p> <p><b>Adult Education Leaders:</b> Based on student learning goal/objective attainment of SLOs of adult education teachers.</p> <p><b>Personnel Leaders:</b> Based on student learning goal/objective attainment of non-tenured teachers.</p> <p><b>Athletic Leaders:</b> Based on the aggregate success of coaching staff in meeting their goals.</p> <p><b>Business and Operations Leaders:</b> Based on the aggregate success of administrators’ practice on the Organizational Systems and Safety performance expectation of leadership practice.</p>	<p>The proposed adaptations reflect the educators for whom each of the central office roles are most accountable for in working within the school district.</p>

DRAFT

# PROPOSED ADAPTATIONS TO THE ADMINISTRATOR PRACTICE AND PERFORMANCE (40%) COMPONENT

GUIDELINES: ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION COMPONENTS	PROPOSED ADAPTATIONS	RATIONALE FOR PROPOSED ADAPTATIONS
<p><b>Forty percent (40%)</b> of an administrator’s evaluation shall be based on ratings of administrator performance and practice by the district superintendent or her/his designee(s). Ratings must be based on evidence collected about leadership practice as described in the <i>Common Core of Leading (CCL): Connecticut School Leadership Standards</i>.</p> <p>The weighting of standards may be different for each administrator, but the weights must be established by the evaluator as part of the goal-setting conference at the start of the school year.</p> <p>For central office administrators, a rubric is not required. Districts may generate ratings from evidence collected directly from the <i>CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards</i>.</p>	<p><b>Special Education Leaders, Curriculum Leaders, Adult Education Leaders:</b> weight the Teaching and Learning performance expectation half of this component and the balance of the remaining performance expectations as half of this component (each equally weighted).</p> <p><b>Personnel Leaders, Athletic Leaders:</b> weight each of the performance expectations equally.</p> <p><b>Business and Operations Leaders:</b> weight the Organizational Systems and Safety performance expectation half of this component and the balance of the remaining performance expectation as half of this component (each equally weighted).</p> <p><i>While the CCL: Connecticut School Leadership Standards continues to serve as the foundation for the observation of leadership practice, guides to the application of the standards have been prepared for six central office administrator roles so that the standards can be illuminated in role-specific practice.</i></p>	<p>The proposed adaptations for the weighting of performance expectations and the language of indicators of performance recognize and address the shifting emphasis of duties and responsibilities that occur in roles beyond the principal and assistant principal. The proposed adaptations also recognize that some central office administrator roles are similar in nature to those of school-based administrators, and that other administrator roles may be more deeply rooted in organizational or operational duties and responsibilities.</p>

DRAFT

## PROPOSED ADAPTATIONS TO THE STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK (10%) COMPONENT

GUIDELINES: ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION COMPONENTS	PROPOSED ADAPTATIONS	RATIONALE FOR PROPOSED ADAPTATIONS
<p><b>Ten percent (10%)</b> of an administrator’s summative rating shall be based on feedback from stakeholders on areas of principal and/or school practice described in the Connecticut Leadership Standards.</p> <p>Central office administrators shall be based on feedback from the stakeholders whom the administrator directly serves.</p>	<p>The proposed adaptations document provides suggestions for stakeholder groups based on each of the six central office roles.</p> <p>A bank of survey questions aligned with the CT Leadership Standards is provided for districts to select questions to add to their existing surveys that would apply to central office administrators.</p> <p><b>Special Education Leaders:</b> principals, assistant principals, teachers, and parents.</p> <p><b>Curriculum Leaders:</b> principals, assistant principals and teachers</p> <p><b>Adult Education Leaders:</b> teachers and students</p> <p><b>Personnel Leaders:</b> principals, assistant principals, and teachers</p> <p><b>Athletic Leaders:</b> students and coaches</p> <p><b>Business and Operations Leaders:</b> principals, assistant principals, and teachers</p>	<p>These suggestions are consistent with the Guidelines, and provide specific suggestions for each of the six central office roles.</p>

DRAFT

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

## Work Group

The CSDE wishes to thank the following for their contributions to the development of the proposed adaptations:

**Erica Forti**

Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum  
East Haven Public Schools

**Glenn LaBossiere**

Athletic Director  
Griswold Public Schools

**Jan Perruccio**

Assistant Superintendent for Personnel  
Wallingford Public Schools

**Michael Galluzzo**

Educational Consultant  
CAS/CIAC

**Erin Murray**

Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum  
Simsbury Public Schools

**Jason Sconziano**

Special Education Supervisor  
Waterbury Public Schools

**Thomas W. Giard III**

Assistant Superintendent for  
Personnel and Staff Development  
Meriden Public Schools

**Maryann O'Donnell**

Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum  
Clinton Public Schools

**Sharon Fuller**

Education Consultant  
CSDE Talent Office

**Nancy Johnston**

Director of Special Education and Services  
Region 18

**Elizabeth Osga**

Work Group Facilitator  
Independent Education Consultant

---

## Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy

The Connecticut State Department of Education is committed to a policy of equal opportunity/affirmative action for all qualified persons. The Department of Education does not discriminate in any employment practice, education program, or educational activity on the basis of race, color, religious creed, sex, age, national origin, ancestry, marital status, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability (including, but not limited to, mental retardation, past or present history of mental disability, physical disability or learning disability), genetic information, or any other basis prohibited by Connecticut state and/or federal nondiscrimination laws. The Department of Education does not unlawfully discriminate in employment and licensing against qualified persons with a prior criminal conviction. Inquiries regarding the Department of Education's nondiscrimination policies should be directed to Levy Gillespie, Equal Employment Opportunity Director/American with Disabilities Act Coordinator, Title IX/ADA/Section 504 Coordinator, State of Connecticut Department of Education, 25 Industrial Park Road, Middletown, CT 06457 860-807-2071.