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Connecticut State Pilot

Teacher Evaluation Model

The contents of this draft are meant for use in pilot districts during the 2012-2013 school year.

The state may refine the tools provided in this document for visual clarity and ease of use and in advance of fall implementation for the pilot in 2012-2013, the CSDE may make a final set of revisions.
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I. SEED: Connecticut’s System for Educator Evaluation and Development

Context and Timeline
This document outlines a new pilot model for the evaluation and development of teachers in Connecticut. SEED is Connecticut’s System for Educator Evaluation and Development. It is based on the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, developed by a diverse group of educators in June 2012 (see Appendix A for a list of Performance Evaluation Advisory Council Members), and on best practice research from around the country. In 2012-2013, ten districts/district consortia will pilot this model and provide feedback to refine it for the following 2013-14 year when all districts will implement a new educator evaluation system. In early 2013, districts can adopt the final state model in its entirety, or adapt it in accordance with the Guidelines as they develop evaluation systems to best suit their local contexts.

Purpose and Rationale of the Evaluation System
When teachers succeed, students succeed. Research has proven that no school-level factor matters more to students’ success than high-quality teachers. To support our teachers, we need to clearly define excellent practice and results; give accurate, useful information about teachers’ strengths and development areas; and provide opportunities for growth and recognition. However, our current evaluation systems often fail to do these things in a meaningful way. Connecticut’s new state model, SEED, strives to change that and to treat our teachers like the hard-working professionals they are. The purpose of the new evaluation model is to fairly and accurately evaluate teacher performance and to help each teacher strengthen his/her practice to improve student learning.

Design Principles
The following principles guided the design of the pilot model.

- Consider multiple, standards-based measures of performance
  An evaluation system that uses multiple sources of information and evidence results in fair, accurate and comprehensive pictures of teachers’ performance. The new model defines four categories of teacher performance: student learning (45%), teacher performance and practice (40%), parent feedback (10%) and school-wide student learning or student feedback (5%). These categories are grounded in research-based, national standards: Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching; the Common Core State Standards, as well as Connecticut’s standards: The Connecticut Common Core of Teaching; the Connecticut Framework K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards; the CMT/CAPT Assessments; and locally developed curriculum standards.

---

1 Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT): The CMT is the standard assessment administered to students in Grades 3 through 8. Students are assessed in the content areas of reading, mathematics and writing in each of these grades and science in grades 5 and 8. Connecticut Academic Performance Test (CAPT): The CAPT is the standard assessment administered to students in Grade 10. Students are assessed in the content areas of reading, mathematics, writing and science.
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. At the same time, teachers’ ratings should depend on their performance, not on their evaluators’ biases. Accordingly, the model aims to minimize the variance between school leaders’ evaluations of classroom practice and support fairness and consistency within and across schools.

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 in the new model occurs more frequently and focuses on what students are learning and what teachers and their administrators can do to support teaching and learning.

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. SEED promotes a shared language of excellence to which professional development, coaching, and feedback can align to improve practice.

Ensure feasibility of implementation
Launching this new model will require hard work. Throughout each district, 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 constraints in our districts.
II. Evaluation System Overview

Evaluation System Overview
The evaluation 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:
   
   (a) Observation of teacher performance and practice (40%) as defined in the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support, which articulates four domains and eighteen components of teacher practice
   (b) 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. There is also an option in this focus area to include student feedback. This focus area is comprised of two categories:
   
   (a) Student growth and development (45%) as determined by the teacher’s student learning objectives (SLOs)
   (b) Whole-school measure of student learning or student feedback (5%) as determined by aggregate student learning indicators or student surveys

Scores from each of the four categories will be combined to produce a summative performance rating of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing or Below Standard. The performance levels are defined as:

   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

These definitions of the 4 performance levels are inadequate and inappropriate. What does 'substantially exceeding' mean? How many are 'some' indicators? Who would decide which indicators would fall into the category of those the teacher would have to meet, or not have to meet, in order to be considered 'developing'? Does 'below standard' mean the teacher doesn't meet ANY indicators of performance at all? This leaves too much open to subjectivity.
Teacher Evaluation Process

The annual evaluation process between a teacher and an evaluator (principal or designee) 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.

Goal-Setting and Planning:

- **Orientation on process**
- **Teacher reflection and goal-setting**
- **Goal-setting conference**

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 discuss the evaluation process and their roles and responsibilities within it. In this meeting, they will discuss any school or district priorities that should be reflected in teacher practice goals and student learning objectives (SLOs) and they will commit to set time aside for the types of collaboration required by the evaluation process.
2. **Teacher Reflection and Goal-Setting**—The teacher examines student data, prior year evaluation and survey results, and the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support to draft proposed performance and practice goal(s), a parent feedback goal, student learning objectives (SLOs) and a student feedback goal (if required) for the school year. The teacher may collaborate in grade-level or subject-matter teams to support the goal-setting process.

3. **Goal-Setting Conference**—The evaluator and teacher meet to discuss the teacher’s proposed goals and objectives in order to arrive at mutual agreement about them. The teacher collects evidence about his/her practice and the evaluator collects evidence about the teacher’s practice to support the review. 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

**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.

1. **Mid-Year Conference**—The evaluator and teacher complete at least one mid-year check-in conference during which they review progress on teacher practice goals, student learning objectives (SLOs) and performance on each to-date. The mid-year conference is an important point in the year 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 SLOs 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.

**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 specifically 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 category and focus area ratings. The category ratings generate the final, summative rating. After all data, including state test data, are available, the evaluator may adjust the summative rating if the state test data change the student-related indicators significantly to change the final rating. Such revisions should take place as soon as state test 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 to discuss category ratings. Following the conference, the evaluator assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year (June 30 at the latest).
Primary and Complementary 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. Some districts may also decide to use complementary evaluators to assist the primary evaluator. Complementary evaluators are certified teachers, although they may also have administrative certification. They may have specific content knowledge, such as department heads or curriculum coordinators. Complementary evaluators must be fully trained as evaluators in order to be authorized to serve in this role.

Complementary evaluators may assist primary evaluators by conducting observations, collecting additional evidence, reviewing student learning objectives (SLOs), and providing additional feedback. A complementary evaluator should share his or her feedback with the primary evaluator as it is collected and shared with teachers.

Primary evaluators will have sole responsibility for assigning final summative ratings and must achieve proficiency on the training modules provided.

Ensuring Fairness and Accuracy: Evaluator Training, Monitoring and Auditing
All evaluators are required to complete extensive training on the evaluation model. The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) will provide districts with training opportunities and tools throughout the year to support district administrators and evaluators in implementing the model across their schools. Districts will adapt and build on these tools to provide comprehensive training and support to their schools and to ensure that evaluators are proficient in conducting teacher evaluations.

At the request of a district or employee, the CSDE or a third-party designated by the CSDE will review evaluation ratings that include dissimilar ratings in different categories (i.e., include both exemplary and below standard ratings). In these cases, CSDE will determine a final summative rating.

In addition, CSDE will select districts at random annually to review evaluation evidence files for a minimum of two educators rated exemplary and two educators rated below standard.
III. 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 exemplary practice.

Evaluation-Based Professional Learning

In any sector, people learn and grow by honestly co-assessing current performance, setting clear goals for future performance, and outlining the supports they need to close the gap. Throughout the Connecticut SEED model, every teacher will be identifying their professional learning needs in mutual agreement between the teacher and his/her evaluator and 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.

Improvement and Remediation Plans

If a teacher’s performance is rated as developing or below standard, it signals the need for the administrator to create an individual teacher improvement and remediation plan. The improvement and remediation plan should be developed in consultation with the teacher and his/her exclusive bargaining representative. Improvement and remediation plans must:

- identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided to address documented deficiencies;
- indicate a timeline for implementing such resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same school year as the plan is issued; and
- include indicators of success including a summative rating of proficient or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.

Career Development and Growth

Rewarding exemplary 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 below standard; leading Professional Learning Communities; differentiated career pathways; and focused professional development based on goals for continuous growth and development.

Concern here: Statute says that teacher eval guidelines "shall include...the creation of individual teacher improvement and remediation plans for teachers...designed in consultation with such teacher and his or her bargaining representative...." This means that consultation has to happen, not that it should happen.
IV. Teacher Practice Related Indicators

The Teacher Practice Related Indicators half of SEED 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

A diverse group of Connecticut stakeholders reviewed the research and options for a framework of teaching practice and chose to blend the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching Standards with Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching. The resulting rubric, The Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support (see Appendix B), represents the most important skills and knowledge that teachers need to successfully educate each and every one of their students.

The Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support is organized into four domains, each with 4-5 components:
Observation Process

Research, such as the Gates Foundation's *Measures of Effective Teaching* study, has shown that multiple snapshots of practice conducted by multiple observers provide a more accurate picture of teacher performance than one or two observations per year. These observations don't have to cover an entire lesson to be valid. Partial period observations can provide valuable information and save observers precious time.

Observations in and of themselves aren't useful to teachers – it's the feedback based on observations that helps teachers to reach their full potential. All teachers deserve the opportunity to grow and develop through observations and timely feedback. In fact, teacher surveys conducted

---

### Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1: Planning for Active Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a. Ensuring that content/curriculum is at an appropriate level of challenge and meets student learning needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Developing and organizing coherent and relevant units, lessons, and learning tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Supporting content area literacy skills, and when appropriate, numeracy skills, across the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to monitor student progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 2: The Classroom Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b: Establishing a culture for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c: Managing classroom procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d: Managing student behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e: Organizing physical space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 3: Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a: Communicating with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b: Using questioning and discussion techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c: Engaging students in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d: Using assessment in instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a: Engaging in continuous professional growth to impact instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b: Collaborating with colleagues to develop and sustain continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c: Communicating, collaborating with, and engaging appropriately with families about their students and the instructional program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d: Demonstrating other professional behaviors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domains 1 & 4 are directly from the CCT. Domains 2 & 3 are from the Charlotte Danielson (CD) framework. CD training only pertains to 2 & 3, but it is essential that training for domains 1 & 4 is provided. Such training should focus on understanding the language of the standards, how to collect data pertaining to practice, how to analyze and synthesize patterns of performance as shown through what is often qualitative data, and how to make a sound judgment about what the data says.
nationally demonstrate that most teachers are eager for more observations and feedback that they can then incorporate into their practice throughout the year.

Therefore, in the SEED model:

- Each teacher should be observed between 5 and 8 times per year through both formal and informal observations as defined below.
  - Formal: Scheduled observations or reviews of practice that last at least 30 minutes and are followed by a post-observation conference, which includes both written and verbal feedback.
  - Informal: Non-scheduled observations or reviews of practice that last at least 10 minutes and are followed by written and/or verbal feedback.
- All observations should be followed by feedback, either verbal (e.g., a post-conference, conversation in the hallway) or written (e.g., via email, comprehensive write-up, quick note in mailbox) or both, within two days of an observation.
- In order to capture an authentic view of practice and to promote a culture of openness and comfort with frequent observations and feedback, it's recommended that the majority of observations be unannounced.
- Districts and principals can use their discretion to decide the right number of observations for each teacher based on school and staff needs and in accordance with the Guidelines for Educator Evaluation. A summary of requirements are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Category</th>
<th>Model Number of Observations</th>
<th>Guideline Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First and Second Year Novice Teachers</td>
<td>3 formal in-class observations, 2 of which include a pre-conference and 3 informal observations</td>
<td>At least 3 formal in-class observations, all of which include a post-conference and 2 of which include a pre-conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Standard and Developing</td>
<td>3 formal in-class observations, 2 of which include a pre-conference and 5 informal observations</td>
<td>At least 3 formal in-class observations, all of which must include a post-conference and 2 of which include a pre-conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient and Exemplary</td>
<td>1 formal in-class observation and 4 informal observations, including non-classroom observations or reviews of practice</td>
<td>At least 3 formal observations or reviews of practice, 1 of which must be a formal in-class observation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: In the first year of implementation, all teachers should be observed 6 times: 3 formal observations and 3 informal observations. After the first year of implementation, observations should be structured according to the table above.

---

2 Examples of non-classroom observations or reviews of practice include but are not limited to: observations of data team meetings, observations of coaching/mentoring other teachers, review of lesson plans or other teaching artifacts.
**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. Pre-conferences are optional for observations except where noted in the requirements described above. A pre-conference can be held with a group of teachers, where appropriate.

Post-conferences provide a forum for reflecting on the observation against the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support 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.

Classroom observations provide the most evidence for domains 2 and 3 of the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support, but both pre- and post-conferences provide the opportunity for discussion of all four domains, including practice outside of classroom instruction (e.g., lesson plans, reflections on teaching).

**Non-Classroom Reviews of Practice**

Because the new evaluation model aims to provide teachers with comprehensive feedback on their practice as defined by the four domains of the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support, all 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.

**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 school leaders are encouraged to discuss feedback preferences and norms with their staff.

**Teacher Performance and Practice Goal-Setting**

As described in the Evaluation Process section, teachers develop one to three practice and performance goals that are aligned to the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support. These goals provide a focus for the observations and feedback conversations.

At the start of the year, each teacher will work with his or her evaluator to develop their practice and performance goal(s) through mutual agreement. All goals should have a clear link to student achievement and should move the teachers towards Proficient or Exemplary on the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support. Schools may decide to create a school-wide goal aligned to a particular component (i.e., 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques) that all teachers will include as one of their goals.

Goals should be SMART:

- **S**pecific and Strategic
- **M**easurable
- **A**ligned and Attainable
- **R**esults-Oriented
- **T**ime-Bound

**SMART Goal Example for Teacher Performance and Practice (40%)**:

By June 2013, I will use higher-order thinking questioning and discussion techniques to actively engage at least 85% of my students in discussions that promote understanding of content, interaction among students and opportunities to extend thinking.

Additional information on SMART goals can be found in Appendix C: Template for Setting SMART Goals. Progress towards goals and action steps for achieving progress should be referenced in feedback conversations following observations throughout the year. Goals and action steps should be formally discussed during the mid-year conference and the end-of-year conference. Although performance and practice goals are not explicitly rated as part of the Teacher Performance and Practice component, progress on goals will be reflected in the scoring of Teacher Performance and Practice evidence.

**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 Framework components that were observed. During observations, evaluators should take evidence-based, scripted 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**
At the end of the year, primary evaluators must determine a final teacher performance and practice rating and discuss this rating with teachers during the end-of-year conference. 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 component ratings for each of the 18 components.

2) Average components within each domain to a tenth of a decimal to calculate domain level scores of 1.0-4.0.

3) Apply domain weights to 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 interactions and uses professional judgment to determine component ratings for each of the 18 components.

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 18 components. Some questions to consider while analyzing the evidence include:

**Consistency:** What rating have I seen relatively uniform, homogenous evidence for throughout the semester? 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. Below Standard = 1 and Exemplary = 4. See example below for Domain 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Evaluator’s Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Average components with each domain to a tenth of a decimal to calculate domain-level scores:
3) Apply domain weights to domain scores to calculate an overall observation of Teacher Performance and Practice rating of 1.0-4.0.

Each of the domain ratings is weighted according to importance and summed to form one overall rating. Strong instruction and a positive classroom environment are major factors in improving student outcomes. Therefore, Domains 2 and 3 are weighted significantly more than the others at 35%. Planning and Professional Responsibilities are weighted 15%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steps 2 and 3 can be performed by district administrators and/or using tools/technology that calculates the averages for the evaluator. Sample tools will be provided during the pilot year.

The summative Teacher Performance and Practice rating and the component 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 progress toward Teacher Performance and Practice goals/outcomes.

Add up the numbers and get an average score for each domain. In this example: 2+2+3+4=11; 11 divided by 4 = 2.8 (rounded up from 2.75)
The essence of the state model parent survey is this: parents are surveyed about whatever, the school sets school-wide goals, the teacher chooses one goal and does whatever to try to reach the goal, and then it's a question of the extent to which the teacher met the goal.

**CATEGORY #2: Parent Feedback (10%)**

Feedback from parents will be used to help determine the remaining 10% of the Teacher Practice Indicators focus area of SEED.³

The process described below focuses on:
1. conducting a whole-school parent survey (meaning data is aggregated at the school level),
2. determining several school-level parent goals based on the survey feedback,
3. teacher and evaluator identifying one related parent engagement goal and setting improvement targets,
4. measuring progress on growth targets, and
5. determining a teacher's summative rating. This parent feedback rating shall be based on four performance levels.

1. **Administration of a Whole-School Parent Survey**
   Parent surveys should be conducted at the whole-school level as opposed to the teacher-level, meaning parent feedback will be aggregated at the school level. This is to ensure adequate response rates from parents.

   Parent surveys must be administered in a way that allows parents to feel comfortable providing feedback without fear of retribution. Surveys should be confidential, and survey responses should not be tied to parents' names. The parent survey should be administered every spring and trends analyzed from year-to-year.

   NOTE: CSDE recognizes that in the first year of implementation, baseline parent feedback may not be available. Teachers can set a goal based on previously-collected parent feedback, or if none is available, teachers can set a parent engagement goal that is not based on formal parent feedback.

   Appendix D contains a model parent survey than can be used to collect parent feedback. Districts may use that survey, use existing survey instruments, or develop their own. School districts are encouraged to work closely with teachers to develop the survey and interpret results. Parent representatives may be included in the process, but if a school governance council exists, the council must be included in this process. Parent surveys deployed by districts should be valid (that is, the instrument measures what it is intended to measure) and reliable (that is, the use of the instrument is consistent among those using it and is consistent over time).

2. **Determining School-Level Parent Goals**
   Principals and teachers should 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 2-3 improvement goals for the entire school.

³ Peer feedback is permitted by Connecticut’s Guidelines for Educator Evaluation as an alternative for this category. However, it is not included in the state model, SEED. If pilot districts wish to utilize peer feedback instead of parent feedback, they must submit a plan to do so to CSDE when they submit their evaluation system proposal.
3. **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 one related parent goal they would like to pursue as part of their evaluation. Possible goals include improving communication with parents, helping parents become more effective in support of homework, improving parent-teacher conferences, etc. See a sample state model survey in Appendix D for additional questions that can be used to inspire goals.

   Teachers will also set improvement targets related to the goal they select. For instance, if the goal is to improve parent communication, an improvement target could be specific to sending more regular correspondence to parents such as sending bi-weekly updates to parents or developing a new website for their class. Part of the evaluator’s job is to ensure (1) the goal is related to the overall school improvement parent goals, and (2) that the improvement targets are aligned and attainable.

4. **Measuring Progress on Growth Targets**

   Teachers and their evaluators should use their judgment in setting growth/improvement targets for the parent feedback category. There are two ways a teacher can measure and demonstrate progress on their growth targets. A teacher can (1) measure how successfully they implement a strategy to address an area of need (like the examples in the previous section), and/or (2) they can collect evidence directly from parents to measure parent-level indicators they generate. For example, a teacher could conduct interviews with parents or a brief parent survey to see if they improved on their growth target.

5. **Arriving at a Parent Feedback Rating**

   The Parent Feedback rating should reflect the degree to which a teacher successfully reaches his/her parent goal and improvement targets. This is accomplished through a review of evidence provided by the teacher and application of the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Below Standard (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeded the goal</td>
<td>Met the goal</td>
<td>Partially met the goal</td>
<td>Did not meet the goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Again, the rating is determined based on vague criteria overall.
V. Student Outcomes Related Indicators

The Student Outcomes Related Indicators half of SEED 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 to nurture in their students each year. As a part of the SEED 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
- Either whole-school student learning or student feedback or a combination of the two, which 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. Connecticut, like many other states and localities around the nation, has selected a goal-setting process called Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) as the approach for measuring student growth during the school year.

Student Learning Objectives in SEED 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

While this process should feel generally familiar, SEED will ask teachers to set more specific and measurable targets than they may have done in the past, and to develop them through consultation with colleagues in the same grade level or teaching the same subject and through mutual agreement with supervisors. The four SLO phases are described in detail below:

By ‘measurable’ the SDE means ‘quantifiable’ and measured by an assessment or another tool that can give quantifiable scores...

This first phase is the discovery phase, just before the start of the school year and in its first few weeks. Once teachers know their rosters, they will access as much information as possible about their new students’ baseline skills and abilities, relative to the grade level or course the teacher is teaching. End-of-year tests from the prior spring, prior grades, benchmark assessments and quick
demonstration assessments are all examples of sources teachers can tap to understand both individual student and group strengths and challenges. This information will be critical for goal-setting in the next phase.

Each teacher will write two Student Learning Objectives (SLOs). Teachers whose students take a standardized assessment will create one SLO based on standardized indicators and one SLO based on a minimum of one non-standardized indicator and a maximum of one additional standardized indicator. All other teachers will develop their two SLOs based on non-standardized indicators.

SEED uses a specific definition of “standardized assessment.” As stated in the CT Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, 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 (e.g. nation- or state-wide);
- Commercially-produced; and
- Often administered only once a year, although some standardized assessments are administered two or three times per year.

To create their SLOs, teachers will follow these four steps:

**Step 1: Decide on the Student Learning Objectives**

The objectives will be broad goals for student learning. They should each address a central purpose of the teacher's assignment and should pertain to a large proportion of his/her students. Each SLO should reflect high expectations for student learning - at least a year's worth of growth (or a semester’s worth for shorter courses) - and should be aligned to relevant state, national (e.g. common core), or district standards for the grade level or course. Depending on the teacher’s assignment, the objective might aim for content mastery (more likely at the secondary level) or it might aim for skill development (more likely at the elementary level or in arts classes).

Teachers are encouraged to collaborate with grade-level and/or subject-matter colleagues in the creation of SLOs. Teachers with similar assignments may have identical objectives although they will be individually accountable for their own students’ results.

The following are examples of Student Learning Objectives based on student data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Category</th>
<th>Student Learning Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Grade Science</td>
<td>My students will master critical concepts of science inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Visual</td>
<td>All of my students will demonstrate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SDE has stated that a standardized 'indicator' IS an assessment. It cannot be a district-level assessment (like a benchmark). In their view, a standardized assessment 'rises above' the class or district level, even though benchmarks are aligned to district curricula and standards, and national assessments are not.

The teacher MUST write statements about indicators that say they will use NUMBERS or PERCENTAGES of students who will score at a certain level (again, a number) in order to show success.

So goals are to be broad... that way, the teacher will have to include a large number of students to assess in meeting the goal, which is what the teacher will then be rated on.

*Connecticut’s Guidelines for Educator Evaluation state that teachers will write 1-4 objectives, but under the SEED model, the requirement is two objectives for every teacher.*

*This comes directly from the guidelines, and, we believe, is incomplete and inflexible. We've advocated for standardized indicators to include district benchmarks and CFAs that are aligned to district standards and curriculum. If benchmarks are considered ‘non-standardized,’ and their use the only other indicators of student growth used, 45% of a teacher’s evaluation could end up based on assessments, with no student work considered. This is especially likely to happen with non-tenured teachers, who won't take the issue to dispute resolution, for fear of being non-renewed for doing so.*
Step 2: Select Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGDs)

An Indicator of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD) is the specific evidence, with a quantitative target, that will demonstrate whether the objective was met. Each SLO must include at least one indicator.

Each indicator should make clear (1) what evidence will be examined, (2) what level of performance is targeted, and (3) what proportion of students is projected to achieve the targeted performance level. Indicators can also address student subgroups, such as high- or low-performing students or ELL students. It is through the Phase I examination of student data that teachers will determine what level of performance to target for which students. The Template for Setting SMART Goals should be referenced as a resource for setting SLOs/IAGDs (Appendix C).

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 teachers.

NOTE: For 4th through 8th grade teachers of English/Language Arts and Math, teachers are encouraged to use the CMT vertical scale score to set growth targets.

Taken together, an SLO’s indicators, if achieved, would provide evidence that the objective was met. Here are some examples of indicators that might be applied to the previous SLO examples:

### Sample SLO- Standardized IAGD(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Category</th>
<th>Student Learning Objective</th>
<th>Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (at least one is required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Grade Science</td>
<td>My students will master critical concepts of science inquiry.</td>
<td>1. 78% of my students will score at the Proficient or higher level on the science CMT in March 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Grade</td>
<td>My 22 students will demonstrate improvement in or mastery of reading comprehension skills by June 2013.</td>
<td>1. All 17 (77%) students assessed on the standard CMT will maintain proficiency, goal or advanced performance, or will gain a proficiency band on 4th grade CMT Reading in March 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. All 5 students (23%) assessed on the MAS for Reading CMT will achieve at the proficient or goal level on 4th grade CMT Reading MAS in March 2013.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that all indicators state in one way or another that students will reach the proficient level of performance. There is no mention of 'growth' considering the level of performance at which the student begins.
Sample SLO-Non-Standardized IAGD(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Category</th>
<th>Student Learning Objective</th>
<th>Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (at least one is required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Grade Science</td>
<td>My students will master critical concepts of science inquiry.</td>
<td>1. My students will design an experiment that incorporates the key principles of science inquiry. 90% will score a 3 or 4 on a scoring rubric focused on the key elements of science inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Visual Arts</td>
<td>My students will demonstrate proficiency in applying the five principles of drawing.</td>
<td>1. 85% of students will attain a 3 or 4 in at least 4 of 5 categories on the principles of drawing rubric designed by visual arts teachers in our district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3: Provide Additional Information

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

- the rationale for the objective, including relevant standards;
- any important technical information about the indicator evidence (like timing or scoring plans);
- the baseline data that was used to set each IAGD;
- interim assessments the teacher plans to use to gauge students’ progress toward the SLO during the school year (optional); and
- any training or support the teacher thinks would help improve the likelihood of meeting the SLO (optional).

PD or support to help teachers help kids reach goals is optional????

Step 4: 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.

The evaluator will examine each SLO relative to three criteria described below. SLOs must meet all three criteria to be approved. If they do not meet one or more criteria, the evaluator will provide written comments and discuss their feedback with the teacher during the fall goal-setting conference. SLOs that are not approved must be revised and resubmitted to the evaluator within ten days.

SLO Approval Criteria

**Priority of Content**

Objective is deeply relevant to teacher’s assignment and addresses a large proportion of his/her students.

**Quality of Indicators**

Indicators provide specific, measurable evidence. The indicators provide evidence about students’ progress over the school year or semester during which they are with the teacher.

**Rigor of Objective/Indicators**

Objective and indicators are attainable but ambitious, and taken together, represent at least a year’s worth of growth for students (or appropriate growth for a shorter interval of instruction).

What does ‘deeply relevant’ mean? how many make up a ‘large proportion’? This seems to contradict the notion that a teacher might want to focus on a group of particularly needy students (p 98, middle of page).

Unless there is a disagreement, in which case it can go to dispute resolution. I would expect this may happen in cases in which the evaluator wants the teacher to use a standardized indicator in the 2nd 22.5% and the teacher doesn’t want to do that. The problem locals will encounter is that no non-tenured teacher will push this issue with an evaluator and see it sent to dispute resolution, for fear of being non-renewed.
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.

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.

At the end of the school year, the teacher should collect the evidence required by their indicators and submit it to 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeded (4)</td>
<td>All or most students met or substantially exceeded the target(s) contained in the indicator(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met (3)</td>
<td>Most students met the target(s) contained in the indicators within a few points on either side of the target(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Met (2)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Meet (1)</td>
<td>A few students met the target(s) but a substantial percentage of students did not. Little progress toward the goal was made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have serious concerns about the language here. There are no concrete descriptions of what each term means, leaving this open to great subjectivity and inconsistency in use across schools and districts.
For SLOs with more than one indicator, the evaluator may score each indicator separately 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.

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.

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. The evaluation rating can be amended at that time as needed, but no later than September 15 (see scoring section). See Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring for details.

If a teacher has to use the state test, there is no other indicator for that SLO; the test results aren't in by June 30, so the evaluator can base the final rating of the teacher on the other SLO that uses other evidence. HOWEVER, once the state test scores come back, the evaluator must go back to rescore the SLO, and can change the teacher's rating based on the test scores, if s/he feels it's warranted. Consider that in elementary schools, especially, this means the evaluator must re-score the SLO that uses the CMT score for EVERY teacher in the tested grades. This, in essence, allows a teacher's evaluation to be determined, in the final moment, on ONE test score. There is NO research base to support this practice, and plenty of research that refutes using test scores to evaluate teachers. If the evaluator changes the test score, we're told that won't affect the employment decision, but it can result in a teacher being put on intensive assistance unnecessarily.
CATEGORY #4: Whole-School Student Learning Indicator and/or Student Feedback (5%)

Districts can decide to use a whole-school student learning indicator (option 1), student feedback (option 2), or a combination of the two (option 3) to determine this fourth category of SEED.

Option 1: Whole-school student learning indicator

For districts that include whole-school student learning indicator in teacher evaluations, a teacher’s indicator rating shall be equal to the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the principal’s evaluation rating at that school. For most schools, this will be based on the school performance index (SPI), which correlates to the whole-school student learning on a principal’s evaluation.

Option 2: Student feedback

Districts can use feedback from students, collected through whole-school or teacher-level surveys, to comprise this category of a teacher’s evaluation rating.

Research, including the Gates Foundation’s Measures of Effective Teaching study, has shown that student surveys can be valid and reliable indicators of teacher performance and that student feedback about a teacher is correlated with student performance in that class. Additionally, student surveys provide teachers with actionable information they can use to improve their practice—feedback that teachers would not necessarily receive elsewhere in the evaluation process.

Some educators express concerns about student surveys, including that student survey instruments must not be “popularity contests” and that students must take the surveys seriously. The following implementation approach, drawn from best practices across the country, can mitigate these issues.

School districts are encouraged to work closely with their teachers on the development of the student survey category.

Eligible Teachers and Alternative Measures

Student surveys will not be applicable and appropriate for all teachers. Ultimately, school districts should use their judgment in determining whether student surveys should be included in a particular teacher’s summative rating. Here are important guidelines to consider:

- Students in grades K-3 should not be surveyed unless an age-appropriate instrument is available.
- Special education students who would not be able to respond to the survey, even with accommodations, should not be surveyed.
- Surveys should not be used to evaluate a teacher if fewer than 15 students would be surveyed or if fewer than 13 students ultimately complete the survey.

When student surveys are not appropriate for a particular teacher, the 5% allocated for student feedback should be replaced with the whole-school student learning indicator described in Option #1.

Survey Instruments

Appendix E contains example surveys than can be used to collect student feedback. Districts may use these surveys, use existing survey instruments, or develop their own. Student survey...
instruments should be aligned to the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching and the Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support whenever possible.

Districts may choose to use different surveys for different grade levels, such as an elementary survey for students in grades 4-6 and a secondary survey for grades 6-12. Districts may also choose to use different surveys for different types of classes. For example, a district might establish a standard survey for all 6-12 classes and then add additional questions for core classes such as English and math.

The surveys selected by a district must be valid (that is, the instrument measures what it is intended to measure) and reliable (that is, the use of the instrument is consistent among those using it and is consistent over time).

Districts are encouraged to use instruments that will offer teachers constructive feedback they can use to improve their practice. Districts may include feedback-only questions that are not used for evaluation purposes, and districts may allow individual schools and teachers to add questions to the end of the survey, where feasible.

Survey Administration
Student surveys must be administered in a way that allows students to feel comfortable providing feedback without fear of retribution. Surveys should be confidential, and survey responses must not be tied to students’ names.

If a secondary school teacher has multiple class periods, students should be surveyed in all classes. If an elementary school teacher has multiple groups of students, districts should use their judgment in determining whether to survey all students or only a particular group.

Fall Baseline and Feedback Survey
If it is feasible, it is recommended but not required that schools conduct two student feedback surveys each year. The first, administered in the fall, will not affect a teacher’s evaluation but could be used as a baseline for that year’s targets, instead of using data from the previous school year. The second, administered in the spring, will be used to calculate the teacher’s summative rating and provide valuable feedback that will help teachers achieve their goals and grow professionally. Additionally, by using a fall survey as a baseline rather than data from the previous year, teachers will be able to set better goals because the same group of students will be completing both the baseline survey and the final survey. If conducting two surveys in the same academic year is not possible, then teachers should use the previous spring survey to set growth targets.

Establishing Goals
Teachers and their evaluators should use their judgment in setting goals for the student feedback category. In setting a goal, a teacher must decide what he/she wants the goal to focus on. A goal will usually refer to a specific survey question (e.g. “My teacher makes lessons interesting.”). However, some survey instruments group questions into categories or topics, such as “Classroom Control” or “Communicating Course Content,” and a goal may also refer to a category rather than an individual question.

Additionally, a teacher (or the district) must decide how to measure results for the selected question or topic. CSDE recommends that teachers measure performance in terms of the percentage of students who responded favorably to the question. (Virtually all student survey...
instruments have two favorable answer choices for each question.) For example, if the survey instrument asks students to respond to questions with “Strongly Disagree,” “Disagree,” “Neutral,” “Agree,” and “Strongly Agree,” performance on a goal would be measured as the percentage of students who responded “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” to the corresponding question. Next, a teacher must set a numeric performance target. As described above, this target should be based on growth or on maintaining performance that is already high. Teachers are encouraged to bear in mind that growth becomes harder as performance increases. For this reason, we recommend that teachers set maintenance of high performance targets (rather than growth targets) when current performance exceeds 70% of students responding favorably to a question.

Finally, where feasible, a teacher may optionally decide to focus a goal on a particular subgroup of students. (Surveys may ask students for demographic information, such as grade level, gender, and race.) For example, if a teacher’s fall survey shows that boys give much lower scores than girls in response to the survey question “My teacher cares about me,” the teacher might set a growth goal for how the teacher’s male students respond to that question.

The following are examples of effective goals:

- The percentage of students who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with “My teacher believes I can do well” will increase from 50% to 60%.
- The percentage of students who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with “My teacher makes what we’re learning interesting” will remain at 75%.
- The percentage of ninth graders who “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with “I feel comfortable asking my teacher for extra help” will increase from 60% to 70%.

See the example surveys in Appendix E for additional questions that can be used to develop goals.

**Arriving at a Student Feedback Summative Rating:**

In most cases, summative ratings should reflect the degree to which a teacher makes growth on feedback measures, using data from the prior school year or the fall of the current year as a baseline for setting growth targets. For teachers with high ratings already, summative ratings should reflect the degree to which ratings remain high.

This is accomplished in the following steps, undertaken by the teacher being evaluated through mutual agreement with the evaluator:

1. Review survey results from prior period (previous school year or fall survey).
2. Set one measurable goal for growth or performance (see above).
3. Later in the school year, administer surveys to students.
4. Aggregate data and determine whether the teacher achieved the goal.
5. Assign a summative rating, using the following scale to be discussed and finalized with their evaluator during the end-of-year conference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeded the goal</td>
<td>Met the goal</td>
<td>Partially met the goal</td>
<td>Did not meet the goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Option 3: Whole-school student learning indicator and student feedback*

As previously mentioned, districts can use whole-school student learning indicators for certain teachers and feedback from students for others depending on grade level.
NOTE: If the Whole-School Student Learning rating is not available when the summative rating is calculated, then Student Growth and Development score will be weighted 50 and Whole-School Student Learning will be weighted 0 (see Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring section). However, once the state data is available, the evaluator should revisit the final rating and amend at that time as needed, but no later than September 15).
VI. Summative Teacher Evaluation Scoring

**Summative 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.

Every educator will receive one of four performance ratings:

- **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

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.
2. Calculate a Student Outcomes Related Indicators score by combining the Student Growth and Development score and Whole-School Student Learning or Student Feedback score.
3. 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
calculate a student outcomes related indicators rating by combining the student growth and development score and whole-school student learning or student feedback score.

the student growth and development category counts for 45% of the total rating and the whole-school student learning or student feedback category 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score (1-4)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Points (score x weight)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Growth and Development (SLOs)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole School Student Learning or Student Feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL STUDENT OUTCOMES RELATED INDICATORS POINTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rating Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Outcomes Related Indicators Points</th>
<th>Student Outcomes Related Indicators Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-80</td>
<td>Below Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-126</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-174</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175-200</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) 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 proficient and the Student Outcomes Related Indicators rating is proficient. The summative rating is therefore proficient. If the two focus areas are highly discrepant (e.g., a rating of exemplary for Teacher Practice and a rating of below standard for Student Outcomes), then the evaluator should examine the data and gather additional information in order to make a summative rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summative Rating Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Practice Related Indicators Rating</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the boxes that say ‘gather further information,’ this is where the teacher really has to bring in any extenuating circumstances or control factors.

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

Each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system. A pattern may consist of a pattern of one. The state model recommends the following patterns:

Novice teachers shall generally be deemed effective if said educator receives at least two sequential “proficient” ratings, one of which must be earned in the fourth year of a novice teacher’s career. A “below standard” rating shall only 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 “proficient” ratings in years three and four. Superintendents shall offer a contract to any educator he/she is deeming effective at the end of year four. This shall be accomplished through the specific issuance of that effect.

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

Dispute Resolution Process

A panel, composed of the superintendent, teacher union president and a neutral third person, shall resolve disputes where the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on objectives/goals, the evaluation period, feedback on performance and practice, or final summative rating. Pilot districts may choose alternatives such as a district panel of equal management and union members, the district Professional Development Committee, or a pre-approved expert from a Regional Educational Service Center (RESC) so long as the superintendent and teacher union president agree to such alternative at the start of the school year. Resolutions must be topic specific and timely. Should the process established not result in resolution of a given issue, the determination regarding that issue will be made by the superintendent.

New: The definitions of ‘effectiveness’ and ‘ineffectiveness.’ This is how I believe it plays out, in various situations, beginning with the first year of implementation:

Novice / new (non-tenured) teachers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>if in year 1</th>
<th>then in year 2...</th>
<th>then in year 3...</th>
<th>then in year 4</th>
<th>final determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>below standard</td>
<td>MUST be at least developing</td>
<td>MUST be proficient</td>
<td>MUST be proficient</td>
<td>effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing</td>
<td>might be developing again??</td>
<td>MUST be proficient</td>
<td>MUST be proficient</td>
<td>effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developing</td>
<td>is proficient</td>
<td>is developing</td>
<td>is proficient</td>
<td>ineffective *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Why ‘ineffective?’ Because the teacher does not have at least 2 sequential ratings of proficient. A change in assignment can easily move a teacher into the developing category.

Tenured teachers:

* any year rating of ‘below standard’ >> ineffective
* any 2 years of sequential ‘developing’ ratings >> ineffective

This line of thinking doesn’t take into account the time it takes a teacher to learn a new position and refine the skills needed by that position to reach the proficient level of performance. Example: a tenured teacher holds a grades 7-12 English/LA certificate, teaches grades 10 & 11. S/he also holds an elementary (K-8) certificate, having begun his/her career teaching 6th grade. The teacher is transferred to teach grade 5 the first year (rated developing due to the dramatic change in assignment), then is transferred the following year to grade 1. If the teacher is rated either developing or below standard, the teacher is considered ineffective.
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Appendix B: Connecticut Framework for Teacher Evaluation and Support
See SEED website: http://www.connecticutseed.org/?page_id=13

Appendix C: Template for Setting SMART Goals
The SMART goal-setting process ensures that every goal is measurable and clear. The advantages of the SMART goal-setting process are:

- Provides a structured approach to a complex task
- Gives a clear framework for creating meaningful and achievable goals
- Accommodates all kinds of goals
- Is easy to teach others how to develop
- Helps to define goals in terms that can be widely understood
- Requires thinking through the implementation as well as the outcome

The characteristics of SMART goals are:

- **Specific and Strategic**
  - The goal should be well defined enough that anyone with limited knowledge of your intent should understand what is to be accomplished.

- **Measurable**
  - Goals need to be linked to some form of a common measure that can be used as a way to track progress toward achieving the goal.

- **Aligned and Attainable**
  - The goal must strike the right balance between being attainable and aligned to standards but lofty enough to impact the desired change.

- **Results-Oriented**
  - All goals should be stated as an outcome or result.

- **Time-Bound**
  - The time frame for achieving the goal must be clear and realistic.

**SMART goals Dos and Don’ts**

**DO:**
- Create a plan
- Start Small
- Write it down
- Be specific
- Track your progress
- Celebrate your success
- As for support sooner than later
- Make commitments

**DON’T:**
- Expect to accomplish without effort
- Focus on too much at once
- Forget to make a deadline
- Deal in absolutes
- Expect perfection
- Keep your goal on a shelf
- Beat yourself up over shortcomings
- Try to accomplish it alone
- Forget that you CAN DO IT!
Appendix D: Sample Parent Survey

The survey included is an example survey for parents/guardians. A state model parent survey will be released in the fall of 2012.

Parent Feedback Survey, All Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I: School Feedback</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>I Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I talk with my child’s teacher(s) about my child’s schoolwork.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I talk with my child’s teacher(s) about what I can do to help my child learn.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I know how my child is doing in school before I get my child’s report card.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have attended at least one meeting or event at school this year.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel welcome at this school.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My child is learning a lot in school this year.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My child’s teacher(s) have high expectations for my child.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My child’s teacher(s) talk to me about how my child is doing in class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My child’s teacher(s) care about my child.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Part II: Background**

10. What is your child’s gender?
- Male
- Female

11. My child’s grades are…
- Mostly A’s
- Mostly B’s
- Mostly C’s
- Mostly D’s
- Mostly F’s
- I Don’t Know / Does Not Apply

12. What is the highest level of education that you have attained?
- Not a high school graduate
- Some college
- Graduate school
- High school graduate
- College graduate

13. What is your child’s race or ethnicity?
- White
- Black or African American
- Asian
- Hispanic or Latino
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Two or More Races/Ethnicities
Appendix E: Sample Student Feedback Surveys

The surveys included are examples of surveys for students. State model student surveys will be released in the fall of 2012.

Student Feedback Survey, Grades 4-5: Instructions

Thank you for participating in this survey. When you answer these questions, it is important that you think about your experiences in this classroom in particular. No one at your school will see your answers. Someone outside of the school will tally the results. Your teacher will not know what any individual student said. Please answer honestly. You may leave any question blank, but we hope you will answer as many questions as you can.

This survey is tallied by computer. Please use a pencil, and erase completely. Press hard to write darkly, and fill in each circle completely, like this: ● Mark only one answer per question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I: This Class</th>
<th>Very True</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
<th>Sort of True</th>
<th>A Little True</th>
<th>Not True</th>
<th>I Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My teacher cares about me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When my teacher teaches us something, he/she seems to know it really well.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am confused a lot in class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My teacher knows my first name.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We learn a lot in class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My teacher goes too fast when we are learning new things.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My teacher shows us how what we’re learning is important, even outside of school.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My teacher is happy to answer questions.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My teacher explains things clearly.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A lot of time is wasted in class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am proud of the work I do in class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My teacher knows me well.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. If I ask my teacher for help, he/she will help me.

15. My teacher thinks I can do well in school.

Part II: Student Background

Please be honest with your answers.

16. About how much time in a week do you usually spend doing homework for this class?
   - Less than 1 hour
   - 1 hour
   - 2 hours
   - 3-4 hours
   - 5 or more hours

17. Are you a boy or a girl?
   - Boy
   - Girl

18. About how many books are there where you live?
   - 0-10
   - 11-25
   - 26-100
   - More than 100

19. What is your race or ethnicity?
   - White
   - Black or African American
   - Asian
   - Hispanic or Latino
   - American Indian or Alaska Native
   - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   - Two or More Races/Ethnicities
Appendix E: Sample Student Feedback Surveys (continued)

**Student Feedback Survey, Grades 6-12: Instructions**

Thank you for participating in this survey. When you answer these questions, it is important that you think about your experiences in this classroom in particular. No one at your school will see your answers. Someone outside of the school will tally the results. Your teacher will not know what any individual student said. Please answer honestly. You may leave any question blank, but we hope you will answer as many questions as you can.

This survey is tallied by computer. Please use a pencil, and erase completely. Press hard to write darkly, and fill in each circle completely, like this: ● Mark only one answer per question.

### Part I: This Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My teacher cares about me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My teacher seems to know this subject really well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am often confused in this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My teacher tests us on things we didn’t learn in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My teacher challenges me to think.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My teacher makes what we’re learning interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I look forward to going to this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I’m afraid to speak up in this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Our discussions in class help me learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>This class moves too quickly for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My teacher assigns homework that helps me learn the material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My teacher knows my first name.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>My teacher checks to make sure we understand what he/she is teaching us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>In this class, we learn a lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My teacher grades fairly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part I: This Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel uncomfortable asking my teacher for extra help.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My teacher shows us how what we're learning is important outside of the classroom.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My teacher gives us work to do in class that helps us learn.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My teacher explains things clearly.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My teacher believes that I can do well.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I don’t work as hard as I could in this class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My teacher has trouble maintaining class control.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. A lot of time is wasted in this class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I am proud of what I do in this class.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My teacher returns corrected homework and tests quickly.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My teacher makes me want to do my best.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part II: Student Background

*Please be honest with your answers.*

27. About how much time **in a week** do you usually spend doing homework for this class?
   - ○ Less than 1 hour
   - ○ 1 hour
   - ○ 2 hours
   - ○ 3-4 hours
   - ○ 5 or more hours

28. What is your gender?
   - ○ Male
   - ○ Female

29. This semester, what grade do you expect to receive in this course?
   - ○ A
   - ○ B
   - ○ C
   - ○ D
   - ○ F
### Part II: Student Background

*Please be honest with your answers.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. What is the highest level of education that either of your parents has attained?</td>
<td>Not a high school graduate, Some college, Graduate school, High school graduate, College graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. About how many books are there where you live?</td>
<td>0-10, 11-25, 26-100, More than 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. What is your race or ethnicity?</td>
<td>White, Black or African American, Asian, Hispanic or Latino, American Indian or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races/Ethnicities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>