

## Databases on State Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policies (STEP Database and SPEP Database)—Comprehensive Comparison

For a list of state references shown in brackets (e.g., [RI-2], [DC-5]), please click the title of the state desired.

Note to user: If the answer to a question is listed as "**Not specified**," the researcher was unable to locate sufficient information to provide an accurate answer.

Component 1: Evaluation System Goals		
System Goals	<a href="#">Colorado</a>	<a href="#">Connecticut</a>
<b>A. According to the state, what are the goals and purposes of the evaluation system?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Serve as a basis for the improvement of instruction</li> <li>• Enhance the implementation of programs of curriculum</li> <li>• Serve as a measurement of the professional growth and development of licensed personnel</li> <li>• Provide a basis for making decisions in the areas of hiring, compensation, promotion, assignment, professional development, earning and retaining nonprobationary status, dismissal, and nonrenewal of contract"</li> </ul> <p>[CO-22, p. 32]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To strengthen individual and collective practices in order to improve student learning.</li> <li>• To provide opportunities for formative, summative, and self-evaluation.</li> <li>• To provide regular and ongoing professional learning opportunities and allocate time for educators and evaluators to collaborate to promote effective implementation of the evaluation plan.</li> </ul> <p>[CT-9, p. 157; CT-8, p. 7]</p>
<b>B. Are the goals aligned with the state strategic plan or other teacher reform initiatives?</b>	<p>Yes, the goals were informed by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Colorado Achievement Plan for Kids (CAP4K)</li> <li>• The Quality Teachers Commission</li> <li>• The School Leadership Academy Board (SLAB)</li> <li>• Colorado school districts' work in linking student outcomes to evaluation results and evaluation to decisions such as promotion and pay</li> <li>• The state's application for federal Race to the Top funding</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, the goals outlined in the state's ESEA flexibility waiver request [CT-9, pp. 148–173].</p>

	[CO-22, pp. 30–31]	
<b>C. Are the goals and standards aligned with teacher preparation and certification programs?</b>	Yes; in April 2011, the State Council for Educator Effectiveness recommended that the Colorado Department of Education and the Department of Higher Education prepare to transition to the new Colorado Teacher Quality Standards [CO-22, p. 22].	Not specified
<b>Standards</b>	<b><u>Colorado</u></b>	<b><u>Connecticut</u></b>
<b>A. What are the state's teaching standards?</b>	Colorado Teacher Quality Standards [CO-19]	2010 Common Core of Teaching [CT-7]
<b>B. When were the standards last revised?</b>	The new standards were submitted to the Colorado State Board of Education on April 13, 2011, as part of the final report and recommendations of the State Council for Educator Effectiveness [CO-19]. Several revisions have taken place since April 2011 [CO-22], and the Colorado Board of Education adopted the standards as part of the evaluation framework in November 2011 [CO-12; CO-15].	2010 [CT-7, p. 1]
<b>C. Are they aligned with InTASC standards?</b>	Not directly; however, Colorado's standards were informed by the InTASC standards and other states' standards [CO-22, p. 42].	No
<b>D. Are they aligned with principal evaluation standards?</b>	Yes [CO-22, p. 94]	No [CT-3]
<b>E. What areas do the standards cover?</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Content knowledge</li> <li>2. Learning environment</li> <li>3. Facilitate learning</li> <li>4. Reflect on practice</li> <li>5. Demonstrate leadership</li> <li>6. Take responsibility for student growth</li> </ol> <p>[CO-19]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content and essential skills</li> <li>• Classroom environment, student engagement, and commitment to learning</li> <li>• Planning for active learning</li> <li>• Instruction for active learning</li> <li>• Professional responsibilities and teacher leadership</li> </ul> <p>[CT-7, p. 4]</p>



Component 2: Stakeholder Investment and Communication Plan		
Stakeholders, Roles, and Feedback	<u>Colorado</u>	<u>Connecticut</u>
<b>A. Did the state mandate (or recommend) which stakeholders are or were involved in creating the evaluation system?</b>	Yes, mandated the creation of the State Council for Educator Effectiveness, which was charged with making recommendations to the state board of education on the components and design of the evaluation system. The council was composed of a variety of stakeholders, including teachers, teacher associations and federations, school and district administrators, school board members, parent/guardians, students, and the business community [CO-4, sec. 22-9-104(2)(c and f) and sec. 22-9-105.5; CO-22, p. 27].	Yes, mandated stakeholder involvement through the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC), composed of state commissioners of education and higher education, representatives from the Connecticut Association of Boards of Education, the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents, the Connecticut Federation of School Administrators, the Connecticut Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers–Connecticut, and others selected by the commissioner of education, including teachers and experts. The PEAC was charged with developing guidelines and the framework for the evaluation of teachers, which were adopted by the Connecticut State Board of Education in June 2012 [CT-2, sec. 10-151d; CT-8, p. 1; CT-9, pp. 17, 148–150].
<b>A1. If yes, what roles did stakeholder groups play—advisory or authoritative?</b>	Advisory [CO-22, p. 26]	Advisory [CT-9, pp. 148–150]
<b>B. Did the state mandate (or recommend) how constituent feedback was integrated into the redesign effort? (methods and response)</b>	<p>Yes, mandated that the State Council for Educator Effectiveness provide detailed recommendations to the State Board of Education, which were passed into law in February 2012 [CO-22, p. 26; CO-2, sec. 1]. The Colorado Department of Education gathered public input through public hearings, meetings, and the Educator Effectiveness website [CO-9; CO-10; CO-22, p. vii].</p> <p>In addition, 15 pilot districts will test the Colorado state model during the 2011–12 and 2011–13 school years and give feedback on improvements and changes needed for</p>	Yes, recommended. The Connecticut State Department of Education received stakeholder input on developing their new evaluation guidelines by sending out a survey to all the LEAs in the state, including private and charter schools. The Connecticut State Department of Education also plans to assemble three advisory groups consisting of teachers, administrators, and service staff to develop performance criteria, rubrics, and other tools [CT-9, pp. 153–154, 160–161].

	midcourse corrections. Finally, the Colorado Department of Education is partnering with seven additional districts who have already begun work on their own evaluation systems to learn from their experiences and incorporate their feedback into the final state model [CO-1, p. 6; CO-5; CO-6, pp. 120, 130].	
<b>C. Whose feedback was solicited? (pilot participants, teachers, etc.)</b>	The State Council for Educator Effectiveness included representatives from teachers, teacher associations and federations, school and district administrators, school board members, parent/guardians, students, and the business community [CO-22, p. 26]. In addition, the state solicited comments from the general public [CO-9; CO-10] and school districts through multiple district piloting processes [CO-9; CO-10; CO-6, pp. 119–120].	The Connecticut State Department of Education solicited feedback from LEAs and the members of the Performance Evaluation Advisory Committee, which consists of teachers, principals, association members, union representatives, and representatives from higher education [CT-9, pp. 148–150].
<b>Communication Plan</b>	<b><u>Colorado</u></b>	<b><u>Connecticut</u></b>
<b>A. Did the state develop a communication plan to keep the broader school community informed?</b>	No, but the Colorado Department of Education developed "Keeping Stakeholders Informed," a document outlining the key dates, strategies, and communication modes that would be used to inform stakeholders and other interested states about the planning and implementation process [CO-18].	No, but Connecticut plans to develop a communication plan and provide communication guidance to LEAs for its new teacher evaluation model [CT-9, pp. 167–168].
<b>A1. If yes, what kind of information was communicated and to which audiences?</b>	The Colorado Department of Education provides the State Council for Educator Effectiveness's recommendations and other documents on its website [CO-10; CO-21; CO-23]. In addition, the Department of Education has made training modules, rubrics, planning guides, and tools being used by the pilot districts available [CO-5].	Not applicable
<b>A2. If yes, what modes of communication were used?</b>	A main website with resources, webinars, news conferences, newsletters, brochures, and presentations [CO-1; CO-8; CO-9; CO-17; CO-	Connecticut plans to communicate via e-mail, website, online inquiry forms, and a helpline phone number [CT-9, pp. 167–168].

	23].	
<b>A3. If yes, what was the basic timeline for communicating aspects of the reform?</b>	Not specified	Not applicable

Component 3: Selecting Measures		
Student Growth Measures (Tested Subjects/Grades)	<u>Colorado</u>	<u>Connecticut</u>
<b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) that student growth measures be included?</b>	Yes, mandates [CO-4, sec. 5 (3)(a); CO-22, pp. 10, 12–13].	Yes, mandates [CT-2, sec. 10-151b; CT-4, p. 1]
<b>A1. If yes, what model of measurement does the state require? (value-added model, percentile model, gain scores, covariate-adjusted, layered)</b>	Districts may select their own student growth models; however, the State Council for Educator Effectiveness has recommended the use of the Colorado Growth Model that uses student growth percentiles [CO-7; CO-4, sec. 5(3)(a); CO-15; CO-22, pp. 40, 66–77].	Vertical scale model [CT-9, pp. 83, 85, 91, 154]
<b>B. Does the state mandate (or recommend) an inclusion/exclusion criterion that will determine which teachers will have the growth model included in their final score?</b>	Yes, recommends [CO-22, p. 66].	Yes, mandates [CT-8, sec. 2.3(1)(c); CT-9, pp. 85, 91, 154].
<b>B1. If yes, what is the criterion for inclusion/exclusion?</b>	The State Council for Educator Effectiveness recommended the Colorado Growth Model or a similar appropriate value-added model only for teachers in courses that are currently assessed using a state summative assessment and for which there is a state summative assessment available in the same subject for the prior grade or in cases where there is a high-quality end-of-course, interim assessment and a high-quality predictive assessment [CO-22, p. 68].	Teachers of tested subjects and grades in elementary and middle schools (Grades 3–8) will have the vertical scale model included. All other teachers will have other measures of student growth. All teachers will have student learning objectives or nonstandard indicators included in their score, which for teachers of tested subjects and grades will compose half of the student growth component [CT-8, sec. 2.3(1)(c); CT-9, pp. 91, 154].
Student Growth Measures (Nontested Subjects/Grades)	<u>Colorado</u>	<u>Connecticut</u>
<b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) that student growth measures be included?</b>	Yes, mandates [CO-4, sec. 5, (3)(a); CO-22, pp. 10, 12–13].	Yes, mandates [CT-2, sec. 10-151b; CT-4, p. 1; CT-8, sec. 2.3(1)(c)]
<b>A1. If yes, does the state mandate (or</b>	Yes, recommends [CO-22, pp. 62–63].	Yes, recommends [CT-8, sec. 2.3(1)(c and d);

<b>recommend) alternative growth measures?</b>		CT-9, p. 154]
<b>A1a. If yes, are the alternative measures state, district, or locally created measures?</b>	District created, vendor created, nationally created, locally or teacher created, and student growth objectives [CO-22, pp. 62–63].	State, district, or locally created [CT-9, p. 154]. The state mandates that standardized measures be used where available [CT-8, sec. 2.3(1)(c)].
<b>B. Do the alternative measures rely on any of the following?</b>	Yes, classroom-based, interim, benchmark, and curriculum-based assessments [CO-22, pp. 62–63].	Yes, classroom-based assessments and interim or benchmark assessments [CT-9, p. 154].
<b>B1. Classroom-based assessments</b>	Yes [CO-22, pp. 62–63]	Yes [CT-9, p. 154]
<b>B2. Interim or benchmark assessments</b>	Yes [CO-22, pp. 62–63]	Yes [CT-9, p. 154]
<b>B3. Curriculum-based assessments</b>	Yes [CO-22, pp. 62–63]	Not specified
<b>C. Do the alternative measures include any of the following?</b>	Yes; during the piloting phase, student growth objectives (similar to student learning objectives (SLOs)) are recommended for subjects where no appropriate assessment data are available. The state will provide guidelines for using student growth objectives after the pilot years but has provided preliminary guidance for pilot use [CO-22, pp. 70–72; CO-20].	Yes, portfolios, teacher-developed assessments, and student learning objectives (SLOs) [CT-9, p. 154].
<b>C1. The four P's: projects, portfolios, performances, products</b>	Not specified	Yes [CT-9, p. 154]
<b>C2. Pre- and posttests</b>	Not specified	Not specified
<b>C3. Teacher-developed item banks and assessments</b>	Not specified	Yes [CT-9, p. 154]
<b>C4. Student learning objectives (SLOs)</b>	Yes, recommends [CO-22, pp. 70–72].	Yes [CT-8, sec. 2.3(1)(b); CT-9, p. 154]
<b>Measures of Teacher Performance (Observation)</b>	<a href="#">Colorado</a>	<a href="#">Connecticut</a>
<b>A. Are any observation instruments</b>	Yes, mandates use of an observation rubric but	No, but the state mandates that the instrument

<b>mandated (or recommended) by the state?</b>	recommends use of the state model rubric [CO-4; CO-22, pp. 40, 139; CO-2]. There is a model rubric recommended by the state [CO-5].	be based on the state's teaching standards and include four performance categories [CT-4, p. 5; CT-8, sec. 2.3(2)(b)(1-3)].
<b>A1. If yes, what is/are the observation instrument(s)?</b>	The state has developed a model teacher evaluation rubric that districts may choose to use. They may also choose to create their own rubric as long as it adheres to state law [CO-5; CO-11, p. 1].	Not applicable
<b>B. Has the instrument been piloted?</b>	The model system is being piloted and tested during the 2011–12 and 2012–13 school years. During these pilot years, revisions will be made to the rubric based on lessons learned and feedback from pilot participants and the field [CO-11, pp. 1–2].	Not applicable
<b>C. What are the labels attached to the levels of performance on the observation rubric? (proficient, distinguished, etc.)</b>	Not evident, partially proficient, proficient, accomplished, and exemplary [CO-11, pp. 2, 32]	Not applicable
<b>D. Are these labels aligned with the system-level performance levels?</b>	No [CO-11, pp. 2, 32]	Not applicable
<b>E. How is a final rating determined for the various domains measured by the observation rubric?</b>	The final rating on the model rubric is based on a point system [CO-11, p. 32].	Not applicable
<b>Details for Observation Methods</b>	<a href="#"><u>Colorado</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Connecticut</u></a>
<b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) the frequency and format of observation differentiated by status or years of experience?</b>	Yes, mandates [CO-4, sec. 6 (1)(c)(I and II); CO-22, p. 54].	Yes, mandates [CT-8, sec. 2.3(2)(c-e)]
<b>A1. If no, what are the state's requirements for frequency of observation for all teachers?</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>A2. If yes, briefly describe the state's</b>	For probationary teachers, the state mandates a	The state mandates that teachers in their first

<p><b>requirements for different groups of teachers.</b></p>	<p>minimum of two observations and one summative evaluation with written feedback each year; for nonprobationary teachers, the state requires a minimum of one observation per year and a summative evaluation with written feedback every three years [CO-4, sec. 6 (1)(c)(I and II)].</p> <p>The state recommends more intensive evaluations for teachers in the year prior to becoming nonprobationary and for any teacher whose performance indicates that they are likely to be rated as ineffective, partially effective, or highly effective [CO-22, p. 54].</p>	<p>and second year of employment will have at least three formal classroom-based observations, two of which must include a preconference and all of which must include a postconference with verbal and written feedback. Teachers who are rated as below standard or developing will have the same observation requirements as first- and second-year teachers, and may have more required observations as outlined in their professional development plan. Teachers rated as Proficient or Exemplary will have at least three formal observations or reviews of practice, one of which must be a classroom-based observation. The evaluator and teacher must agree on the number and type of observations or reviews of practice at the beginning of the evaluation process. Nonclassroom observations or reviews of practice may include observations of data team meetings, observations of coaching or mentoring of other teachers, or review of lesson plans or other artifacts [CT-8, sec. 2.3(2)(c-e)].</p>
<p><b>B. Does the state mandate (or recommend) how many evaluators are used?</b></p>	<p>Not specified</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>B1. If yes, who evaluates? (principals, teams, peers, etc.)</b></p>	<p>Principals, administrators, or their designees [CO-4, sec. 7 (4)(a)]</p>	<p>Principals or their designees [CT-6, p. 166; CT-8, sec. 2.2(1)].</p>
<p><b>C. Does the state mandate (or recommend) that opportunities be provided for teacher reflection on the results of the observation? (like pre- and postobservation conferences)</b></p>	<p>No, but the state recommends that teachers and their supervisors engage in professional dialogue focused on their practice and areas for growth throughout the evaluation process [CO-22, p. 57].</p>	<p>Yes, mandates that teachers be oriented to the evaluation process, have a goal-setting conference at the beginning of the year, midyear check-in conferences, an end-of-year self-assessment, and an end-of-year summative conference [CT-8, sec. 2.2(1-3)].</p>
<p><b>Additional Measures of Teacher Performance</b></p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Colorado</u></a></p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Connecticut</u></a></p>
<p><b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) measures other than</b></p>	<p>Yes, recommends [CO-22, pp. 40, 57].</p>	<p>Yes, mandates [CT-4, p. 2; CT-8, sec. 2.3(3-4)]</p>

<b>observation?</b>		
<b>A1. If yes, what are the additional measures?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of classroom artifacts</li> <li>• Review of teacher portfolio</li> <li>• Community/parent survey</li> <li>• Student survey</li> </ul> <p>[CO-22, p. 57] The state also encourages peer review [CO-22, p. 57].</p>	Peer or parent feedback surveys and whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback [CT-4, p. 2].
<b>B. How are the alternative measures incorporated into the evaluation?</b>	The state recommends that districts use the various measures to determine a score on each standard and then weight those scores when combining into a final performance rating [CO-22, pp. 80–83].	Incorporated into the final, summative score [CT-4, p. 2; CT-8, sec. 2.3(3-4)].
<b>B1. Included in a rubric with an observation</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>B2. Included in a rubric, but separate from any observation</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>B3. Not included in a rubric, but calculated or incorporated into final summative score</b>	Yes [CO-22, pp. 80–83]	Peer or parent feedback surveys will compose 10 percent of the final summative score, and whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback will compose 5 percent of the final score [CT-4, p. 2; CT-8, sec. 2.3(3-4)].

Component 4: System Structure		
Regulatory Framework	<u>Colorado</u>	<u>Connecticut</u>
<b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) the use of multiple measures?</b>	Yes, mandates [CO-4, sec. 7(e)(II); CO-6, p. 122; CO-2].	Yes, mandates [CT-2, sec. 10-151b; CT-8, sec. 1.2; CT-9, p. 45]
<b>A1. If yes, does the state mandate (or recommend) different weights for various measures?</b>	Yes, mandates that student growth compose at least 50 percent of the evaluation score. The state recommends that the remaining standards (standard I–standard V) each compose 7.5–40 percent of the overall score [CO-22, pp. 59–61].	Yes, mandates that 45 percent of the evaluation score be derived from multiple indicators of student learning growth, 40 percent from teacher observation and professional practice, 10 percent from peer and parent feedback, and 5 percent from schoolwide student learning or student feedback [CT-4, p. 2; CT-8, sec. 2.3; CT-9, p. 149].
<b>A2. If no, does the state provide an alternative method for combining the data from different measures? (comparison matrix, etc.)</b>	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>B. Does the state mandate (or recommend) a continuous cycle of teacher goal setting and professional development as part of the evaluation system?</b>	Not specified	Yes, mandates [CT-8, sec. 2.2(1–3)]
<b>B1. If yes, briefly describe the goal-setting cycle and any links to professional development.</b>	Not specified	The state mandates that teachers be oriented to the evaluation process, have a goal-setting conference at the beginning of the year, midyear check-in conferences, an end-of-year self-assessment, and an end-of-year summative conference [CT-8, sec. 2.2(1–3)].
Weights of Measures	<u>Colorado</u>	<u>Connecticut</u>
<b>A. If multiple measures, how much weight is given to student growth measures?</b>	At least 50 percent [CO-22, p. 51; CO-13, p. 9; CO-16]	45 percent of the teacher evaluation component is determined by multiple student learning indicators. Half this measure is based on student growth on state standardized tests or another

		standardized measure [CT-4, p. 2].
<b>B. How much weight is given to classroom observation?</b>	Classroom observation may be included in weights for all standards besides standard VI (student growth), which is 50 percent or less [CO-22, p. 58].	40 percent from observations [CT-4, p. 2].
<b>B1. If yes, how much weight was given to other areas?</b>	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 percent for whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback</li> <li>• 10 percent for peer or parent feedback surveys</li> </ul> [CT-4, p. 2]
<b>C. Are the weights stable or do they fluctuate with teaching discipline and context?</b>	Yes, fluctuates depending on district choice [CO-22, p. 59].	Yes, stable [CT-4, p. 2; CT-8, sec. 2.3]
<b>D. If applicable, what is the anticipated date for rolling out the system statewide?</b>	2014–15 [CO-22, p. 131]	2013–14 [CT-9, p. 150]
<b>Levels and Domains</b>	<b><u>Colorado</u></b>	<b><u>Connecticut</u></b>
<b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) the number of proficiency levels?</b>	Yes, mandates at least three levels and recommends four levels [CO-4, sec. 3(a); CO-22, p. 13; CO-6, pp. 121–122].	Yes, mandates four levels [CT-4, p. 4; CT-8, sec. 2.1(1)(a)].
<b>B. What are the labels attached to the levels? (basic, proficient, etc.)</b>	Highly effective, effective, partially effective, and ineffective [CO-22, p. 13; CO-6, p. 122]	Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Below Standard [CT-4, p. 4; CT-8, sec. 2.1(1)(a)].
<b>C. Are the levels attached to a career ladder? (novice, apprentice, leader, master, etc.)</b>	Not specified	Yes, the state mandates that districts must provide opportunities for career development and professional growth based on evaluation results, which may include differentiated career pathways [CT-8, sec. 2.6].
<b>D. What domains are covered by the evaluation system?</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Know Content</li> <li>2. Establish Environment</li> <li>3. Facilitate Learning</li> <li>4. Reflect on Practice</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Student Growth</li> <li>2. Observations of Practice and Performance</li> <li>3. Whole-School Student-Learning Indicators or Student Feedback</li> </ol>

	<p>5. Demonstrate 6. Leadership 7. Student Growth</p> <p>[CO-22, pp. 10–13, 83]</p>	<p>4. Parent or Peer Feedback</p> <p>[CT-8, sec. 2.3]</p>
<p><b>E. Do the domains align with the state's teacher standards?</b></p>	<p>Yes [CO-22, pp. 10, 83]</p>	<p>Yes, the Observations of Practice and Performance align with the state's teaching standards [CT-8, sec. 2.3(2)(b)(1–2)].</p>

Component 5: Evaluators		
Personnel	<u>Colorado</u>	<u>Connecticut</u>
<b>A. Does the state provide the trained personnel who will use the rubrics or other sources of documentation?</b>	No, but the State Council for Educator Effectiveness is required to develop recommendations regarding ongoing training on the use of the system so that all evaluators and educators have a complete understanding of the evaluation system and its use CO-4, sec. 5, (3)(e)(l)].	No, but the state mandates that evaluators must be trained in observation, scoring, and providing feedback and that the local board of education must offer annual orientations to the evaluation process for teachers [CT-4, p. 4; CT-8, secs. 2.3(2)(f) and 2.7].
<b>A1. If yes, to whom and what kind of training does the state provide for using data? (interpreting value-added scores, tracking progress, monitoring data)</b>	Not specified	Not applicable
<b>B. Does the state select evaluators, and if yes, what are the eligibility criteria?</b>	Not specified	Yes, evaluators are principals or their designees [CT-8, sec. 2.2(1)].
Training and Guidelines	<u>Colorado</u>	<u>Connecticut</u>
<b>A. Does the state provide oversight to ensure that evaluators use the instrument with fidelity?</b>	Not specified	Not specified
<b>B. Has the state created mechanisms to retrain evaluators who are not implementing the system with fidelity?</b>	Not specified	Yes. According to the state's Race to the Top application, the state plans to have administrators participate in calibration exercises every other year and receive retraining every three years [CT-6, p. 166].
<b>C. Does the state provide examples and guidance in determining levels of proficiency and approval?</b>	Not specified	Not specified
<b>D. Does the state provide guidance or resources in maintaining a steady pool of trained evaluators?</b>	Not specified	Not specified

Component 6: Data Integrity		
Data Infrastructure and Validation	<a href="#">Colorado</a>	<a href="#">Connecticut</a>
<b>A. Has the state provided, or has it plans to provide, a data infrastructure to link teachers to individual student data using unique identifiers?</b>	Yes [CO-22, p. 31]	Yes. Connecticut's statewide longitudinal data system includes unique identifiers for students and teachers. The state is currently, however, in the process of linking student and teacher data by July 1, 2013 [CT-1; CT-2, sec. 10-151b; CT-6, pp. 110, 112, 158; CT-9, p. 51].
<b>B. What data validation processes are in place? (teachers reviewing student lists, administrators monitoring input, software for auto validation)</b>	Data validation is recommended by the State Council for Educator Effectiveness, but the process is not specified [CO-22, p. 67].	Not specified
<b>C. How does the state ensure teacher/student confidentiality?</b>	The State Council for Educator Effectiveness recommended that the state pass new statutory provisions to protect the use and reporting of educator evaluation results [CO-22, p. 158]. The state currently has a unique identifier system with built-in protections to ensure educator confidentiality [CO-3, sec. 4 (22-68.5-102); CO-14, p. 1].	Not specified
<b>D. Is there a system through which teachers and administrators can correct errors?</b>	Not specified	Not specified
Reporting	<a href="#">Colorado</a>	<a href="#">Connecticut</a>
<b>A. Is teacher evaluation data able to be aggregated or disaggregated to depict results at various levels?</b>	Not specified	According to the state's Race to the Top application, Connecticut plans to develop an electronic data collection process that will aggregate evaluation data [CT-6, p. 164].
<b>B. Do administrators and teachers have access to evaluation data?</b>	Not specified	Connecticut plans to enhance its data system to enable teachers to view their own evaluation data, such as observation forms, scores, and effectiveness rating. Principals will also be able to view teacher evaluation data by individual

		teacher or by group [CT-9, p. 51].
<b>C. Has the state provided teachers with training to use the data to inform teacher practice?</b>	Not specified	Not specified
<b>Use of Data</b>	<b><u>Colorado</u></b>	<b><u>Connecticut</u></b>
<b>A. How frequently is evaluation data shared with the education community?</b>	Not specified	Not specified
<b>B. What evaluation data is shared? (component scores, summative scores, school-level scores)</b>	Not specified	Not specified
<b>C. How are the evaluation results shared with the community? (website, press releases, town meetings)</b>	Not specified	Not specified
<b>D. Is evaluation data used to inform changes in the evaluation design?</b>	Not specified	Not specified
<b>E. Has the state put protections in place to prevent misuse of the evaluation data?</b>	Not specified. The State Council for Educator Evaluation recommends that the state adopt provisions to provide protections regarding the use and reporting of educator evaluation data [CO-22, p. 158].	Not specified

Component 7: Using Results		
Trigger Points for Action	<a href="#">Colorado</a>	<a href="#">Connecticut</a>
<b>A. Does the state mandate, recommend, or allow evaluation results to be used in human resource decisions? (teacher distribution, promotion, dismissal, renewal, tenure, compensation, etc.)</b>	Yes, mandates [CO-4, sec. 5(10(a)(IV)(B); CO-22, pp. 154–166].	No. Currently, teachers are awarded tenure after four years of teaching and teacher evaluation results are not required in dismissal decisions [CT-2, sec. 10-151, 7(d) and (e)]. The state plans to use the new evaluation system to inform human resource decisions, according to its Race to the Top application [CT-6, p. 154].
<b>A1. If yes, under what conditions does the state mandate, recommend, or allow evaluation results to trigger promotion, retention, dismissal? (three unsatisfactories over three years, etc.)</b>	The state mandates that evaluation results be used in decisions regarding a teacher's probationary or nonprobationary status after the piloting stage [CO-4, sec. 5, (10)(a)(IV)(B); CO-22, p. 138]. The State Council for Educator Effectiveness has recommended additional policy changes needed to allow evaluation results to be used in decisions over dismissal, compensation, and teacher recognition [CO-22, pp. 154–166]. The council has drafted initial recommendations and will give its final recommendations by the end of the pilot phase [CO-22, pp. 84–92].	Not applicable
<b>B. Does the state mandate (or recommend) how and when teachers are to be notified of next steps toward professional growth or termination?</b>	While the state does not specify how it will notify teachers of steps toward professional growth or termination, the state mandates that districts provide teachers with written feedback from their evaluation at least two weeks before the end of the school year [CO-4, sec. 6, (1)(c)(I and II)].	Not specified
<b>C. What is the timeline for rolling out the incorporation of high-stakes decisions?</b>	2015–16 [CO-22, p. 141]	The state planned to implement high-stakes decisions in 2013–14 in its Race to the Top application but has not specified this information since [CT-6, p. 154].
Evaluation Cycle and Evaluation Results	<a href="#">Colorado</a>	<a href="#">Connecticut</a>

<p><b>A. Does the state mandate (or recommend) that teachers who are identified as ineffective be given sufficient opportunities and support to improve before termination is considered?</b></p>	<p>Yes, mandates that teachers rated as ineffective be provided a remediation plan that should include relevant professional development to correct deficiencies needed to be rated effective. A specific time period is not specified; instead, the legislation stipulates a teacher must be provided a reasonable period of time to show improvement [CO-4, sec. 7 (3.5)(a)].</p>	<p>Yes, mandates that teachers rated as developing or below standard will have individual improvement plans and remediation that are collaboratively developed by the teacher and his or her bargaining representative. The plan must identify resources and support provided by the local board of education, a timeline for implementation within the same school year that the plan is issued, and clear indicators of success [CT-8, sec. 2.5].</p> <p>Termination decisions are left to the districts [CT-5, p. 8].</p>
<p><b>B. Does the state mandate (or recommend) that data obtained through evaluation inform professional development offerings?</b></p>	<p>Not specified</p>	<p>Yes, mandates that LEAs provide professional learning opportunities and professional growth based on evaluation results [CT-8, secs. 2.4 and 2.6]. There must be a clear link between teacher evaluation, professional development, and improvement in student learning [CT-5, p. 4].</p>
<p><b>C. Does the state mandate (or recommend) that evaluation results be used to identify teachers for roles such as mentor teachers, master teachers, and consulting teachers?</b></p>	<p>Not specified</p>	<p>Yes, mandates that districts provide opportunities for career development and professional growth based on evaluation results, such as observation of peers, mentoring or coaching, developing improvement and remediation plans for peers rated as developing or below standard, leading professional learning communities (PLCs), or differentiated career pathways [CT-8, sec. 26].</p>

<b>Component 8: System Evaluation</b>		
<b>Evaluation Process</b>	<b><u>Colorado</u></b>	<b><u>Connecticut</u></b>
<b>A. Has the state mandated (or recommended) a process to assess the system's effectiveness?</b>	Not specified	Yes, mandates that the University of Connecticut conduct a study on the evaluation system, which it will submit to the state board of education by January 2014 [CT-8, sec. 1.4].
<b>B. Has the full evaluation system model been piloted or are there plans to pilot it?</b>	Yes, the state is piloting the system in the 2011–12 and 2012–13 school years. The state plans to implement the full evaluation system in 2013–14 [CO-5; CO-22, pp. 130–132].	Yes, the state is piloting the full evaluation system in 2012–13 [CT-9, p. 150].
<b>C. Had the state detailed any plans for research to assess correlation between growth model scores and observation ratings?</b>	Not specified	Not specified
<b>Effectiveness of Outcomes</b>	<b><u>Colorado</u></b>	<b><u>Connecticut</u></b>
<b>A. Has the state selected outcomes to determine the overall effectiveness of the system?</b>	Yes, the state will monitor the results of the evaluation system and report on a variety of student and educator outcomes [CO-22, pp. 148–149].	Not specified
<b>B. What benchmarks or targets have been established?</b>	The State Council for Educator Effectiveness identified 18 specific indicators of success for the new evaluation system [CO-22, pp. 146–148].	Not specified
<b>C. Has the state created a data infrastructure for tracking data over time?</b>	Not specified	Yes. Connecticut currently has a data warehouse where they collect all student and teacher data [CT-9, p. 170]. The state also mandates that the state's information system be expanded to track and report data relating to teacher performance and to make such information available to local boards of education for the use in evaluating the performance growth of teachers [CT-1].

