

For Release:
Friday, March 18, 2016

Contact:
Matt O'Connor,
860/221-5696
moconnor@aftct.org

Comments on Lawmakers' Action to Decouple Standardized Tests from Teacher Evaluations

AFT Connecticut leaders made the following remarks on passage in the General Assembly's education committee of legislation excluding student performance data on the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC) from teacher performance assessments:

"Today, Education Committee Co-Chair State Senator Gayle Slossberg identified the challenge before lawmakers; how to help teachers improve our students' outcomes and close the achievement gap," said AFT Connecticut President Jan Hochadel. "The majority of the committee took a significant step in the right direction by voting to place instructional emphasis on deep issue knowledge and analytical skills, rather test preparation. Our member educators appreciate lawmakers' commitment to their students' opportunities to learn," added Hochadel, who taught physics and science in the Connecticut Technical High School System.

"SBAC, like so many other standardized tests, was never designed to evaluate educator effectiveness," said David Cicarella, a reading and math teacher with 22 years experience in New Haven Public Schools. "Of course teachers must be held accountable; S.B. 380 does not change that in any way. This bill moves the rest of Connecticut closer to adopting a system that continues to employ multiple measures of assessment. At the same time, it will remove a test that is inappropriate for use in evaluations and allow SBAC to measure school and district performance, as it was originally intended," added Cicarella, who currently serves as president of the New Haven Federation of Teachers and a vice-president on AFT Connecticut's executive committee.

"This bill is an acknowledgment by lawmakers that standardized test scores are a mere snapshot in time," said Patti Fusco, a teacher of talented and gifted students with 28 years experience in West Haven Public Schools. "The majority on the committee demonstrated their understanding that one test does not give a picture of a student's growth or an educator's proficiency. This bill is a step toward grading teachers on what we teach and our students will be better for it," added Fusco, a member of the West Haven

Healthcare
Higher Education
Public Employees
PSRP
Teachers

35 Marshall Road
Rocky Hill, CT 06067
860/257-9782
Fax: 860/257-8214
Toll Free: 888/398-3373
www.aftct.org

Jan Hochadel
PRESIDENT

John Brady, RN
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Jean Morningstar
FIRST VICE PRESIDENT

Ed Leavy
SECRETARY-TREASURER

VICE PRESIDENTS
Erin Benham
Dennis Bogusky
Dave Cicarella
Joanne Chapin
Lisa D'Abrosca
Shellye Davis
John DiSette
Patti Fusco
Mary Ann Goggin
David Hayes
Andrea Johnson
Tom Kuroski
Kristen Malloy Scanlon
Laila A. Mandour
Donna R. Maronde
Chuck Morrell
Harry Rodriguez
Jim Romano
Kathy Sanner
Martha Shoemaker
Mary Symkowicz

Federation of Teachers and AFT Connecticut's jurisdictional vice president
for PreK-12 educators.

###

AFT Connecticut represents approximately 30,000 professionals across the state, including PreK-12 teachers, paraeducators and education support personnel in 29 local and regional school districts. For more information, visit www.aftct.org or follow the labor federation on Twitter at [@AFTCT](https://twitter.com/AFTCT) and on Facebook at www.facebook.com/aftct.

Attached –

S.B. 380 - An Act Concerning the Exclusion of Student Performance Results on the Mastery Examination from Teacher Evaluations.



General Assembly

February Session, 2016

Raised Bill No. 380

LCO No. 2547



Referred to Committee on EDUCATION

Introduced by:
(ED)

AN ACT CONCERNING THE EXCLUSION OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE RESULTS ON THE MASTERY EXAMINATION FROM TEACHER EVALUATIONS.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

1 Section 1. Section 10-151b of the 2016 supplement to the general
2 statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof
3 (*Effective from passage*):

4 (a) The superintendent of each local or regional board of education
5 shall annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each teacher, and for
6 the school year commencing July 1, 2013, and each school year
7 thereafter, such annual evaluations shall be the teacher evaluation and
8 support program adopted pursuant to subsection (b) of this section.
9 The superintendent may conduct additional formative evaluations
10 toward producing an annual summative evaluation. An evaluation
11 pursuant to this subsection shall include, but need not be limited to,
12 strengths, areas needing improvement, strategies for improvement and
13 multiple indicators of student academic growth. For any evaluation
14 conducted for the school year commencing July 1, 2016, and each

15 school year thereafter, such multiple indicators of student academic
16 growth shall not include the use of student performance data on the
17 state-wide mastery examination pursuant to section 10-14n. Claims of
18 failure to follow the established procedures of such teacher evaluation
19 and support program shall be subject to the grievance procedure in
20 collective bargaining agreements negotiated subsequent to July 1, 2004.
21 In the event that a teacher does not receive a summative evaluation
22 during the school year, such teacher shall receive a "not rated"
23 designation for such school year. The superintendent shall report (1)
24 the status of teacher evaluations to the local or regional board of
25 education on or before June first of each year, and (2) the status of the
26 implementation of the teacher evaluation and support program,
27 including the frequency of evaluations, aggregate evaluation ratings,
28 the number of teachers who have not been evaluated and other
29 requirements as determined by the Department of Education, to the
30 Commissioner of Education on or before September fifteenth of each
31 year. For purposes of this section, the term "teacher" shall include each
32 professional employee of a board of education, below the rank of
33 superintendent, who holds a certificate or permit issued by the State
34 Board of Education.

35 (b) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, not later
36 than September 1, [2013] 2016, each local and regional board of
37 education shall adopt and implement a teacher evaluation and support
38 program that is consistent with the guidelines for a model teacher
39 evaluation and support program adopted by the State Board of
40 Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. Such teacher
41 evaluation and support program shall be developed through mutual
42 agreement between the local or regional board of education and the
43 professional development and evaluation committee for the school
44 district, established pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-220a. If a
45 local or regional board of education is unable to develop a teacher
46 evaluation and support program through mutual agreement with such
47 professional development and evaluation committee, then such board

48 of education and such professional development and evaluation
49 committee shall consider the model teacher evaluation and support
50 program adopted by the State Board of Education, pursuant to
51 subsection (c) of this section, and such board of education may adopt,
52 through mutual agreement with such professional development and
53 evaluation committee, such model teacher evaluation and support
54 program. If a local or regional board of education and the professional
55 development and evaluation committee are unable to mutually agree
56 on the adoption of such model teacher evaluation and support
57 program, then such board of education shall adopt and implement a
58 teacher evaluation and support program developed by such board of
59 education, provided such teacher evaluation and support program is
60 consistent with the guidelines adopted by the State Board of
61 Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. Each local and
62 regional board of education may commence implementation of the
63 teacher evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to this
64 subsection in accordance with a teacher evaluation and support
65 program implementation plan adopted pursuant to subsection (d) of
66 this section.

67 (c) (1) On or before [July 1, 2012] August 15, 2016, the State Board of
68 Education shall adopt, in consultation with the Performance
69 Evaluation Advisory Council established pursuant to section 10-151d,
70 guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program. Such
71 guidelines shall include, but not be limited to, (A) the use of four
72 performance evaluations designators: Exemplary, proficient,
73 developing and below standard; (B) subject to the provisions of
74 subdivision (3) of this subsection, the use of multiple indicators of
75 student academic growth and development in teacher evaluations that
76 do not include the use of student performance data on the state-wide
77 mastery examination pursuant to section 10-14n; (C) methods for
78 assessing student academic growth and development; (D) a
79 consideration of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school
80 information system, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-10a, that

81 may influence teacher performance ratings, including, but not limited
82 to, student characteristics, student attendance and student mobility; (E)
83 minimum requirements for teacher evaluation instruments and
84 procedures, including scoring systems to determine exemplary,
85 proficient, developing and below standard ratings; (F) the
86 development and implementation of periodic training programs
87 regarding the teacher evaluation and support program to be offered by
88 the local or regional board of education or regional educational service
89 center for the school district to teachers who are employed by such
90 local or regional board of education and whose performance is being
91 evaluated and to administrators who are employed by such local or
92 regional board of education and who are conducting performance
93 evaluations; (G) the provision of professional development services
94 based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are
95 identified through the evaluation process; (H) the creation of
96 individual teacher improvement and remediation plans for teachers
97 whose performance is developing or below standard, designed in
98 consultation with such teacher and his or her exclusive bargaining
99 representative for certified teachers chosen pursuant to section 10-
100 153b, and that (i) identify resources, support and other strategies to be
101 provided by the local or regional board of education to address
102 documented deficiencies, (ii) indicate a timeline for implementing such
103 resources, support, and other strategies, in the course of the same
104 school year as the plan is issued, and (iii) include indicators of success
105 including a summative rating of proficient or better immediately at the
106 conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan; (I) opportunities
107 for career development and professional growth; and (J) a validation
108 procedure to audit evaluation ratings of exemplary or below standard
109 by the department or a third-party entity approved by the department.

110 (2) The State Board of Education shall, following the completion of
111 the teacher evaluation and support pilot program, pursuant to section
112 10-151f, and the submission of the study of such pilot program,
113 pursuant to section 10-151g, review and may revise, as necessary, the

114 guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program and
115 the model teacher evaluation and support program adopted under this
116 subsection.

117 (3) Not later than August 1, 2016, the State Board of Education shall
118 revise the guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support
119 program and the model teacher evaluation and support program,
120 adopted under this subsection, to exclude the use of student
121 performance data on the state-wide mastery examination, pursuant to
122 section 10-14n. The state board, in consultation with the Performance
123 Evaluation Advisory Council, may reconsider how much weight shall
124 be given to multiple indicators of student academic growth and
125 development in teacher evaluations and revise, as necessary, such
126 guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program and
127 the model teacher evaluation and support program.

128 (d) A local or regional board of education may phase in full
129 implementation of the teacher evaluation and support program
130 adopted pursuant to subsection (b) of this section during the school
131 years commencing July 1, 2013, and July 1, 2014, pursuant to a teacher
132 evaluation and support program implementation plan adopted by the
133 State Board of Education, in consultation with the Performance
134 Evaluation Advisory Council, not later than July 1, 2013. The
135 Commissioner of Education may waive the provisions of subsection
136 (b) of this section and the implementation plan provisions of this
137 subsection for any local or regional board of education that has
138 expressed an intent, not later than July 1, 2013, to adopt a teacher
139 evaluation program for which such board requests a waiver in
140 accordance with this subsection.

This act shall take effect as follows and shall amend the following sections:		
Section 1	<i>from passage</i>	10-151b

Statement of Purpose:

To exclude student performance data on the Smarter Balanced Assessment from teacher performance evaluations.

[Proposed deletions are enclosed in brackets. Proposed additions are indicated by underline, except that when the entire text of a bill or resolution or a section of a bill or resolution is new, it is not underlined.]