

Connecticut Guidelines for Educator and Leader Evaluation and Support 2023

(CT GUIDELINES 2023)

Initially Proposed to the State Board of Education – June 14, 2023

Updated August 31, 2023



Connecticut State Department of Education

Contents

Connecticut General Statutes Requirements	1
Historical Context	1
Introduction and Guiding Principles	2
Vision	3
Guiding Principles	3
Reimagining Educator and Leader Evaluation and Support	3
Standards and Criteria	5
Goal-Setting Process — Educators	8
Goal-Setting Process — Leaders	8
Professional Practice and Educator Growth	9
Professional Practice and Leader Growth	9
Evaluator/Observer/Stakeholder Feedback and Engagement	10
Process Elements — Educator	10
Process Elements — Leader	11
Dispute Resolution	13
Local and State Reporting	14
Appendix	15

The Connecticut State Department of Education is committed to a policy of equal opportunity/affirmative action for all qualified persons. The Connecticut Department of Education does not discriminate in any employment practice, education program, or educational activity on the basis of race; color; religious creed; age; sex; pregnancy; sexual orientation; workplace hazards to reproductive systems, gender identity or expression; marital status; national origin; ancestry; retaliation for previously opposed discrimination or coercion, intellectual disability; genetic information; learning disability; physical disability (including, but not limited to, blindness); mental disability (past/present history thereof); military or veteran status; status as a victim of domestic violence; or criminal record in state employment, unless there is a bona fide occupational qualification excluding persons in any of the aforementioned protected classes. Inquiries regarding the Connecticut State Department of Education's nondiscrimination policies should be directed to: Attorney Louis Todisco, Connecticut State Department of Education, by mail 450 Columbus Blvd., Hartford, CT 06103-1841; or by telephone 860-713-6594; or by email louis.todisco@ct.gov.

Connecticut General Statutes Requirements

[Connecticut General Statutes 10-151b](#) requires that “the superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each teacher.”

Teacher is defined as “each certified professional employee below the rank of superintendent employed by a board of education who holds a certificate or permit issued by the State Board of Education” (SBE). This definition encompasses the multiple roles of certified professional employees employed by a board of education.

To ensure successful implementation of an effective system of evaluation and support, these guidelines delineate the following definitions:

- Educator includes teachers and student and educator support specialists who provide instruction and support services to students and staff. Educators serving in a teaching role or serving in a role of providing support services hold a valid certificate or permit issued by the State Board of Education.
- Leader includes school and district administrators who are responsible for providing instructional leadership and for developing, implementing, and evaluating systems and policies within the school or district. Leaders serving in an administrative position hold a valid certification endorsement for Intermediate Administration or Supervision (#092) issued by the State Board of Education.

Historical Context

In response to the requirements contained in federal Race to the Top regulations, Connecticut adopted a framework described in [Connecticut General Statutes 10-151d](#) that created the Performance Evaluation and Advisory Council (PEAC). Established by the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE), PEAC includes membership from CSDE partner organizations and was responsible for:

1. Assisting the State Board of Education in the development of:
 - a. guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program; and
 - b. a model teacher evaluation and support program, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-151b.
2. The data collection and evaluation support system, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-10a.
3. Assisting the State Board of Education in the development of a teacher.
4. Evaluation and support program implementation plan, pursuant to subsection (e) of section 10-151b.

These tasks were accomplished over the initial years of implementation of [Connecticut General Statutes 10-151b](#) during the 2011-15 school years.

The initial [Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation \(2012\)](#), developed by PEAC and adopted by the Connecticut State Board of Education, were [amended to provide educators with greater flexibility](#) in the implementation of the new educator evaluation and support system. The most recent version of the [Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation \(2017\)](#) reflects these amendments. These guidelines include the components of an educator evaluation and support program pursuant to [Connecticut General Statutes 10-15 \(c\)](#).

Pursuant to [Connecticut General Statutes 10-220a](#), each local and regional board of education was directed to establish a professional development and evaluation committee (PDEC) to include at least one teacher and one administrator selected by the exclusive bargaining representative for certified employees and other school personnel as the local board deems appropriate. The duties of PDECs shall include, but not be limited to:

- participation in the development or adoption of a teacher evaluation and support program for the district, pursuant to section 10-151b; and
- the development, evaluation, and annual updating of a comprehensive local professional development plan for certified employees of the district.

This was the framework for educator evaluation and support that was in place during the onset of the global pandemic. During this period, due to the extraordinary circumstances and challenges associated with the management of the public health crisis, additional flexibilities regarding the educator evaluation process were included within [Governor Lamont's Executive Order 7C](#). These changes opened the door for local innovation and placed a renewed focus on the original purposes of professional evaluation and support. That shift, combined with feedback from the field that suggested the previous model had not entirely fulfilled its intended purpose, precipitated an effort to rethink Connecticut's approach to this critical system for improved student growth and success. This transformational framework is designed to promote reflective practice through ongoing, job-embedded professional learning, which supports educator and leader growth and development toward mutually agreed upon goals at each stage of their professional career within the education system.

Introduction and Guiding Principles

The primary goal of the educator evaluation and support system is to strengthen individual and collective practices to increase student learning, growth, and achievement. To consider how the existing system did or did not align with this purpose and to provide suggestions for how to improve it, in fall 2022, the CSDE reconvened the Educator Evaluation and Support (EES) Council, codified in [Connecticut General Statutes 10-151b](#) as the Performance Evaluation and Advisory Council. In addition to the CSDE, the EES Council stakeholder organizations include:

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education of Connecticut (AACTE-CT)
- American Federation of Teachers of Connecticut (AFT-CT)
- Connecticut Association of Boards of Education (CABE)
- Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS)
- Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS)
- Connecticut Education Association (CEA)
- Connecticut Association of School Administrators (CASA)
- Connecticut Federation of School Administrators (CFSA)
- Minority Teacher Recruitment (MTR) Policy Oversight Council
- Regional Educational Service Center (RESC) Alliance

A liaison from the State Board of Education participated in EES Council meetings.

During their initial meetings, EES Council members reached consensus that the reimagined guidelines for educator evaluation and support will need to:

- be consistent with emerging research and best practices in the field of education;
- include a renewed focus on professional learning to develop systems of continuous improvement for educator practice and student outcomes; and
- address the continued impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on students, teachers, administrators, families, and school communities.

With that as a foundation, the council then conducted an in-depth review of research based best practices and the data on the effectiveness of the current system both here in Connecticut and in other jurisdictions across the country. After much consideration and debate, the EES Council has developed the following vision and guiding principles for the next generation of educator and leader evaluation and support in Connecticut:

Vision

All Connecticut educators and leaders have the opportunity for continuous learning and feedback, to develop and grow, both individually and collectively, through the educator and leader evaluation and support system so that all Connecticut students experience growth and success.

Guiding Principles

The EES Council engaged in a collaborative process to reach consensus on the design principles that would most impact the design of a transformative educator and leader evaluation and support system that uses high-quality professional learning to improve educator and leader practice and student outcomes. These include:

- **Allow for differentiation of roles** (for example, teachers, counselors, instructional coaches, student support staff, and leaders in central office such as principal, assistant principal, etc.).
- **Simplify and reduce the burden** (for example, eliminate the technical challenge; reduce the number of steps, paperwork).
- **Focus on things that matter** (identify high leverage, mainstream goal focus areas).
- **Connect to best practices aimed at the development of the whole child** (including, but not limited to, academic, social, emotional, and physical development).
- **Focus on educator growth and agency** (meaningfully engage professionals by focusing on growth and practice in partnership with others aligned to a strategic focus—see above, focus on things that matter).
- **Meaningful connections to professional learning** (provide multiple pathways for participants to improve their own practice in a way that is meaningful and impactful).
- **Specific, timely, accurate, actionable, and reciprocal feedback.**

Reimagining Educator and Leader Evaluation and Support

The design elements of the *Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (2023)* (CT Guidelines 2023) represent several shifts from what has become common practice when implementing the [Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation \(2017\)](#). These shifts are based on research and best practices from Connecticut educators and from other states, and represent changes in the following areas for both educators and leaders:

- Standards and criteria
- Goal setting process
- Professional practice and student growth
- Evaluator/observer/stakeholder feedback and engagement
- Process elements
- Dispute resolution

These elements include:

- **Nonnegotiables:** these components *must* be included in a district's educator and leader evaluation and support plan (EESP); and
- **Best Practices Preferences:** these components *should* be included in a district's EESP.

The vision, guiding principles, and overall framework for educator and leader evaluation and support describe a systematic process of continuous improvement and professional learning leading to high-quality professional practice and improved outcomes for students. It is important to acknowledge that while some components of this framework may be similar for educators and leaders, there are also components that apply specifically to educators or to leaders. Components specific to educators and to leaders are distinguished in the following requirements and best practices.

The focus of the leadership evaluation and support framework emphasizes developing the capacity of leaders through a transformational perspective in which leaders work together with learners, educators, and the broader community to achieve an inclusive vision of ambitious and equitable outcomes for each and every learner. Emphasizing leadership for learning shifts the focus from management to a learning organization that embraces a continuous growth model. The delineation of *leader* acknowledges the various levels of leadership within the system that includes, but is not limited to, central office (i.e., assistant superintendent, director of curriculum, director of pupil services, building principal, assistant principal, supervisors). Developing the capacity of teacher leaders also serves as an important component of a continuous growth system focused on learning. Central to the evaluation and support framework is the belief that when central office works in meaningful ways toward supporting the development of schools' capacity for high-quality teaching and learning, sustainable success occurs. (Wallace Foundation, 2020).

Standards and Criteria

Nonnegotiables (*Your new plan must ...*)

- Educator and leader practice discussions are based on a set of national or state performance standards set by professional organizations agreed upon by the PDEC. A representative PDEC works to mutually agree upon a standard-based best practice observation model.
- The teacher evaluation and support program shall be developed through mutual agreement between the local or regional board of education and the PDEC. If the local or regional board of education and the PDEC are unable to come to mutual agreement, they shall consider the model teacher evaluation and support program adopted by the State Board of Education and may, through mutual agreement, adopt such model teacher evaluation and support program.
- If the local or regional board of education and the PDEC are unable to mutually agree on the adoption of the State Board of Education’s model program, then the local or regional board of education shall adopt and implement a teacher evaluation and support program developed by such board, provided that the program is consistent with the guidelines adopted by the State Board of Education.
- While a district may create their own rubrics for use in this process, the district must demonstrate that those rubrics are aligned with or tied to an externally referenced standard.

	Educator	Leader
Examples of national or state professional standards	CT Common Core of Teaching (2010) Teacher Leader Model Standards (2008) School Social Work Association of America	Common Core of Leading: CT School Leadership Standards (2012) Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (2015)
Examples of rubrics	CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2017 CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2017	CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2017

Additional examples of rubrics include those developed by Charlotte Danielson, Kim Marshall, and Robert Marzano.

- **Evaluation and support will be an ongoing, cyclical progress monitoring process with evaluator and educator/leader/team conferences in the fall/winter/spring.**
 - Educators and leaders will meet with their supervisor three times a year (at minimum, fall goal setting, midyear review, end of year reflection). The meetings should be approached in a spirit of continuous improvement, reflection, and collaboration. Goals should always be connected to standards recommended by the PDEC and approved by the local board of education.
 - The first meeting will be focused on goal setting, which can be completed either as an individual or as a collaborative group depending on the goal.

- In this process, the end-of-year meeting should be used as a time to reflect on the current year and how it might inform/launch the next evaluation cycle.
 - An appropriate summary of the educator/leader growth achieved through the process and the provision of a platform to consider future work will be provided by the evaluator on an annual basis. This summary should be tied to the agreed on standards and goals upon which the process was based and will make a distinction regarding the educator’s/leader’s successful completion of the evaluative cycle.
- **Multiple measures of student learning, growth, and achievement as mutually agreed upon during the goal-setting process.**

	Educator	Leader
Multiple measures can include, but not be limited to, student learning, educator learning, cultural changes, etc. Additional evidence relevant to one or more competencies may be part of the process and discussion.	. . . can include, but not be limited to, promoting a positive, safe, and equitable learning culture, engaging in instructionally focused interactions, facilitating collaboration and professional learning, as well as managing operations, personnel, and resources strategically. Additional evidence relevant to one or more competencies may be part of the process and discussion.
Multiple measures should be adjusted and be appropriate per the role of the educator in the process (educator, counselor, instructional coach, etc.).	. . . the leader in the process (assistant superintendent, principal, department chair, etc.).

Best Practices Preference (*Your new plan should ...*)

- **Single point competencies** are preferred as they focus the discussion and feedback on the desired practice rather than a rating outcome. This will allow:
 - The promotion of clear, research-based expectations tied to standards.
 - Current rubrics could be used as talking points for feedback and deepening reflection on practice but are encouraged to be framed or converted as single points for increased clarity and avoiding the trap of ratings and past practice. This can be completed by the PDEC or by adoption of an external, standards-based model.
 - The goal is to establish a clearly articulated vision of effective practice that focuses on growth (celebrations/next steps) and not a final rating.

A **single point competency** is a description of a standard of behavior or performance that is framed only as a single set of desired outcomes rather than laid out across a rating or scale of performance like a more traditional rubric. The primary reason for using this approach is that it supports a focus on understanding of the goal and the performance's strengths and weaknesses without the complication of having to interpret those elements into a rating. Ratings are essentially symptoms, not root causes. What we see in practice when this shift is successful is that it becomes easier for the participants to focus the energy of the process on the evidence, why that evidence looks the way it does, and what can be done to support improvement rather than on a debate or negotiation on what the rating is.

Examples are provided in the appendix.

- **Goals and standards should be consistent with the goals of the district.** Clear alignment between district, school, and certified staff goals (departments, grade-level teams, or collaborations) improves the collective effectiveness of practice.
 - This will encourage individual educators and leaders to reflect on how they are contributing to the goals, mission, vision of the district, whether they will be developing individual, department, or grade-level team-based goals.
 - The goal-setting process should encourage consideration of growth of the whole child—considering growth indicators in a variety of areas critical to the overall well-being of students.
- This will encourage individual educators and leaders to reflect on how they are contributing to the goals, mission, vision of the district, whether they will be developing individual, department, or grade-level team-based goals.
- The goal-setting process should encourage consideration of growth of the whole child—considering growth indicators in a variety of areas critical to the overall well-being of students.

Goal-Setting Process — Educators

Nonnegotiables (*Your new plan must ...*)

- Goal-setting process must follow the timelines and frameworks created by the PDEC consistent with the standards established during this process.
- Goals and feedback will be based on evidence, observations, and artifacts of professional practice as aligned to the lens of the agreed upon standards.
- Educators and their evaluators mutually agree upon a one-, two- or three-year goal and develop a plan for professional development and support that is consistent with their professional status and goals.
 - All educators are assigned a primary evaluator (092).
- PDECs determine protocols for each level of educator (novice, provisional, professional, transfers to the district, part-time or partial year, educator or leader in need of support, etc.)

Best practices Preference (*Your new plan should ...*)

- Goal setting should allow for differentiated timelines (one, two, or three years) and differentiated partnerships (perhaps in teams or in collaboration with another educator), depending on the role of the educator and aligned with a plan for professional learning and growth.
- There should be discussion and exploration of how goals may/should be aligned with districtwide and individual professional development, professional learning communities, and other integrated efforts to support the goals, mission, and vision established within the district.

Goal-Setting Process — Leaders

Nonnegotiables (*Your new plan must ...*)

- Goal-setting process must follow the timelines and frameworks created by the PDEC consistent with the standards established during this process.
- Goals and feedback will be based on evidence, observations, and artifacts of professional practice as aligned to the lens of the agreed upon standards.
- Mutually agree on a one-, two-, or three-year goal and develop a plan for professional development and support that is consistent with their professional status and goals.
 - All leaders are assigned a primary evaluator (092 or 093).
- PDECs determine protocols for each level of leader (level of experience, role, transfers to the district, part-time or partial year, leader in need of support, etc.).

Best Practices Preferences (*Your new plan should ...*)

- Goal setting should allow for differentiated timelines (one, two, or three years) and differentiated partnerships (perhaps in teams or in collaboration with another leader) depending upon the role of the leaders and aligned with a plan for professional learning and growth.
- There should be discussion and exploration of how goals may/should be aligned with districtwide and individual professional development, a theory of action, PLC work, and other integrated efforts to support the goals, mission, and vision established within the district.

Professional Practice and Educator Growth

Nonnegotiables (*Your new plan must ...*)

- Feedback to educator must consider multiple and varied quantitative and qualitative indicators of evidence.
- Dialogue through the professional growth process should begin with educator self-reflection/self-assessment of impact of professional learning and educator practice on student growth, as well as the identification of next steps.
- Within the required process structure, the local PDEC may identify a minimum or recommended number of observations aligned with the current professional needs of the educator (novice, provisional, professional).
 - The PDEC must create the district's plan for the nature and number of observations and/or reviews of practice and artifacts that are required.
- There should be multiple pieces of evidence, which may include artifacts, observations of practice, student feedback, and reflections of the educator on student growth as part of the educator feedback process.

Professional Practice and Leader Growth

Nonnegotiables (*Your new plan must ...*)

- Feedback to leaders must consider multiple and varied quantitative and qualitative indicators of evidence.
- Dialogue through the professional growth process should begin with leader self-reflection/self-assessment of impact of professional learning and leadership practice on organizational health, as well as the identification of next steps.
- Within the required process structure, the local PDEC may identify a minimum or recommended number of observations aligned with the current professional needs of the leader (new or experienced).
 - The PDEC must create the district's plan for the nature and number of observations and/or reviews of practice and artifacts that are required.
- There should be multiple pieces of evidence, which may include artifacts; observations of practice; teacher, leader, and staff feedback; and reflections of the leader on organizational growth as part of the leader feedback process.

Evaluator/Observer/Stakeholder Feedback and Engagement

Nonnegotiables (*Your new plan must ...*)

- Feedback, tied to standards, identifies strengths and areas of focus for advancement.
 - PDECs determine clear timelines for both written and verbal feedback.
 - PDECs determine a process to determine appropriate feedback and how to use informal and formal feedback from stakeholders.
- In person beginning of the year, midyear, end-of-year check-in for all educators (timelines determined by PDEC).
- Cycle of check-ins to discuss what is happening in the classroom/school or district—identify additional needs (mutually agreed upon). Dialogue is important, however, there must be a balance of written and verbal feedback, as required by the district plan, which must be provided periodically.

Cycle of Check-Ins

Educator	Leader
Opportunities for discussion linking student growth and development with observations of practice and performance.	Opportunities for discussion linking organizational growth and development with observations of practice and performance.

Process Elements — Educator

Nonnegotiables (*Your new plan must ...*)

- PDECs articulate agreed upon processes for both formal and informal observations.
- At a minimum, an initial goal-setting meeting, midyear, and end-of-year reflective progress review for all educators.
- A pattern of persistent lack of growth and reflection or resistance to growth-oriented feedback should lead to advancing levels of support with a defined process for placing an educator on a corrective support plan with indicators of success for transitioning out of it. The corrective support plan shall be developed in consultation with the educator and their exclusive bargaining representative for certified teachers chosen pursuant to C.G.S. §10-153b.
 - PDECs should establish a clearly articulated corrective support model that is separate from the normal educator growth model.
 - Corrective support models shall include:
 - » clear objectives specific to the well documented area of concern;
 - » resources, support, and interventions to address the area of concern;
 - » timeframes for implementing the resources, support, and interventions; and
 - » supportive actions from the evaluator.

- The district PDEC plan should include samples of tier 1, 2, and 3 supports and be responsive to educator needs.
 - Utilize and document all three tiers prior to movement to a corrective support plan.
 - Ongoing training to ensure all stakeholders understand tiers, supports, and process (model of a corrective structure with tier 1, 2, and 3 supports should be provided in the appendix).
- PDEC agrees upon orientation, training, and support elements for evaluators and educators on the critical components for success.

Best Practices Preferences (*Your new plan should...*)

- Intermediate support should be in place prior to getting to a point where an educator is on a corrective support plan.
- Corrective support should not be initiated without appropriate evidence of concern.
 - Educators involved in a formal induction process should have an evaluation pathway that is aligned (but separate) with their induction process to reduce the work burden on beginning educators and support their transition to provisional and professional educator status.
 - » The intention of redesign should be to reduce the burden of evaluation on beginning educators without compromising the hard separation between induction and evaluation.
 - » There should be regular check-ins/interactions with evaluators and mentors for beginning educators.
 - Establish policy for PDEC operations that includes membership, quorum, and consensus criteria.
 - PDECs should create a reflective process either through PDEC, survey, etc., that reviews the TEVAL plan and process, reflects, assesses, and revises it as needed.

Process Elements — Leader

Nonnegotiables (*Your new plan must ...*)

- At a minimum, an initial goal-setting meeting, midyear, and end-of-year reflective progress review for all leaders.
- There should be ongoing, on-site, evidence-driven visits or reviews of practice for each leader whose purpose/focus is aligned with the leader's goals in this process. PDECs should decide the minimum number of visits as appropriate for the district and its capacity.
- PDEC agrees upon orientation, training, and support elements for evaluators and leaders on the critical components for success.
- A pattern of persistent lack of growth and reflection or resistance to growth-oriented feedback should lead to advancing levels of support with a defined process for placing a leader on a corrective support plan with indicators of success for transitioning out of it. The corrective support plan shall be developed in consultation with the leader and their exclusive bargaining representative for administrators chosen pursuant to section C.G.S. §10-153b.
 - PDECs should establish a clearly articulated corrective support model that is separate from the normal educator growth model.

- Corrective support models shall include:
 - » clear objectives specific to the well documented area of concern;
 - » resources, support, and interventions to address the area of concern;
 - » timeframes for implementing the resources, support, and interventions; and
 - » supportive actions from the evaluator.
- The district PDEC plan should include differentiated supports and be responsive to leader needs.
 - Utilize and document differentiated support prior to movement to a corrective support plan.
 - Ongoing training to ensure all stakeholders understand differentiated supports and process (model of a corrective structure should be provided in the appendix).
 - Support models should always include clear objectives specific to the well documented area of concern, timeframes, interventions, supportive actions from the evaluator.

Best Practices Preferences (*Your new plan should...*)

- Coaching and/or mentoring should be strongly considered as an option for a new leader.
- Intermediate supports should be in place prior to getting to a point where a leader is on a support plan.
- Support plan should not be initiated without appropriate evidence of concern.
- PDECs should create a reflective process either through PDEC, survey, etc., that reviews the LEVAL plan and process, reflects, assesses, and revises it as needed.
- Establish policy for PDEC operations that includes membership, quorum, and consensus criteria.

Dispute Resolution

Nonnegotiables (*Your new plan must ...*)

- Each local or regional board of education shall, in mutual agreement with the professional development and evaluation committee, include a process for resolving disputes in cases where the evaluator and educator/leader being evaluated cannot agree on goals/objectives, the evaluation period, feedback, or the professional development plan.
- Any claims that the district has failed to follow the established procedures of the teacher evaluation and support program shall be subject to the grievance procedures set forth in the then-current collective bargaining agreements between the local or regional board of education and the relevant bargaining unit.

Local and State Reporting

The superintendent shall report:

1. the status of teacher evaluations to the local or regional board of education on or before June first of each year; and
2. the status of the implementation of the teacher evaluation and support program, including the frequency of evaluations, the number of teachers who have not been evaluated, and other requirements as determined by the Department of Education, to the Commissioner of Education on or before September 15 of each year.

For purposes of this section, the term “teacher” shall include each professional employee of a board of education, below the rank of superintendent, who holds a certificate or permit issued by the State Board of Education.

Appendix

Definitions

educator. Includes teachers and student and educator support specialists who provide instruction and support services to students and staff. Educators serving in a teaching role or serving in a role of providing support services hold a valid certificate or permit issued by the State Board of Education.

leader. Includes school and district administrators who are responsible for providing instructional leadership and for developing, implementing, and evaluating systems and policies within the school or district. Leaders serving in an administrative position hold a valid certification endorsement for Intermediate Administration or Supervision (#092) issued by the State Board of Education.

single-point competency. A description of a standard of behavior or performance, that is framed only as a single set of desired outcomes rather than laid out across a rating or scale of performance like a more traditional rubric.

Examples

Educator example of a single-point rubric based on the *CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2017* from **Domain 3: Instruction for Active Learning, Indicator 3b: *Leading students to construct meaning and apply new learning through the use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies.***

Cognitive Engagement for Active Learning

Teachers implement instruction to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by: ***Indicator 3b: Leading students to construct meaning and apply new learning through the use of a variety of differentiated and evidence-based learning strategies.***

Areas of Strength	Effective Practice Adapted from the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2017	Opportunities for Growth/ Next Steps
	<p>The teacher implements effective instruction for active learning, which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employs differentiated strategies, tasks, and questions that cognitively engage students through appropriately integrated recall, problem-solving, critical and creative thinking, purposeful discourse and/or inquiry. • Uses resources and flexible groupings that cognitively engage students. • Fosters students' ownership, self-direction, and choice of resources and/or flexible groupings to develop their learning. • Provides multiple opportunities for students to develop independence as learners. <p>And where the students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate new learning in multiple ways, including application of new learning to make connections between concepts. • Generate their own questions and problem-solving strategies and synthesize and communicate information. • Approach learning in ways that will be effective for them as individual learners. 	

Leader example of a single point rubric based on the *Connecticut Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2017* from **Domain 2: Talent Management, Indicator 2.2: Professional Learning**: *Establishes a collaborative professional learning system that is grounded in a vision of high-quality instruction and continuous improvement through the use of data to advance the school or district's vision, mission, and goals.*

Professional Learning System for Continuous Improvement

Education leaders ensure the success and achievement of all students by implementing practices to recruit, select, support by: **Indicator 2.2: Establishing a collaborative professional learning system that is grounded in a vision of high-quality instruction and continuous improvement through the use of data to advance the school or district's vision, mission, and goals.**

Areas of Strength	Effective Practice Adapted from the Connecticut Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2017	Opportunities for Growth/ Next Steps
	<p>The leader implements an effective professional learning system that leads to high-quality instruction and continuous improvement, which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishes, implements, and monitors the impact of a high-quality professional learning system to improve practice and advance the school or district's vision, mission, and goals. • Models reflective practice using multiple sources of evidence and feedback to determine professional development needs and provide professional learning opportunities. • Provides multiple conditions, including support, time, or resources for professional learning that lead to improved practice. <p>And where educators and leaders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Align individual and collaborative goals with goals of the school and/or district to improve the collective effectiveness of practice. • Analyze multiple pieces of evidence to identify strengths and areas for growth that inform focus areas for professional learning leading to student and educator growth. • Engage in ongoing, cyclical progress monitoring processes, based on self-reflection and multiple pieces of evidence, to improve student learning, growth, and achievement. 	

Resources

Connecticut School Leadership Standards - [Common Core of Leading: CT School Leadership Standards \(2012\)](#)

[Professional Standards for Educational Leaders \(2015\)](#) - National Policy Board for Educational Administration

[Connecticut's Common Core of Leading: A Guide for Professional Growth](#)

Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (2010) - [CT Common Core of Teaching \(2010\)](#)

Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation 2017 - [Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation \(2017\)](#)

Connecticut Rubrics for Educator and Leader Practice:

- [CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2017](#)
- [CCT Rubric for Effective Service Delivery 2017](#)
- [CT Leader Evaluation and Support Rubric 2017](#)

Governor Ned Lamont's Executive Order 7C - [Governor Lamont's Executive Order 7C](#)

Nondisclosure of Records of Teacher Performance and Evaluation - [Connecticut General Statutes 10-151 \(c\)](#)

Performance Evaluation and Advisory Council (PEAC) - [Connecticut General Statutes 10-151d](#)

Professional Development and Evaluation Committee (PDEC) - [Connecticut General Statute 10-220a](#)

School Social Worker Standards - [School Social Work Association of America](#)

Standards for Professional Learning:

- [CT's Professional Learning Standards \(2015\)](#)
- [Learning Forward's Professional Learning Standards \(2022\)](#)

Teacher Evaluation - [Connecticut General Statutes 10-151b](#)

Teacher Leader Model Standards (2008) - [Teacher Leader Model Standards \(2008\)](#)



CSDE
CONNECTICUT STATE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION