

CAS Request for Proposal



**Connecticut Association of Schools
Request for Proposals
For**

Strategic Initiatives Related to CT Educator Evaluation and Support System

Advertising Date:

RFP Available:

Proposal Opening:

Contract Award:

Bidder Information

Company/Vendor_____

Bidder's Address_____

Bidder's Representative_____

Telephone Numbers_____

Email Address_____

Please check the box(es) below to identify which sections are addressed in the submitted proposal.

CAS is seeking proposals to acquire:

- A system for training evaluators of teachers, assessing proficiency and ongoing calibration
- A system for training evaluators of administrators
- A data management system to support CT's educator evaluation system and professional learning

CAS Request for Proposal

The Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS), on behalf of The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) is seeking submission of written proposals, on a competitive basis, from qualified companies (vendors) to design, develop and implement 1) a system for training evaluators of teachers, a proficiency assessment and ongoing calibration for teacher evaluation based upon a rubric aligned to the CT Common Core of Teaching; 2) a system for training evaluators of administrators, based upon a rubric aligned to the CT School Leadership Standards; and 3) managing data to support CT's educator evaluation and support system.

The training for the new educator evaluation and support system will commence in April 2013 and is projected to continue through the 2013-2014 school year, contingent on available funds.

RFP documents may be obtained at the reception desk of CAS located at 30 Realty Drive, Cheshire, CT 06410 or at www.casciac.org after March 15, 2013.

Sealed proposals may be mailed or hand delivered to:

Everett Lyons
Assistant Executive Director
CAS
30 Realty Drive
Cheshire, CT 06410
RFP: Strategic Initiatives Related to CT Educator Evaluation and Support System

Sealed proposals will be accepted at CAS, at 30 Realty Drive, Cheshire, CT 06410 until April 1, 2013 at 12:00 p.m. No extensions will be granted.

It is expected that a decision will be made by April 8, 2013. All vendors submitting proposals will be notified of our decision.

CAS is pleased to make this opportunity available and looks forward to receiving your proposal.

CAS is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

Please direct any and all questions concerning the RFP to Everett Lyons, Assistant Executive Director, at elyons@casciac.org.

CAS Request for Proposal

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	Page 4
Requirements To Bid	Pages 5-6
Staffing Requirements	Pages 7-8
Insurance Requirements	Pages 9-12
Scope of Work	Pages 13-21
Award of Contract	Pages 22-28

- Proposal Acceptance
- Vendor Information
- Notice of Award
- Vendor Independence
- Family Relations
- Subcontractors
- Vendor Affidavit
- Bid Submittal Form

Appendix A – Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation

Appendix B – Common Core of Teaching

CAS Request for Proposal

INTRODUCTION

About CAS: The Connecticut Association of Schools is a private non-profit organization and is tax exempt under section 501c(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Purpose of RFP: This RFP is requesting proposals (collectively, "Proposals" and individually, a "Proposal") for services necessary and/or required to perform the work for both the design and implementation of a system for evaluator training and assessing proficiency of observers to accurately assess teaching practice, and to design and implement a data management system to support educator evaluation.

1. A Proposal must be submitted in a sealed envelope(s) or package(s) bearing on the outside the wording Attention: Everett Lyons – RFP – “Strategic Initiatives Related to CT Educator Evaluation and Support System”
2. One (1) original and four (4) copies of each Proposal must be submitted in the sealed envelope(s).
3. Vendors shall only rely upon the written instructions of the RFP and any written addendums to the RFP, which addendums shall be provided to all vendors.
4. If forwarded by mail, the sealed envelope(s) or package(s) containing the Proposal (marked as directed above) must be enclosed in another envelope, addressed as specified to:

Everett Lyons
Assistant Executive Director
CAS
30 Realty Drive
Cheshire, CT 06410
RFP: Strategic Initiatives Related to CT Educator Evaluation and Support System

CAS Request for Proposal

REQUIREMENTS TO BID

INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

A Proposal shall contain all of the information required by this RFP. Otherwise the Proposal may be considered non-conforming and subject to rejection.

Authorized Signatures: Bids must be signed by a company officer or representative authorized to make contractual commitments.

Insurance: Each vendor must furnish a letter from an insurance company legally authorized to act within the State of Connecticut, indicating that the vendor is insurable to the extent required by specifications listed under the Insurance and Property Requirements section.

Late Bids: Bids received after the date and time specified on page 2 of this document will not be accepted. Late bids will be returned unopened.

Bid Price: Bidders shall submit pricing as outlined in the bid document.

Rejection for Default or Misrepresentation: CAS reserves the right to reject the bid of any bidder that is in default of any prior contract or for misrepresentation.

References: Each vendor should submit a list of at least two (2) references for other customers where the vendor is currently or in the past supplied similar services. One reference should represent a statewide scale of work similar to the scope of work of this project. Each reference should include a contact name, phone number, company name, number of years vendor has supplied services to the company and type of services rendered. Vendors are also welcome to submit any written letters of recommendation.

Award:

A. Qualifications and Experience (40%)

a. Demonstrated ability to provide services: Experience (of organization)

Please provide a detailed explanation of the experience your organization has to support the work CAS has outlined.

b. Demonstrated ability to provide services: Staff (working on project)

Please provide a detailed explanation of the expertise and capacity within your organization to support the work CAS has outlined.

CAS Request for Proposal

B. Methodology (30%)

a. Proposed method of providing service

Please provide a detailed explanation of the methodology you will use in order to provide the services outlined.

b. Proposed resources providing services

Please provide a detailed explanation of the resources you will use in order to provide the services outlined.

C. Pricing (20%)

a. Proposed pricing

Please provide budget narrative and an itemized, detailed budget.

b. Additional savings and/or increased revenues and/or sustainability plan

Please provide an explanation of additional savings and/or increased revenues and/or logic for how your proposal will be sustainable.

D. Organizational information (10%)

a. Financial stability

b. References

c. Quality assurance

d. Appropriate insurance/bonding

Affidavit: Please see the vendor affidavit. A signed copy of the vendor affidavit must be included in the Proposal.

Other: Information which a vendor desires to present that does not fall within any of the above categories may be presented in this section.

Proposal evaluators will place emphasis on completeness and clarity of content in each vendor's Proposal. Thus, the clarity of a vendor's written response will be considered along with a vendor's capability to perform the requirements of this RFP.

CAS Request for Proposal

STAFFING REQUIREMENTS

APPLICABLE LAWS AND REGULATIONS

1. A vendor agrees and warrants that in the performance of the Services it will not discriminate or permit discrimination against any person or group of persons on the grounds of race, color, religious creed, age, marital status, national origin, ancestry, sex, mental or physical disability, including, but not limited to, blindness, unless it is shown, by the vendor that such disability prevents performance of the work involved, in any manner prohibited by the laws of the United States or the State. The vendor further agrees to take affirmative action to insure that applicants with job-related qualifications are employed and that employees are treated when employed without regard to their of race, color, religious creed, age, marital status, national origin, ancestry, sex, mental or physical disability, including, but not limited to, blindness, unless it is shown, by the vendor that such disability prevents performance of the Services.
It shall be the responsibility of the vendor to be familiar with, and knowledgeable about all applicable State labor standards, laws and regulations. A vendor may be required to undergo a pre-award compliance review for the purpose of ascertaining whether, in the opinion of CAS, the vendor is willing and/or capable of complying with these requirements.
2. All work performed under the Contract must meet State and federal OSHA standards, as amended.
3. CAS is an equal opportunity employer and purchaser. The vendor agrees that in connection with the Services no employee or applicant for employment or vendor will be discriminated against because of of race, color, religious creed, age, marital status, national origin, ancestry, sex, mental or physical disability, including, but not limited to, blindness, or veteran's status.

CAS Request for Proposal

BID REQUIREMENTS

~~~~~

Date:

I, \_\_\_\_\_, (vendor owner or authorized employee) verify and authorize that \_\_\_\_\_ (vendor company name) accept and can meet the standards, criteria, requirements, and other expectations outlined above in the **REQUIREMENTS TO BID** section of this RFP.

Please check one box below:

- Vendor has NO additional comments or clarifications to the INSTRUCTIONS AND STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.
- Vendor has written comments or clarifications to the INSTRUCTIONS AND STAFFING REQUIREMENTS and they are attached.



## CAS Request for Proposal

### INSURANCE & PROPERTY REQUIREMENTS

1. The vendor will, at all times, hold harmless and indemnify CAS, related entities, its officers, its members, and its employees, from and against any and all liability, damages, loss claims, accidents, costs, claims, demands, expenses, including attorney's fees, occasioned by or rising out or caused or alleged to have been caused in any manner by the performance of the Services under the RFP or the Contract.
2. The awarded vendor will be expected to carry and furnish proof, of insurance as defined herein.
3. The vendor must protect all exterior property of CAS from injury or other damage occasioned by or rising out of the performance of the Services. Any damage so caused must be repaired by the vendor at its own expense.
4. The vendor shall take all necessary precautions to prevent loss or damage caused by vandalism, theft or pilferage of property located within the properties.

All entities or organizations are required to provide proof of the required insurance coverage before entering or using the premises, or commencing any work, at any CAS facility. The entity or organization shall not commence use of facilities or any work until they have obtained, at their own expense, all the insurance required here, and evidence of such insurance has been properly furnished to, and approved by CAS.

All subcontractors are subject to the same requirements. It is your responsibility to be sure that subcontractors provide acceptable evidence of insurance before entering any CAS facility.

CAS also requires that they be named on your general liability policy(ies) as an additional insured. Your general liability policy must be endorsed with ISO Endorsement CDG 20 10 (or equivalent) **or** ISO Endorsement CG 20 26 (or equivalent) **and** ISO Endorsement CG 20 37 (or equivalent). These form numbers must be specifically referenced on the certificate of insurance. If your insurance company uses another form to provide CAS with additional insured status on your policies, copies of those forms must be provided in advance with the certificate for review and approval by CAS. All coverage must be primary as to CAS.

The proper name for the entity to be named as additional insured is "Connecticut Association of Schools, and/or related or affiliated entities".

Evidence of compliance with these requirements is with the ACCORD form 25, "Certificate of Liability Insurance", with 30 day notice of cancellation, plus copies of any required additional insured endorsements. Certificates should be sent to:

Cheryl Novicelli, Comptroller  
CAS  
30 Realty Drive  
Cheshire, CT 06410

Contact Information: Phone (203) 250-1111 /Fax (203) 250-1345/ Email: [cnovicelli@casciac.org](mailto:cnovicelli@casciac.org)



## **CAS Request for Proposal**

### **Insurance Requirements**

Vendors working for and/or doing business with CAS, or using CAS facilities, shall agree as a condition of acceptance to furnish, and perpetually maintain, at their own expense, for the duration of any project, work, contract or use of CAS facilities the following policies of insurance covering the following items. Insurance must be primary and endorsed to be noncontributory by CAS, must be written in an insurance company A.M. Best rated as "A-VII" or better, and CAS must be endorsed to the policy as an additional insured (except Workers' Compensation) unless this requirement is specifically waived in writing by CAS. Vendor further agrees that any subcontractor they intend to use on CAS assigned work will be required to submit to the same indemnity and insurance requirements contained in this schedule. Vendor shall obtain insurance certificates stating that both Vendor and CAS shall be endorsed to the subcontractor's insurance policies as additional insured.

### **Indemnity Clause**

Vendor shall save harmless, indemnify, and in the event of claim notification or suit will immediately defend CAS and any related or subsidiary entities, their officers, employees, and volunteers, from and against all loss, costs, damage, expense, claims or demands arising out of or caused or alleged to have been caused in any manner by the performance of work or use of facilities herein provided, including all suits, claims or actions of every kind or description brought against CAS either individually or jointly with the entity or organization for or on the account of any damage or injury to any person or persons or property, including the entity or organization's employees or their property, caused or occasioned, or alleged to have been caused or occasioned in whole or in part by the entity or organization, including any subcontractor, their employees or agents.

### **Certificates of Insurance**

Before starting any work, or commencing any use or occupancy of CAS premises, the vendor shall furnish to CAS a certificate of insurance indicating, specifically, the existence of those coverage's and limits set forth as follows. CAS must be named on the insurance certificate as "additional insured" for the coverage's afforded, and a copy of the actual policy endorsement that adds CAS as an additional insured must be attached to the certificate (Blanket additional insured endorsements are deemed acceptable). It shall be the duty of entity or organization to provide such future certificates and endorsements to CAS upon renewal or new placement of any insurance policy which may expire or renew during the term of any project or engagement. Further, that the vendor shall give CAS thirty (30) days notice of any cancellation or change in the terms of such policy or policies during the periods of coverage. Upon request of CAS, the vendor shall furnish to CAS for its examination and approval such policies of insurance with all endorsements, or copies thereof, certified by the agent of the insurance company.

The entity or organization agrees to forward a signed original of this Insurance Requirement signed by an authorized Officer or Agent for the entity or organization to the care of Cheryl Novicelli, Comptroller, CAS, 30 Realty Drive, Cheshire, CT, 06410, as acknowledgement and acceptance to the terms and conditions stated herein and prior to the commencement of any work being performed.

## CAS Request for Proposal

~~~~~

Date:

I, _____, (vendor owner or authorized employee) verify and authorize that _____ (vendor company name) accept and can meet the standards, criteria, requirements, and other expectations outlined above in the **INSURANCE AND PROPERTY REQUIREMENTS** section of this RFP.

Please check one box below:

- Vendor has NO additional comments or clarifications to the **INSURANCE AND PROPERTY REQUIREMENTS**.
- Vendor has written comments or clarifications to the **INSURANCE AND PROPERTY REQUIREMENTS** and they are attached.

CAS Request for Proposal

SCOPE OF WORK / SERVICES REQUIREMENTS

Project Background:

On May 15, 2012, Governor Malloy signed **Public Act 12-116**, *An Act Concerning Education Reform*, which empowers the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) to implement a set of crucial new reforms to close achievement gaps in Connecticut and improve educator outcomes for all students. The legislation included changes to the existing system in the State Section 51(c) of the bill reads, “On or before July 1, 2012, the State Board of Education shall adopt, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) established pursuant to section 10-151d, guidelines for a model educator evaluation and support program.”

On June 27, 2012, the State of Connecticut Board of Education (BOE) approved Connecticut’s statewide Guidelines for Educator Evaluation (Core Requirements), as provided in subsection (a) of Sec. 10-151b (C.G.S.), as amended by Sec. 51 of P.A. 12-116, a new statewide approach based on multiple indicators of student performance, observations, and other inputs (*Appendix A*).

Excellent schools begin with great school leaders and teachers; effective teachers are among the most important school level factors in student learning, and effective leadership is an essential component of any successful school. High-quality evaluations and individualized professional development are necessary to support educators and ensure that all students achieve and develop the skills that will enable them to become lifelong learners and productive citizens in a global world. Connecticut’s educator evaluation and support system is based on a defined evaluation model, which includes multiple observations of educator performance and practice, multiple measures of student academic growth and development, whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback and parent or peer feedback. The new evaluation and support system aims to ensure teachers and administrators are evaluated in a fair, reliable and consistent manner.

During the 2013-14 school year, all districts within the state will implement evaluation and support systems based on these Core Requirements. The CSDE was also charged with developing a state model based on these Core Requirements, which districts can adopt. The state model is called CT’s System for Educator Evaluation and Development (SEED). By April 15, 2013, districts must submit a proposal for the evaluation and support model, which outlines whether they intend to adopt SEED, a hybrid of SEED, or a district-proposed alternative. The CSDE will be reviewing and approving proposals through May 2013.

The initiatives described in this RFP are central to the efforts of Governor Dannel P. Malloy and the CSDE to ensure that Connecticut’s schools develop the talented workforce that it requires to inspire our students to higher levels of performance.

Scope of Work:

CAS is seeking proposals to acquire 1) a system for training evaluators of teachers, which must include the assessment of proficiency and ongoing calibration for evaluation based upon a rubric aligned to the CT Common Core of Teaching; 2) a system for training evaluators of administrators, based upon a rubric

CAS Request for Proposal

aligned to the CT Professional Leadership Standards; and 3) a data management system to support CT's educator evaluation and support system. The vendor(s) will be expected to furnish training resources (face-face, online or a blended learning model) with on-demand, easy-to-use learning designed to develop knowledge, skills and best practices in observation protocols; inter-rater reliability training with proficiency assessments and ongoing calibration resources; on-line data collection tools; and multiple types of professional development resources linked to evaluation outcomes and the professional learning needs of educators.

A data management system will help districts make data-driven human capital decisions, including tracking and storing observation data, organizing forms related to instructional and practice goals, generating reports, calculating summative evaluation ratings according to the Core Requirements and matching and tracking of professional development.

Interested parties may respond with proposals to provide services for one area or both of the areas below. Separate proposals must be submitted by any organization who wishes to bid on more than one of the following components:

- A. Design and implement a system for training evaluators of teachers, including the assessment of proficiency of observers to accurately and consistently assess teaching practice aligned to prescribed teaching standards, along with resources for ongoing calibration. This work will be based on a rubric aligned to the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching.
- B. Design and implement a system for training evaluators of administrators. This work will be, in part, based upon a rubric aligned to the CT School Leadership Standards.
- C. Design and implement an evaluation and professional development data management system to support the implementation of CT's educator evaluation and support system.

Service Specifications:

- A. ***Design and implement a system for training evaluators of teachers, based on the teacher model as outlined in the Core Requirements (Appendix A). The system should include an assessment of proficiency of observers to accurately and consistently assess teaching practice and performance aligned to prescribed teaching standards, along with resources for ongoing calibration.***
 1. The training must be a comprehensive and sustainable evaluator training model that will ensure a consistent process for the collection and analysis of observational data aligned to prescribed teaching standards and will result in consistent, accurate, valid and fair assessments of teacher practice. This work will be based on the use of a rubric aligned to the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching.
 2. Training must include focused professional development modules and provide ample opportunity for practice in the teacher evaluation and support model, as well as observation and reviews of practice that will ensure all evaluators, such as, but not limited to principals and district administrators

CAS Request for Proposal

- possess a deep understanding of effective teaching and can accurately differentiate the components and performance levels defined by the selected observational tool;
 - are skilled in gathering consistent, reliable and valid observational data/evidence and artifacts about educator practice based upon the use of a rubric aligned to the CT Common Core of Teaching;
 - accurately and consistently recognize classroom examples of different components of practice as defined by the observational instrument; and
 - correctly interpret the evidence against specific levels of performance.
3. Specific focus should be placed on ensuring inter-rater reliability such that observers consistently document educator performance and deliver accurate and reliable evaluations of classroom teaching.
 4. Specific focus should be placed on bias-awareness training to minimize the effects of observer bias.
 5. The training must include a proficiency assessment process to ensure evaluators are qualified in conducting observations and reviews of practice and assigning valid ratings.
 6. The training must include a process for on-going calibration to support inter-rater reliability and valid educator evaluation ratings across all evaluators.
 7. The training may address and support other components of the teacher evaluation and support system, as applicable.
 8. Connecticut's evaluation and support system for teachers includes the following weighted components:
 - 45%** - Multiple student learning indicators;
 - 40%** - Observation of teacher performance and practice;
 - 10%** - Feedback from peers or parents including surveys; and
 - 5%** - School-wide student learning indicators or student feedback.

B. Design and implement a system for training evaluators of administrators based on the administrator model as outlined in the Core Requirements (Appendix A).

1. The training must be a comprehensive and sustainable evaluator training model that will ensure a consistent process for the collection and analysis of observational data aligned to prescribed leadership standards and will result in consistent, accurate, valid and fair assessments of administrator practice. This work will be based on the use of a rubric aligned to the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The training may address and support other components of the teacher evaluation and support system, as applicable.
2. Training must include focused professional development modules and provide ample opportunity for practice in the administrator evaluation and support model, as well as observation and reviews of practice.
3. Connecticut's evaluation and support system for administrators includes the following weighted components:

CAS Request for Proposal

45% - Multiple student learning indicators;

40% - Observations of administrator performance and practice;

10% - Stakeholder feedback, including surveys; and

5% - Teacher effectiveness outcomes.

C. Design and implement an evaluation and professional development data management system to support the implementation of CT's Educator Evaluation and Support System.

1. The data management system must incorporate the elements of the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation and guidelines on professional learning in designing and developing a cohesive system to gather, integrate and store the specified data elements, provide the technical tools to analyze and summarize the data and to calculate the final ratings.
2. The functionality of the system should permit local district extraction of data elements to inform and support professional development activities and reporting features to fulfill local, state and federal information requirements.
3. The system must be user-friendly and support the design principles of CT's educator evaluation and support system including professional dialogue, multiple measures and feasibility of implementation.
4. The system will also be used to determine the fidelity of implementation of local evaluation and support systems across the state.
5. The system will also be used to evaluate the effectiveness of professional learning programs and educator support initiatives.
6. The system must provide educators with on-demand, easy-to-use learning to develop skills and best practices.
7. The system should support continuous improvement of instructional practice and student outcomes by helping evaluators, administrators and teachers monitor professional growth and student improvement.
8. The system should include custom publishing tools to create content that meets local district needs.
9. The system should provide a method of documenting participation in a given activity; users should be able to log when and where the activity occurred and any other information about the activity relevant for monitoring purposes.
10. Professional development modules and professional learning tools should be incorporated into the technology database.
11. The system should be compatible with other vendors.

The Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) has done considerable work on the Core Requirements that districts must meet when developing their own evaluation and support systems. Below is a summary of the Core Requirements adopted by the State Board of Education: *(additional information included in Appendix A)*

1. Four-level rating system: Teachers and administrators will be rated at four levels: Exemplary, Proficient, Developing and Below Standard.

CAS Request for Proposal

2. High-quality observations of performance and practice:

District guidelines will require that: i) observations are rated against a standards-based rubric, ii) observations result in useful feedback and iii) evaluators receive training in observation and scoring and how to provide high-quality feedback.

The state model will provide: i) the number and duration of formal vs. informal observations, ii) pre- and post-conference specifics and iii) detailed observation rubrics tied to the Connecticut teaching and leadership standards.

Annual reviews will be required, but the number of observations per year should ultimately be adjusted based on new performance ratings.

3. Multiple student learning indicators:

- District guidelines will require: i) multiple student learning indicators that are fair, valid, reliable, and useful; ii) a minimum number of indicators for all educators; and iii) an explanation of how performance indicators will be selected and assessed throughout the school year.
- District guidelines will provide examples of acceptable student learning indicators while the state model will provide specific multiple student learning indicators that can be used for teachers of different grades and subjects.

4. Other evaluation components:

- District guidelines will require that student, parent, peer, community, or staff surveys used are fair, valid, reliable and useful.
- The state model will provide specific surveys that districts can adopt if they so choose.

5. Evaluation-based professional development:

- District guidelines will require that high-quality professional development accompany the evaluation system so educators receive useful feedback and opportunities for improvement.
- The state model will provide specific examples of effective evaluation-based professional development for educators.

6. State review and approval of evaluation and support systems developed by districts.

Technical Requirements for Data Management System

In order for Connecticut educators to use the information collected through the educator evaluation and support process, the system must be able to track progress and compliance on multiple levels, support ongoing data collection, display immediate feedback to support the process and provide a range of reporting tools for multiple user types. The data system infrastructure must be designed to address key priorities at the state, district, school and individual educator levels, be able to extract and integrate data

CAS Request for Proposal

from pre-populated state and local files, and upload data and electronic documents collected specifically for the educator evaluation and support.

- Must be a secure, web-based system;
- Must offer site license with an unlimited number of end users (principals, vice principals, coaches, teachers) at each site;
- Supports multiple handheld devices and operating systems including Android, Blackberry (including touch-screen devices), and Apple products (iPhone, iPad, iPod Touch);
- Must allow for data to be collected on any compatible device over a wireless/cellular network, or in areas where or times when no connection is available;
- Online reporting tools must be accessible anytime through any Internet connection;
- Must include the option of paper forms on which observations can be manually recorded for later upload;
- Must be compatible with existing district systems and deployable to the district's cellular phones and wireless devices;
- Must provide multiple user access levels as appropriate; and
- All updates, upgrades and technical support must be included in software license fee.
- Customer Support Service operational 24 hours a day, 7 days per week.

System Functionality

1. Employee
 - a. System allows employees to access their forms and results.
 - b. System supports self-evaluations, parent and student surveys, and peer evaluations.
 - c. The system will allow educators to draft and edit student learning objectives and document students' progress periodically throughout the year.
 - d. System allows e-signatures.
 - e. Employees can view and upload attachments, artifacts and other documents.
2. Evaluator
 - a. Evaluators must have access to all forms and all historical evaluations documents 24 hours a day, 7 days per week.
 - b. System has the ability to include supervisor notes.
 - c. System supports multiple walkthroughs and observations.
 - d. System is able to add attachments as support for the final evaluation.
 - e. System supports off-cycle evaluations, observations and all improvement plans.
 - f. System has the capability to provide employee evaluations and support access to more than one designated evaluator.
3. Local and State-level Systems Administrators
 - a. System has capability to create and customize evaluation forms to local specifications.
 - b. System has the capability to build and customize evaluation tools and processes with advanced rules and workflows.

CAS Request for Proposal

- c. System has the capability to configure automated rules for assignment of evaluations to supervisors.
 - d. System has the capability to store multiple year evaluations for extraction and review.
 - e. System has the capability to sort data by a variety of characteristics of subgroup populations and evaluation indicators.
 - f. System has the capability to set weights and compute a total weighted score for each employee's final evaluation.
 - g. System supports workflows, routing all the evaluations to the right supervisor for electronic approval.
 - h. System has the capability to integrate professional development information into evaluation reports.
 - i. System has the ability to imbed video clips from the observation process or of student performance.
 - j. System has the ability to create reports driven by teacher professional learning content interactions in school as well as across the district for aggregation purposes.
 - k. System has the ability to track and be accountable for all forms of professional development.
 - l. System has the ability to suggest professional development courses for every component and track teacher activity related to evaluation components.
4. Local and State Report Development and Dissemination
- a. System provides a report-writer interface that is comprehensive and easy to use, allowing reporting on all data elements in the system.
 - b. System has the capability for supervisors and data analysts to create their own reports.
 - c. System has the capability to do evaluation result comparisons such as between districts, assignment areas, employee characteristics, types of professional development activities, etc.
 - d. System has the capability to export report results into spreadsheet software or analysis databases.
 - e. System provides a library of canned reports, with commonly used queries and sorts, which can be customized as needed.
 - f. System has the capability to maintain full and complete printable files at the local level.
 - g. System allows for the possibility of migration to a state-supported server.

The submissions shall be organized in the following manner and sections (to be tabbed):

- a. **Letter of commitment** – Respondent shall indicate its commitment to the project and how the respondent will meet or exceed expectations. Specifically, the respondent shall describe how it will maintain consistent leadership throughout the entire scope of work, and how it will meet the requirements set forth in this RFP.

CAS Request for Proposal

- b. **Description of organization** – Respondent shall provide CAS a vendor or agency overview, including vision, mission, and company structure.
- c. **Statement of qualifications** – Respondent shall state its qualifications to perform the scope of work. The qualifications should include evidence of national research-based work.
- d. **Capacity** – Respondent’s capacity to initiate and provide a preponderance of services prior to June 30, 2013 must be addressed.
- e. **Project Team** – Respondent shall identify the proposed project team and evidence of experience. Project team resumes must be included.
- f. **Resources** – Respondent shall identify all materials, resources, and online services that would be associated with the model or training program.
- g. **Model Design** – Respondent shall describe the model design for each component selected.
- h. **Training Design** – Respondent shall describe the training design, including the delivery model, number of instructors, number of days and hours required to complete the training, proficiency measures, audience size limitations, and plan for ongoing support and technical assistance for each component selected.
- i. **Project Fees** – Respondent shall provide the cost to complete the proposed work.
- j. **Additional information** – Respondent may provide any additional information to support its proposal.

CAS Request for Proposal

~~~~~

Date:

I, \_\_\_\_\_, (vendor owner or authorized employee) verify and authorize that \_\_\_\_\_ (vendor company name) accept and can meet the Proposal standards, and the other criteria, requirements, and expectations outlined above in the **SCOPE OF WORK / SERVICES REQUIREMENTS** section of this RFP.

Please check one box below:

- Vendor has NO additional comments or clarifications to the **SCOPE OF WORK / SERVICES REQUIREMENTS**
- Vendor has written comments or clarifications to the **SCOPE OF WORK / SERVICES REQUIREMENTS** and they are attached.

## **CAS Request for Proposal**

### **AWARD OF CONTRACT**

#### **PROPOSAL ACCEPTANCE:**

Sealed proposals will be accepted at CAS, at 30 Realty Drive, Cheshire, CT 06410 until March 25, 2013 at 12:00 p.m. No extensions will be granted.

CAS shall have the right, in its sole and absolute discretion, to reject any or all Proposals and, in particular, to reject a Proposal not in compliance with the RFP, or a Proposal which is in any way incomplete or irregular. Further, CAS shall have the right, in its sole and absolute discretion, to waive any informality or irregularity in any Proposal received, to negotiate changes, to offer additional terms and to accept the Proposal that, in its judgment, will be in the best interest of CAS.

CAS may investigate and research, as it deems necessary, any vendor to determine the ability of the vendor to perform the Services. The vendor shall furnish all information and data for this purpose as CAS may request.

CAS reserves the right to reject a Proposal if evidence submitted by the vendor, or investigation of the vendor, fails to satisfy CAS that the vendor is properly qualified to perform the Services.

The vendor certifies under penalty of perjury that, to the best of their knowledge and belief, the prices in the Proposal have been arrived at independently, without collusion, consultation, communication, or agreement with any other vendor or competitor and, further, that the prices which have been quoted in the Proposal have not been knowingly disclosed by them, directly or indirectly, to any other vendor or competitor prior to the opening of Proposals by CAS. The submission of a Proposal shall serve as conclusive evidence that the vendor is satisfied as to all requirements outlined in the RFP and to all conditions serving to control the execution of any Contract which may be executed between the parties.

#### **ADDITIONAL VENDOR INFORMATION**

Vendors submitting a Proposal may be required to give an oral presentation of their Proposal. The oral presentation is intended to be a fact finding and explanation session only and will not include negotiation. CAS will schedule the time and location of the oral presentations. The decision to conduct oral presentations shall be exercised only at the option of CAS.

During the evaluation process, CAS reserves the right, where it may serve in the best interests of CAS, to request additional information or clarifications from vendors, or to allow corrections of errors or omissions. CAS reserves the right to retain all Proposals submitted and to use any ideas in a Proposal regardless of whether that Proposal is selected.

## **CAS Request for Proposal**

### **AWARDING OF CONTRACT**

Awarding of the Contract for Services by CAS, in its sole and absolute discretion, shall only be to the most qualified vendor in each component of the Scope of Work.

No Proposal shall be accepted, nor Contract awarded, to any vendor whose performance on any previous contract has been determined to be unsatisfactory by CAS, in its sole and absolute discretion.

It is expected that a contract award decision will be made by April 8, 2013, if not sooner. All vendors submitting bids will be notified of our decision.

CAS shall not be responsible for any alleged oral instructions or contract interpretations given to vendors.

### **NOTICE OF AWARD**

Until a Contract has been awarded, no vendor can claim any contract rights by virtue of the Proposal alone. Awarding of the Contract means actual written notice to the vendor that the Contract has been awarded.

### **PAYMENT FOR SERVICES**

CAS agrees to pay the vendor:

Upon full delivery of the services or a mutually agreed-upon payment structure.

## CAS Request for Proposal

### VENDOR INDEPENDENCE

When evaluating vendor responses, it is important to acknowledge any potential relationships between the vendor's management and CAS management which may not be, or not appear to be, independent.

#### **Independence:**

First, we request that each vendor disclose any relationship with a CAS management employee which would not be considered an "arms-length" or "independent."

For a relationship to be considered "arms-length" or "independent," a CAS employee should not be influenced, dependent upon, guided or controlled by a vendor into choosing that vendor, or item to purchase, nor should it appear to a third party that a CAS management employee made a purchasing decision which appears to be based upon a personal relationship between the CAS employee and vendor.

The following are examples of when a transaction is NOT considered arms-length or independent: (1) when there exists a personal relationship between a CAS employee and a vendor, (2) when there exists the potential for a personal benefit to a CAS employee, or (3) the parties to a business deal are dependent upon one another for "something" other than the purchase itself.

The fact that a possible relationship between the vendor and a CAS employee may exist which may NOT be arms-length or independent will NOT preclude the vendor from being selected, nor will it be weighed against a vendor through the evaluation process.

Please check one box below:

- Vendor management relationships with CAS management employees would be classified as "arms-length" or "independent."
- Vendor management has the following relationships with CAS management employees which would NOT be classified as "arms-length" or independent." Please identify the name of the vendor employee and CAS employee and briefly describe the relationship.



## CAS Request for Proposal

### Family Relations:

Second, we request that each vendor identify any CAS employee that is an immediate relative of the vendor's proprietors, owners, or senior management. For purposes of this, an immediate relative is considered a spouse, parents, children, siblings, father-in-law, mother-in-law, sister-in-law, brother-in-law and financially supported relatives.

Please check one box below:

- Vendor proprietors or senior management are not an immediate relative of any CAS employee.
- Vendor proprietors or senior management are an immediate relative of a CAS employee Please identify the name of the vendor employee and CAS employee and briefly describe the relationship.

## CAS Request for Proposal

### Subcontractors:

Lastly, we request that each vendor identify subcontractors they would potentially recommend or use under this Contract whereby the vendor does NOT have an "arms-length" or "independent" relationship with.

For a relationship to be considered "arms-length" or "independent," the vendor or vendor management should not be influenced, dependent upon, guided or controlled by a vendor into choosing that subcontractor, or item to purchase, nor should a vendor and/or vendor management receive or potentially receive any financial or economic gain from recommending or using a subcontractor, nor should it appear to a third party that the vendor or vendor management made a hiring or purchasing decision which appears to be based upon a personal relationship between the vendor and the subcontractor.

The fact that a possible relationship between the vendor and a subcontractor may exist which may NOT be arms-length or independent will NOT preclude the vendor from being selected, nor will it be weighed against a vendor through the evaluation process.

Please check one box below:

- Vendor and/or vendor management's relationships with any subcontractor recommended would be classified as "arms-length" or "independent."
- Vendor and/or vendor management's relationships with any subcontractor recommended would NOT be classified as "arms-length" or independent." Please identify the name of the vendor employee and CAS employee and briefly describe the relationship.

Signed by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Vendor Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Name & Title of Vendor Authorized Signer: \_\_\_\_\_

# CAS Request for Proposal

## VENDOR AFFIDAVIT

Everett Lyons  
Assistant Executive Director  
CAS  
30 Realty Drive  
Cheshire, CT 06410

Dear Dr. Lyons,

We have read the Invitation to Bid and fully understand its intent and contents. We certify that we have adequate personnel, insurance, equipment, and facilities to fulfill the specified requirements. We understand that our ability to meet the criteria and provide the required goods or services shall be judged solely by CAS.

It is further understood and agreed that all information included in or attached to our proposal that is required by the Invitation to Bid shall be public record upon delivery to CAS. In addition, we are aware that CAS reserves the right to reject any or all bids.

We certify that, to the best of our knowledge and belief, the prices in the proposal have been arrived at independently, without collusion, consultation, communication, or agreement with any other vendor or competitor and, further, that the prices which have been quoted in the Proposal have not been knowingly disclosed by us, directly or indirectly, to any other vendor or competitor prior to the opening of Proposals by CAS. The submission of a Proposal shall serve as conclusive evidence that the vendor is satisfied as to all requirements outlined in the RFP and to all conditions serving to control the execution of any contract which may ensue.

Also, we attest that the employment policies and practices of our Company are to recruit and employ qualified job applicants without discrimination against any person on the grounds of race, color, religious creed, age, marital status, national origin, ancestry, sex, mental or physical disability and to treat all employees equally without discrimination because of race, color, religious creed, age, marital status, national origin, ancestry, sex, mental or physical disability.

We warrant that we are willing and able to obtain an errors and omissions insurance policy providing a prudent amount of coverage for the willful or negligent acts, or omissions of any officers, employees or agents thereof.

We warrant that all information provided by it in connection with this bid is true and accurate.

Signed by: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Vendor Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Name & Title of Vendor Authorized Signer: \_\_\_\_\_

**CAS Request for Proposal**

**BIDDER SUBMITTAL FORM**

---

**From**

Company/Vendor \_\_\_\_\_

Bidder's Address \_\_\_\_\_

Bidder's Representative \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Numbers \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address \_\_\_\_\_

**Project**

Strategic Initiatives Related to CT Educator Evaluation and Support System

**Bid Total:** \_\_\_\_\_

# **CAS Request for Proposal**

## **Appendix A**

IV. A.


CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
Hartford

TO BE PROPOSED:  
June 27, 2012

**RESOLVED**, That the State Board of Education, pursuant to sections 51 through 56 of P.A. 12-116, amended by sections 23 and 24 of P.A. 12-2 of the June 12 Special Session, and in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC), adopts guidelines for a model teacher and administrator evaluation and support program.

Approved, as amended, by a vote of 10:0, this twenty-seventh day of June, Two Thousand Twelve.

Signed:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Stefan Pryor, Secretary  
State Board of Education

CONNECTICUT STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Hartford

TO: State Board of Education  
FROM: Stefan Pryor, Commissioner of Education  
DATE: June 27, 2012  
SUBJECT: Recommendation for the Adoption of the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation.

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

This report presents the evaluation core requirements, formally entitled “Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, June 2012,” which the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) has developed and advanced by consensus.

**HISTORICAL CONTEXT/BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Subsection (a) of Section 10-151b of the 2012 Supplemental to the Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.), as amended by Sec. 51 of P.A. 12-116, requires, in part, that the “superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall continuously evaluate or cause to be evaluated each teacher, in accordance with guidelines established by the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section.” Subsection (c) of Section 10-151b, as amended by Sec. 51 of P.A. 12-116 (C.G.S.), requires that “on or before July 1, 2012, the State Board of Education shall adopt, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council established pursuant to section 10-151d, guidelines for a model teacher evaluation program. Such guidelines shall provide guidance on the use of multiple indicators of student academic growth in teacher evaluations. Such guidelines shall include, but not be limited to: (1) Methods for assessing student academic growth; (2) a consideration of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school system, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-10a, that may influence teacher performance ratings, including, but not limited to, student characteristics, student attendance and student mobility; and (3) minimum requirements for teacher evaluation instruments and procedures.” For this section, the term “teacher” shall include each certified professional employee below the rank of superintendent employed by a board of education for at least ninety days in a position requiring a certificate issued by the State Board of Education.

Beginning in November 2010, PEAC (formally named in July 2011 when Section 10-151d (C.G.S) was revised) began meeting to discuss the evaluation of teachers and administrators. This group met regularly to develop eleven foundational principles upon which an effective teacher and administrator evaluation process should be based. Additionally, this group identified multiple indicators of student learning. On January 25, 2012, PEAC reached unanimous agreement on the required evaluation framework for teacher evaluation and on February 6, 2012, PEAC reached unanimous agreement on the required evaluation framework for administrator evaluation.

Over the past several months, PEAC has built upon these frameworks in order to develop and advance these guidelines by consensus.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS/JUSTIFICATIONS**

Therefore, the State Department of Education, in collaboration with PEAC, recommends the Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, dated June 2012, be approved by the State Board of Education and serve as the guidelines for a model teacher and administrator evaluation and support program.



CONNECTICUT  
GUIDELINES FOR  
EDUCATOR EVALUATION

Connecticut State Department of  
Education

June 2012

## **Preface**

Connecticut's educators are committed to ensuring that students develop the skills and acquire the knowledge they will require to lead meaningful and productive lives as citizens in an interconnected world. This responsibility is shared among students, teachers, administrators, parents, the community, local boards of education, the state board of education, and local and state governments. The following educator evaluation guidelines will help ensure that Connecticut's schools develop the talented workforce that it requires to inspire our students to higher levels of performance.

Excellent schools begin with great school leaders and teachers. The importance of highly-skilled educators is beyond dispute, as a strong body of evidence now confirms what parents, students, teachers, and administrators have long known: effective teachers are among the most important school-level factors in student learning and effective leadership is an essential component of any successful school.

The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) is committed to raising the overall quality of our schools' workforce. To meet this goal, the state, in partnership with local and regional school districts, aims to create a comprehensive approach to developing Connecticut's educators so that Connecticut prepares, recruits, hires, supports, develops, and retains the best educators to lead our classrooms and schools.

Educator evaluation is the cornerstone of this holistic approach and contributes to the improvement of individual and collective practice, and the growth and development of teachers and leaders. High-quality evaluations are necessary to inform the individualized professional development and support that an educator may require. Such evaluations also identify professional strengths which should form the basis of new professional opportunities. High-quality evaluations are also necessary to make fair employment decisions based on teacher and leader effectiveness. Used in this way, high-quality evaluations will bring greater accountability and transparency to schools and instill greater confidence to employment decisions across the state.

Educator evaluation also serves to articulate our priorities. The evaluation and support framework adopted by the Connecticut State Board of Education, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council, gives student learning the priority that it deserves. The components of this framework, requiring multiple indicators of student academic growth and development and multiple observations of teacher and leader practice from a variety of perspectives, also aim to ensure that formative and summative ratings are a fair, valid, reliable, useful, and accurate reflection of an educator's work.

The following educator evaluator guidelines provide direction to school districts as they develop and adopt new systems of educator evaluation and support. These guidelines aim to ensure that districts have common and high expectations that educators are evaluated in a fair and consistent manner, and that employment decisions are based on fair, valid, reliable and useful indicators of a educator's work.

Educators in Connecticut are committed to ensuring that all students achieve and develop the skills that will enable them to become lifelong learners and productive citizens in a global world. This shared responsibility must be reached collaboratively in order to help students attain excellence.

*Connecticut's Core Requirements for Educator Evaluation* will assist districts in accomplishing this goal.

## **Section 1: Introduction**

### **1.1 Context**

Sections 51 through 56 of P.A. 12-116, signed into law by Governor Dannel P. Malloy on May 15, 2012, and amended by sections 23 and 24 of P.A. 12-2 of the June 12 Special Session, requires the State Board of Education to adopt, on or before July 1, 2012 and in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC), guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program. The PEAC have renamed these guidelines to “Core Requirements.” The following Core Requirements were developed pursuant to this statutory requirement and replace the Connecticut Core Requirements for Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development adopted by the State Board of Education in May of 1999. See appendix for statute language referenced.

Connecticut State Department of Education and national publications form the foundation of the new requirements:

**(1) Connecticut's Common Core Standards, which clearly establishes high expectations for learning for all of Connecticut's children.**

**(2) Connecticut's Common Core of Teaching (CCT), adopted February 2010 (replacing the Common Core of Teaching adopted in 1999), which defines effective teaching practice throughout the career continuum of educators from pre-service to induction to experienced teaching status in six domains:**

1. Content and Essential Skills;
2. Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning;
3. Planning for Active Learning;
4. Instruction for Active Learning;
5. Assessment for Learning; and
6. Professional Responsibilities and Educator Leadership.

**(3) Common Core of Leading: Connecticut Leadership Standards, adopted in June of 2012, which use the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards as their foundation and define effective administrative practice through six performance expectations:**

1. Vision, Mission and Goals
2. Teaching and Learning
3. Organizational Systems and Safety
4. Families and Stakeholders
5. Ethics and Integrity
6. The Education System.

**(4) National Pupil Personnel Standards documents.**

Using these documents as the foundation for educator evaluation establishes critical links among effective teaching, professional learning and increased student achievement. It should be noted that the term “teacher” refers to all individuals in positions requiring certification, including, but not limited to classroom teachers. “Leaders” refer to those individuals in positions requiring an administrative certification, including, but not limited to principals.

Pursuant to subsection (c) of 10-151b of the 2012 Supplement to the Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.), as amended by Sec. 51 of P.A. 12-116 and Sec. 23 of P.A. 12-2 the June 12 Special Session, on or before July 1, 2013, the State Board of Education shall adopt, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council, guidelines for a model teacher evaluation program. Such guidelines shall provide guidance on the use of multiple indicators of student academic growth in teacher evaluations. Such guidelines shall include, but not be limited to: (1) Methods for assessing student academic growth; (2) a consideration of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school information system, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-10a of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), that may influence teacher performance ratings, including, but not limited to, student characteristics, student attendance and student mobility; and (3) minimum requirements for teacher evaluation instruments and procedures. Consideration of such control factors and minimum requirements shall be undertaken and accomplished through the joint deliberations and determinations of the goal-setting conference process.

## **1.2 Introduction and Guiding Principles**

(1) The primary goal of the educator evaluation and support system is to strengthen individual and collective practices so as to increase student learning and development. Connecticut's Core Requirements for Educator Evaluation are based on Connecticut's *Common Core of Teaching* and the *Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards*, which guide the observation of professional practice. The Core Requirements also include multiple indicators of student academic growth and development, stakeholder feedback and the context in which an educator works. Evaluation processes are designed to promote collaboration and shared ownership for professional growth, renewal, and employment decisions.

The Connecticut Core Requirements for Educator Evaluation are based on the following guiding principles:

- (a) The primary purpose of educator evaluation is to strengthen individual and collective practices in order to improve student growth;
- (b) Educator evaluation is standards-based, using the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching for teacher evaluation, Common Core of Leading: Connecticut Leadership Standards for administrator evaluation, and National Pupil Personnel Services standards documents for evaluation of educators in pupil services;
- (c) Connecticut's Common Core Standards, The Connecticut Framework: K-12 Curricular Goals and Standards, the CMT/CAPT Assessments (Smarter Balanced Assessments), as well as locally-developed curriculum standards are the basis for establishing outcomes at the district and school levels;
- (d) The Core Requirements foster continuing collaborative dialogue around teaching and learning in order to increase student academic growth and development;
- (e) The Core Requirements clearly connect professional learning to the outcomes of the evaluation process.

### **1.3 Evaluation Approval Process**

(1) Educator evaluation and support systems plans or revisions to such plans must be approved annually by the State Department of Education prior to district implementation. Such process will be an iterative one—between the State Department of Education and district superintendent or in the instance of a consortium of districts, superintendents—until the State Department of Education approves the teacher and administrator evaluation and support systems plan. The State Department of Education will inform districts of the approval process timeline.

(2) The State Department of Education will provide models for teacher and administrator evaluation and support systems. These models serve as options for districts that choose to implement pre-approved evaluation systems. Districts may choose to propose variations upon the teacher and administrator model so long as the model is consistent with the Connecticut Core Requirements for Educator Evaluation.

(3) In accordance with the requirement in the 1999 Connecticut Guidelines for Teacher Evaluation and Professional Development, in establishing or amending the local teacher evaluation plan, the local or regional board of education shall include a process for resolving disputes in cases where the evaluator and teacher cannot agree on objectives, the evaluation period, feedback or the professional development plan. Regarding the aforementioned subjects, this provision is to be utilized in accordance with the specified processes and parameters regarding objectives, evaluation period, feedback, and professional development contained in the document entitled “Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation,” dated June 2012. Should the process established as required by the document entitled “Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation,” dated June 2012 not result in resolution of a given issue, the determination regarding that issue may be made by the superintendent. An example will be provided within the State model.

### **1.4 Effect of the Neag Study on the Core Requirements**

Upon completion of the study, but not later than January 1, 2014, the Neag School of Education at The University of Connecticut shall submit to the State Board of Education such study and any recommendation concerning validation of the teacher evaluation and support program core requirements adopted by the State Board of Education. The results of the study will help determine any changes needed to the core requirements.

Should pilot districts identify promising practices within the Core Requirements, to implement during the pilot that vary from the established guidelines, those practices must be approved by the State Department of Education in consultation with PEAC and be incorporated into the scope of the Neag study.

## **Section 2: Core Requirements for the Evaluation of Teachers**

As provided in subsection (a) of Sec. 10-151b (C.G.S.), as amended by Sec. 51 of P.A. 12-116, the superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each teacher, in accordance with the requirements of this section. Local or regional boards of education shall develop and implement teacher evaluation programs consistent with these requirements. For the purposes of these Core Requirements, the term “teacher” refers to any teacher serving in a position requiring teacher certification within a district, but not requiring 092 certification. What follows are the Core Requirements of the Educator Evaluation System for teachers.

## **2.1: 4-Level Matrix Rating System**

**(1) Annual summative evaluations provide each teacher with a summative rating aligned to one of four performance evaluation designators: Exemplary, Proficient, Developing and Below Standard.**

(a) The performance levels shall be defined as follows:

- 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

(b) In order to determine summative rating designations for each teacher, districts shall:

1. Rate teacher performance in each of four categories – indicators of student academic growth and development; observations of teacher performance and practice; parent or peer feedback, which may include surveys; and whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback, which may include surveys.
2. Combine the indicators of student growth and development rating and whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “outcomes rating” of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard.
3. Combine the observations of teacher performance and practice rating and the peer or parent feedback rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “practice rating” of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard.
4. Combine the outcomes rating and practice rating into a final rating. In undertaking this step, the district must assign a summative rating category of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard. See appendix for example.

## **2.2: Teacher Evaluation Process**

The annual evaluation process for a teacher shall at least include, but not be limited to, the following steps, in order:

**(1) Goal-setting conference:**

- (a) Orientation on process – To begin the process, the principal or designee provides the teacher with materials outlining the evaluation process and other information as appropriate and meets and reviews these materials. The orientation shall not occur later than November 15 of a given school year.
- (b) Goal-setting conference – At the start of the school year, the principal or designee and teacher meet to discuss information relevant to the evaluation process and set goals for the year.
- (c) Evidence collection and review – The teacher collects evidence about his/her practice and the principal or designee collects evidence about teacher practice to support the review.

See 2.3 for details on the Teacher Evaluation Process.

**(2) Mid-year check-ins:**

- (a) The principal or designee and teacher hold at least one mid-year check-in.

See 2.3 for details on the Teacher Evaluation Process.

**(3) End-of-year summative review:**

- (a) Teacher self-assessment - The teacher reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the principal or designee. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the Goal-setting conference.

- (b) End-of-year conference - The principal or designee and the teacher meet to discuss all evidence collected to date. Following the conference, the principal assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.

See 2.3 for details on the Teacher Evaluation Process.

**(4) Local reporting – The district superintendent shall report the status of teacher evaluations to the local or regional board of education on or before June first of each year.**

**(5) State reporting – Not later than June thirtieth of each year, each superintendent shall report to the Commissioner of Education the status of the implementation of teacher evaluations, including the frequency of evaluations, aggregate evaluation ratings, the number of administrators and teachers who have not been evaluated and other requirements as determined by the Department of Education.**

**(6) Summative rating revisions – After all data, including state test data, are available, the principal or designee may adjust the summative rating if the state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating. A final rating may be revised when state test data are available, before September 15 of a school year.**

**2.3: Teacher Evaluation Components**

**(1) Forty-five percent (45%) of a teacher’s evaluation shall be based on attainment of goals and/or objectives for student growth, using multiple indicators of academic growth and development to measure those goals/objectives.**

- (a) The process for assessing student growth using multiple indicators of academic growth and development for teacher evaluation will be developed through mutual agreement by each teacher and their evaluator at the beginning of the year.

- (b) The process for assessing student growth will have three phases:

- 1. Goal-setting conference:

- a. Each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select at least 1 but no more than 4 goals/objectives for student growth, the exact number based on a consideration of a reasonable number of goals/objectives taking into account teaching responsibilities and teacher experience. For each objective/goal, each teacher, through mutual agreement with his/her evaluator, will select Indicators of Academic Growth and Development (IAGD) and evidence of the IAGD based on the range of criteria used by the district.

- b. Each goal/objective will:
  - i. take into account the academic track record and overall needs and strengths of the students the teacher is teaching that year/semester;
  - ii. Address the most important purposes of a teacher's assignment through self-reflection;
  - iii. Be aligned with school, district and state student achievement objectives;
  - iv. Take into account their students' starting learning needs vis a vis relevant baseline data when available.
  - v. Pursuant to section 10-151b (C.G.S.), as amended by subsection (c) of Sec. 51 of P.A. 12-116, such guidelines shall include consideration of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school information system that may influence teacher performance ratings, including, but not limited to, student characteristics, student attendance and student mobility and minimum requirements for teacher evaluation instruments and procedures. Consideration of such control factors and minimum requirements shall be undertaken and accomplished through the joint deliberations and determinations of the Goal Setting process. (Also see 1.1.)

2. Mid-year check-ins:

- a. Evaluators and teachers will review progress toward the goals/objectives at least once during the school year, which is to be considered the midpoint of the school year, using available information, including agreed upon indicators. This review may result in revisions to the strategies or approach being used and/or teachers and evaluators may mutually agree on mid-year adjustment of student learning goals to accommodate changes (e.g., student populations, assignment).

3. End-of-year summative review:

- a. Teacher Self-Assessment – The teacher reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the principal or designee. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the Goal-setting conference.
  
- b. End of Year Conference – The teacher shall collect evidence of student progress toward meeting the student learning goals/objectives. This evidence will be produced by using the multiple indicators selected to align with each student learning goal/objective. The evidence will be submitted to the evaluator, and the teacher and evaluator will discuss the extent to which the students met the learning goals/objectives. Following the conference, the evaluator will rate the extent of student progress toward meeting the student learning goals/objectives, based on criteria for 4 levels of performance. If state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating, a final rating may be revised before September 15 when state test data are available.



(c) One half (or 22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development used as evidence of whether goals/objectives are met shall be based on the state test for those teaching tested grades and subjects or another standardized indicator for other grades and subjects where available. For the other half (22.5%) of the indicators of academic growth and development, there may be:

- a. A maximum of one additional standardized indicator, if there is mutual agreement, subject to the local dispute resolution procedure as described in 1.3.
- b. A minimum of one non-standardized indicator.

(d) Examples of indicators that may be used to produce evidence of academic growth and development include but are not limited to:

1. Standardized indicators;

- a. Standardized assessments are characterized by the following attributes:
  - i. Administered and scored in a consistent – or “standard” – manner;
  - ii. Aligned to a set of academic or performance “standards;”
  - iii. Broadly administered (e.g. nation- or statewide);
  - iv. Commercially produced;
  - v. often administered only once a year.
- b. Standardized assessments include, but are not limited to:
  - i. AP exams;
  - ii. SAT-9;
  - iii. DRA (administered more than once a year);
  - iv. DIBELS (administered more than once a year);
  - v. NWEA (administered more than once a year);
  - vi. Trade certification exams;
  - vii. Standardized vocational ED exams;
  - viii. Curriculum based assessments taken from banks of state-wide or assessment consortium assessment item banks.

2. Non-standardized Indicators

- a. Non-standardized indicators include, but are not limited to:
  - i. Performances rated against a rubric (such as: music performance, dance performance);
  - ii. Performance assessments or tasks rated against a rubric (such as: constructed projects, student oral work, and other written work);
  - iii. Portfolios of student work rated against a rubric;
  - iv. Curriculum-based assessments, including those constructed by a teacher or team of teachers;
  - v. Periodic assessments that document student growth over time (such as: formative assessments, diagnostic assessments, district benchmark assessments);
  - vi. Other indicators (such as: teacher developed tests, student written work, constructed project).

(e) When selecting indicators used to gauge attainment of goals/objectives, teachers and their evaluators shall agree on a balance in the weighting of standardized and non-standardized indicators as described in 2.3.d.

(f) Within the process, the following are descriptions of selecting indicators of academic growth and development: In the context of the evaluation of a teacher's performance, 2.3.f.1 is an opportunity to evaluate the degree to which the teacher provides students fair opportunity and 2.3.f.2 is an opportunity to evaluate the context in which the teacher is working to show that the teacher is given fair opportunity. Indicators of academic growth and development should be fair, reliable, valid and useful to the greatest extent possible. These terms are defined as follows:

1. Fair to students - The indicator of academic growth and development is used in such a way as to provide students an opportunity to show that they have met or are making progress in meeting the learning objective. The use of the indicator of academic growth and development is as free as possible from bias and stereotype.
2. Fair to teachers - The use of an indicator of academic growth and development is fair when a teacher has the professional resources and opportunity to show that his/her students have made growth and when the indicator is appropriate to the teacher's content, assignment and class composition.
3. Reliable - Use of the indicator is consistent among those using the indicators and over time.
4. Valid - The indicator measures what it is intended to measure.
5. Useful - The indicator may be used to provide the teacher with meaningful feedback about student knowledge, skills, perspective and classroom experience that may be used to enhance student learning and provide opportunities for teacher professional growth and development.

**(2) Forty percent (40%) of a teacher's evaluation shall be based on observation of teacher practice and performance.**

(a) Teacher evaluation programs developed and implemented by local or regional boards of education shall ensure that processes related to observation of teacher practice and performance:

1. Facilitate and encourage effective means for multiple in-class visits necessary for gathering evidence of the quality of teacher practice;
2. Provide constructive oral and written feedback of observations in a timely and useful manner;
3. Provide on-going calibration of evaluators in the district;
4. Use a combination of formal, informal, announced, and unannounced observation;
5. Consider differentiating the number of observations related to experience, prior ratings, needs and goals.

6. Include pre- and post-conferences that include deep professional conversations that allow evaluators and teachers to set goals, allow administrators to gain insight into the teacher's progress in addressing issues and working toward their goals, and share evidence each has gathered during the year.

(b) Observations of teacher practice and performance shall meet the following minimum criteria:

1. Observation models must be standards-based. Examples of acceptable standards based frameworks include, but are not limited to the Danielson, Marzano and Marshall frameworks, or locally developed frameworks based on best practice.

2. Observation models must be aligned to the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching. Districts that do not adopt the state model must specify how district-selected or developed models demonstrate this alignment.

3. Observations must be rated using rubrics that have four performance levels.

(c) First and second year teachers shall receive at least three in-class formal observations. Two of the three observations must include a pre-conference, and all of the observations must include a post-conference with timely written and verbal feedback.

(d) Teachers who receive a performance evaluation designation of below standard or developing shall receive a number of observations appropriate to their individual development plan, but no fewer than three in-class formal observations. Two of the three observations must include a pre-conference, and all of the observations must include a post-conference with timely written and verbal feedback.

(e) Teachers who receive a performance evaluation designation of proficient or exemplary shall receive a combination of at least three formal observations/reviews of practice, one of which must be a formal in-class observation. The exact combination shall be mutually agreed upon by the teacher and evaluator at the beginning of the evaluation process. 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.

(f) Districts shall provide all evaluators with training in observation and evaluation, and how to provide high-quality feedback. Districts shall describe how evaluators must demonstrate proficiency on an ongoing basis in conducting teacher evaluations.

**(3) Five percent (5%) of a teacher's evaluation shall be based on whole-school student learning indicators or student feedback.**

(a) For districts that include whole-school student learning indicators in teacher evaluations, a teacher's indicator ratings shall be represented by the aggregate rating for multiple student learning indicators established for the administrator's evaluation rating.

(b) For districts that include student surveys:

1. Student responses must be anonymous.

2. Surveys must demonstrate properties of fairness, reliability, validity and usefulness.
3. School governance councils shall assist in the development of whole-school surveys, if applicable, in order to encourage alignment with school improvement goals.
4. An age-appropriate student survey must be administered to each student. Both the language used in the survey and the administration protocol (e.g., paper or on-line; read by student or read by an adult) shall be appropriate for the grade level.
5. Results from surveys addressed by teachers should align with student learning goals.
6. For whole-school student surveys, ratings may be based on one of two options:
  - a. Evidence from teacher developed student level indicators of improvement in areas of need as identified by the school level survey results; or
  - b. Evidence of teacher's implementation of strategies to address areas of need as identified by the survey results.
7. Teacher ratings in this area may be based on a teacher's improvement in performance goals based on student feedback or on the criteria found in Domain 6 (Professional Practice) of the Common Core of Teaching. See appendix for details.

(c) Approaches such as focus groups, interviews, or teachers' own surveys may be used to collect information from students.

(d) The whole-school student learning indicators rating or student feedback rating shall be among four performance levels.

**(4) Ten percent (10%) of a teacher's evaluation shall be based on parent or peer feedback, including surveys.**

- (a) For districts that include parent surveys:
  1. Parent responses must be anonymous.
  2. Surveys must demonstrate properties of fairness, reliability, validity and usefulness.
  3. School governance councils shall assist in the development of whole-school surveys, if applicable, in order to encourage alignment with school improvement goals.
  4. Survey is administered to each parent either on-line or paper version.
  5. Results from surveys addressed by teachers should align with student improvement goals.
  6. For whole-school parent surveys, ratings may be based on one of two options:
    - a. Evidence from teacher developed student level indicators of improvement in areas of need as identified by the school level survey results; or
    - b. Evidence of teacher's implementation of strategies to address areas of need as identified by the survey results.

7. Teacher ratings in this area may be based on a teacher's improvement in performance goals based on parent feedback or on the criteria found in Domain 6 (Professional Practice) of the Common Core of Teaching. See appendix for details.

(b) Approaches such as focus groups, interviews, or teachers' own surveys may be used to collect information from parents.

(c) Peer observation or peer focus groups may be developed.

(d) The parent or peer feedback rating shall be among four performance levels.

## **2.4 Evaluation-based Professional Learning**

Districts and schools shall provide professional learning opportunities for teachers, pursuant to subsection (b) of Sec. 10-220a of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process. These learning opportunities shall be clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process as it relates to student learning results, observation of professional practice or the results of stakeholder feedback. See appendix for statutory language referenced.

## **2.5 Individual Teacher Improvement and Remediation Plans**

Districts shall create plans of individual teacher improvement and remediation for teachers whose performance is developing or below standard, collaboratively developed with such teacher and his or her exclusive bargaining representative for certified teachers chosen pursuant to section 10-153b of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), and that (A) identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies, (B) 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 (C) include indicators of success including a summative rating of proficient or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.

## **2.6 Career Development and Growth**

Districts must provide opportunities for career development and professional growth based on performance identified through the evaluation process. Examples of opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring/coaching 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 for their peers; differentiated career pathways; and targeted professional development based on areas of need.

## **2.7 Orientation Programs**

The local or regional board of education or regional educational service center for the school district shall offer annual orientation programs regarding the teacher evaluation and support system to teachers who are employed by such local or regional board of education and whose performance is being evaluated.

## **2.8 Defining Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness; Evaluation Audit and Validation**

(1) Each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system.

(2) At the request of a district or employee, the State Department of Education or a third-party entity approved by the SDE will audit the evaluation components that are combined to determine an individual's summative rating in the event that such components are significantly dissimilar (i.e. include both exemplary and below standard ratings) to determine a final summative rating.

(3) The State Department of Education or a third-party designated by the SDE will audit evaluations ratings of exemplary and below standard to validate such exemplary or below standard ratings by selecting ten districts at random annually and reviewing evaluation evidence files for a minimum of two educators rated exemplary and two educators rated below standard in those districts selected at random, including at least one classroom teacher rated exemplary and at least one teacher rated below standard per district selected.

## **Section 3: Core Requirements for the Evaluation of Administrators who Serve in Roles Requiring a 092 Certification**

As provided in subsection (a) of 10-151b (C.G.S.) as amended by Sec. 51 of P.A. 12-116, the superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each administrator who serves in a role requiring a 092 certification, in accordance with the requirements of this section. Local or regional boards of education shall develop and implement administrator evaluation programs consistent with these requirements. Except where noted below as applying to particular job roles, the requirements apply to all roles requiring a 092 certification. 092 certificate holders whose primary job duties include teaching students shall be evaluated using the requirements in Section 2.

### **3.1: 4-Level Matrix Rating System**

**(1) Annual summative evaluations provide each administrator with a summative rating aligned to one of four performance evaluation designators: Exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard.**

(a) The performance levels shall be defined as follows:

- 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

(b) In order to determine summative rating designations for each administrator, districts shall:

1. Rate administrator performance in each of four categories – multiple student learning indicators, teacher effectiveness outcomes, observations of administrator performance and practice, and stakeholder feedback.
2. Combine the multiple-student learning indicator rating and the teacher effectiveness outcomes rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “outcomes rating” of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard.

3. Combine the observations of administrator performance and practice rating and stakeholder feedback rating into a single rating, taking into account their relative weights; this will represent an overall “practice rating” of Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, or Below Standard.

4. Combine the outcomes rating and practice rating into a final rating that equally weights the outcomes and practice ratings. In undertaking this step, the district must assign a summative rating performance level (i.e., Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Below Standard). The district must provide at the start of each school year how the “practice rating” and “outcomes rating” will be combined into one summative rating. See appendix for example.

### **3.2 Administrator Evaluation Process**

**(1) The annual evaluation process for an administrator shall at least include, but not be limited to, the following steps, in order:**

- (a) Orientation on process – To begin the process, the superintendent or designee provides the administrator with materials outlining the evaluation process and other information as appropriate. Process information provided in orientation must include the rubric used for assessing administrator practice, the instruments to be used to gather feedback from staff, families, and/or students and their alignment to the rubric, the process and calculation by which all evaluation elements will be integrated into an overall rating.
- (b) Goal-setting conference – At the start of the school year, the superintendent or designee and administrator meet to discuss information relevant to the evaluation process, and agree on the specific measures and performance targets for the student learning indicators, teacher effectiveness outcomes, and stakeholder feedback. In the absence of agreement, the superintendent or designee makes the final determination about the performance targets. The evaluator and administrator also identify focus areas for development of administrator practice aligned to the Connecticut School Leadership Standards. The evaluator and administrator also discuss the appropriate resources and professional development needs to support the administrator in meeting the performance targets.
- (c) Evidence collection – The administrator collects evidence about his/her practice and the superintendent or designee collects evidence about administrator practice to support the review.
  - 1. The superintendent or designee must conduct at least two school site observations for any administrator and should conduct at least four school site observations for administrators who are new to their district, school, the profession, or who have received ratings of developing or below standard.
  - 2. The evaluator of an assistant principal shall conduct at least four observations of the practice of said assistant principal.

**(2) Examples of school site observations could include observing the administrator leading professional development or facilitating teacher teams, observing the administrator working with parents and community members, observing classrooms and instructional quality, or assessing elements of the school culture.**

**(3) Mid-year formative review – The superintendent or designee and administrator hold a mid-year formative conference, with explicit discussion of progress toward student learning targets, as well as any areas of performance related to standards of performance and practice**

**(4) End-of-year summative review:**

- (a) Administrator self-assessment - The administrator reviews all information and data collected during the year and completes a self-assessment for review by the superintendent or designee. This self-assessment may focus specifically on the areas for development established in the Goal-setting conference.
- (b) End-of-year conference -The superintendent or designee and the administrator meet to discuss all evidence collected to date. Following the conference, the superintendent or designee assigns a summative rating and generates a summary report of the evaluation before the end of the school year.

**(5) Local reporting – The district superintendent shall report the status of administrator evaluations to the local or regional board of education on or before June first of each year.**

**(6) State reporting – Not later than June thirtieth of each year, each superintendent shall report to the Commissioner of Education the status of the implementation of administrator evaluations, including the frequency of evaluations, aggregate evaluation ratings, the number of administrators who have not been evaluated and other requirements as determined by the Department of Education.**

**(7) Summative rating revisions – After all data, including state test data, are available, the superintendent or designee may adjust the summative rating if the state test data may have a significant impact on a final rating. A final rating may be revised when state test data are available, before September 15 of a school year.**

### **3.3 Administrator Evaluation Components**

**(1) Forty five percent (45%) of an administrator’s summative rating shall be based on multiple student learning indicators.**

- (a) Twenty-two point five percent (22.5%) of an administrator’s evaluation shall be based only on student performance and/or growth on the state-administered assessments in core content areas that are part of the state’s approved school accountability system.

This portion must include:

- 1. School Performance Index (SPI) progress from year to year;
- 2. SPI progress for student subgroups.

This portion may include:

- 1. SPI rating
- 2. SPI rating for student subgroups

Districts may determine locally the relative weight on each of components 1-4 within 3.3.a.

For 092 holders serving in central office administrative roles, districts shall rate performance based on results in the group of schools, group of students, or subject area most relevant to the administrator’s job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.



All protections related to the assignment of school accountability ratings (e.g., the minimum number of days a student must be enrolled in order for that student's scores to be included in an accountability measure) shall apply to the use of state test data for administrator evaluation. If the state adds a student growth indicator tied to content-area assessments to the state accountability system for schools, then that indicator shall become a required element of this portion of the administrator evaluation system.

For any school that does not have tested grades (such as a K-2 school), the entire 45% of an administrator's rating on student learning indicators shall be based on the locally-determined indicators described below in subsection (b).

- (b) Twenty-two point five percent (22.5%) of an administrator's evaluation shall be based on at least two locally-determined indicators of student learning, at least one of which must include student outcomes from subjects and/or grades not assessed on state-administered assessments. Locally determined indicators must align to Connecticut learning standards. In instances where there are no such standards that apply to a subject/grade level, districts must provide evidence of alignment to research-based learning standards.

For administrators in high schools, selected indicators must include:

1. The cohort graduation rate and the extended graduation rate, as defined in the State's approved application for flexibility under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. All protections related to the assignment of school accountability ratings for cohort graduation rate and extended graduation rate shall apply to the use of graduation data for principal evaluation.

- (c) For all school-based administrators, selected indicators must be relevant to the student population (e.g., grade levels) served by the administrator's school, and may include:
1. Student performance or growth on state-administered assessments and/or district-adopted assessments not included in the state accountability measures (e.g., commercial content area assessments, Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate examinations).

2. Students' progress toward graduation in the school using strong predictive indicators, including but not limited to 9th and/or 10th grade credit accumulation and/or the percentage of students that pass 9th and/or 10th grade subjects most commonly associated with graduation.

3. Students' performance or growth on school- or classroom-developed assessments in subjects and grade levels for which there are not available state assessments.

4. Other indicators proposed by the district.

- (d) For assistant principals, indicators may focus on student results from a subset of teachers, grade levels, or subjects, consistent with the job responsibilities of the assistant principal being evaluated.

- (e) For central office administrators, indicators may be based on results in the group of schools, group of students, or subject area most relevant to the administrator's job responsibilities, or on district-wide student learning results.

In selecting indicators, districts may establish district-wide indicators or may allow administrators and their evaluators to craft mutually agreed-upon student learning objectives specific to that administrator. The school or district must be able to collect adequate information on any chosen indicator to make a fair judgment about whether the administrator met the established goal. When setting targets or objectives, the superintendent or designee must include a review of relevant student characteristics (e.g., mobility, attendance, demographic and learning characteristics). The evaluator and administrator must also discuss the professional resources appropriate to supporting the administrator in meeting the performance targets.

For any administrator assigned to a school in “review” or “turnaround” status in the state’s accountability system, the indicators used for administrator evaluation must align with the performance targets set out in the school’s mandated Improvement Plan. Districts are encouraged to have such alignment for all administrators.

**(2) Five percent (5%) of an administrator’s summative rating shall be based on teacher effectiveness outcomes.**

Acceptable measures include:

- (a) Improving the percentage (or meeting a target of a high percentage) of teachers who meet the student learning objectives outlined in their performance evaluations (If this measure is used, districts should have a process for ensuring that the process for setting student learning objectives is rigorous).
- (b) Other locally-determined measures of teacher effectiveness.

For assistant principals, measures of teacher effectiveness shall focus only on those teachers the assistant principal is responsible for evaluating. If the assistant principal’s job duties do not include teacher evaluation, then the teacher effectiveness rating for the principal of the school shall apply to the assistant principal.

**(3) Forty percent (40%) of an administrator’s evaluation shall be based on ratings of administrator performance and practice by the district superintendent or her/his designee(s).**

Ratings must be based on evidence collected about leadership practice as described in the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards using a rubric aligned to those standards.

For principals, districts may vary the relative weights of standards, but must weight the Teaching and Learning Standard at least twice as much as any other standard. The other standards of practice must all have a weighting of at least 5% of the overall evaluation. The weighting of standards may be different for each administrator, but the weights must be established by the evaluator as part of the goal setting conference at the start of the school year.

An assistant principal’s rating must be based on evidence collected about leadership practice as described in the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards. Districts may vary the relative weights of standards, but must include all six standards and weight each of them at least 5% of the overall evaluation of practice. Within the standards, evaluators may limit the rating to those elements that are relevant to the assistant principal’s job duties. The weighting of standards may be different for each assistant principal, but the weights must be established by the evaluator as part of the goal setting conference at the start of the school year. Districts are encouraged to use the observation of assistant principal practice to highlight an individual’s readiness for the principalship.

Performance ratings that the superintendent or designee make based on direct observations of school-based administrator practice shall be based on a locally-developed or locally-selected rubric that meets the following criteria:

- It is aligned to the Common core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.
- It clearly distinguishes among at least four levels of performance.
- It clearly identifies administrator leadership actions related to improving teacher effectiveness, including conducting teacher evaluations.

For central office administrators, a rubric is not required. Districts may generate ratings from evidence collected directly from the Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards.

In rating administrators against the rubric, the evaluator must identify a performance rating with written evidence to support the rating for each leadership standard; further, the evaluator must identify the strengths and growth areas of the administrator.

Districts selecting or designing rubrics other than the state-developed rubric shall provide training of evaluators focused on the language of the rubric and its use in practice.

The superintendent or designee shall provide feedback on administrator performance at least, but not limited to, in the mid-year conference and end-of-year conference. It is recommended that such feedback be provided as soon after an observation as is practical.

The district shall provide all evaluators of administrators with training focused on the administrator evaluation system, including at least, but not limited to, training on conducting effective observations and providing high-quality feedback.

The district may conduct the training or have evaluators participate in state-sponsored training.

**(4) Ten percent (10%) of an administrator's summative rating shall be based on feedback from stakeholders on areas of principal and/or school practice described in the Connecticut Leadership Standards.**

Districts may select a subset of elements and indicators within the Leadership Standards for purposes of gathering feedback. For school-based administrators, stakeholders solicited for feedback must include teachers and parents, but may include other stakeholders (e.g., other staff, community members, students, etc.). Central office administrators shall be rated based on feedback from the stakeholders whom the administrator directly serves.

The instrument(s) selected for gathering feedback must be valid (that is, it 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). In order to minimize burden on schools and stakeholders, the instruments chosen need not be implemented exclusively for purposes of principal evaluation.

More than half of the rating of a principal on stakeholder feedback must be based on an assessment of improvement over time. Districts may also rate administrators based on status performance and may have less of a focus on improvement over time if status performance surpasses a district-determined threshold of adequate performance. Districts may set common targets of improvement and performance for all administrators or set specific targets for individual administrators.

Focus groups, interviews, teacher-level surveys, or other methods may be used to gather stakeholder feedback as long as these methods meet the above definitions of valid and reliable.

If districts elect to use surveys to gather feedback, they may include the survey response rate as an input to the rating on feedback (as a way to increase the accuracy of survey results).

### **3.4 Evaluation-based Professional Learning**

Districts and schools shall provide professional learning opportunities for administrators, pursuant to subsection (b) of Sec. 10-220a of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process. These learning opportunities shall be clearly linked to the specific outcomes of the evaluation process as it relates to student learning results, observation of professional practice or the results of stakeholder feedback include the provision of useful and timely feedback and improvement opportunities. See appendix for statute language referenced.

### **3.5 Individual Administrator Improvement and Remediation Plans**

Districts shall create plans of individual principal improvement and remediation for principals whose performance is developing or below standard, collaboratively developed with such teacher and his or her exclusive bargaining representative for certified principals chosen pursuant to section 10-153b of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), and that (A) identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies, (B) 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 (C) include indicators of success including a summative rating of proficient or better at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan.

### **3.6 Career Development and Growth**

Districts must provide opportunities for career development and professional growth based on performance identified through the evaluation process. Examples of opportunities include, but are not limited to: observation of peers; mentoring/coaching early-career administrators; participating in development of administrator improvement and remediation plans for peers whose performance is developing or below standard; leading Professional Learning Communities for their peers; differentiated career pathways; and, targeted professional development based on areas of need.

### **3.7 Orientation Programs**

The local or regional board of education or regional educational service center for the school district shall offer annual orientation programs regarding the administrator evaluation and support program to administrators who are employed by such local or regional board of education and whose performance is being evaluated and shall train administrators who are employed by such local or regional board of education and who are conducting performance evaluations.

### **3.8 Defining Effectiveness and Ineffectiveness; Evaluation Audit and Validation**

(1) Each district shall define effectiveness and ineffectiveness utilizing a pattern of summative ratings derived from the new evaluation system.

(2) At the request of a district or employee, the State Department of Education or a third-party entity approved by the SDE will audit the evaluation components that are combined to determine an individual's summative rating in the event that such components are significantly dissimilar (i.e. include both exemplary and below standard ratings) to determine a final summative rating.

(3) The State Department of Education or a third-party designated by the SDE will audit evaluations ratings of exemplary and below standard to validate such exemplary or below standard ratings by selecting ten districts at random annually and reviewing evaluation evidence files for a minimum of two educators rated exemplary and two educators rated below standard in those districts selected at random, including at least one administrator rated exemplary and at least one administrator rated below standard per district selected.

## **Section 4: Core Requirements for the Evaluation of Student and Educator Support Specialists**

As provided in Sec. 10-151b of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.) as amended by section 51 of P.A. 12-116, "The superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each Student and Educator Support Specialist", in accordance with the requirements of this section. Local or regional boards of education shall develop and implement Student and Educator Support evaluation programs consistent with these requirements.

### **4.1 Flexibility from Core Requirements for the Evaluation of Teachers**

**(1) Student and Educator Support Specialists shall have a clear job descriptions and delineation of their role and responsibilities in the school to guide the setting of indicators of academic growth and development, feedback and observation.**

**(2) Because of the unique nature of the roles fulfilled by Student and Educator Support Specialists, districts shall be granted flexibility in applying the Core Requirements of teacher evaluation in the following ways:**

(a) Districts shall be granted flexibility in using Indicators of Academic Growth and Development to measure attainment of goals and/or objectives for student growth. The Goal-setting conference for identifying the IAGD shall include the following steps:

1. The educator and evaluator will agree on the students or caseloads that the educator is responsible for and his/her role.

2. The educator and evaluator will determine if the indicator will apply to the individual teacher, a team of teachers, a grade level or the whole school.

3. The educator and evaluator should identify the unique characteristics of the population of students which would impact student growth (i.e. high absenteeism, highly mobile population in school).

4. The educator and evaluator will identify the learning standard to measure: the assessment, data or product for measuring growth; the timeline for instruction and measurement; how baseline will be established; how targets will be set so they are realistic yet rigorous; the strategies that will be used; and the professional development the educator needs to improve their learning to support the areas targeted.

(b) Because some Student and Educator Support Specialists do not have a classroom and may not be involved in direct instruction of students, the educator and evaluator shall agree to appropriate venues for observations and an appropriate rubric for rating practice and performance at the beginning of the school year. The observations will be based on standards when available. Examples of appropriate venues include but are not limited to: observing Student and Educator Support Specialist staff working with small groups of children, working with adults, providing professional development, working with families, participation in team meetings or Planning and Placement Team meetings.

(c) When student, parent and/or peer feedback mechanisms are not applicable to Student and Educator Support Specialists, districts may permit local development of short feedback mechanisms for students, parents, and peers specific to particular roles or projects for which the Student and Educator Support Specialists are responsible.

## **Appendix**

### **I. An Act Educational Reform: Sections 51 through 56 of P.A. 12-116, as amended by section 23 and 24 of P.A. 12-2 of the June 12 Special Session \***

Sec. 51. Section 10-151b of the 2012 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective from passage*):

(a) The superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall [continuously] annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each teacher, in accordance with guidelines established by the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, and such other guidelines as may be established by mutual agreement between the local or regional board of education and the teachers' representative chosen pursuant to section 10-153b, and may conduct additional formative evaluations toward producing an annual summative evaluation. An evaluation pursuant to this subsection shall include, but need not be limited to, strengths, areas needing improvement, strategies for improvement and multiple indicators of student academic growth. Claims of failure to follow the established procedures of such evaluation and support programs shall be subject to the grievance procedure in collective bargaining agreements negotiated subsequent to July 1, 2004. In the event that a teacher does not receive a summative evaluation during the school year, such teacher shall receive a "not rated" designation for such school year. The superintendent shall report the status of teacher evaluations to the local or regional board of education on or before June first 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.

(b) [Each] (1) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, each local and regional board of education shall develop and implement teacher evaluation programs consistent with guidelines [established] adopted by the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this

section, and consistent with the plan developed in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 10-220a.

(2) Not later than June thirtieth of each year, each superintendent shall report to the Commissioner of Education the status of the implementation of teacher evaluations, including the frequency of evaluations, aggregate evaluation ratings, the number of teachers who have not been evaluated and other requirements as determined by the Department of Education.

(c) On or before July 1, 2012, the State Board of Education shall adopt, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council established pursuant to section 10-151d, guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program. Such guidelines shall [provide guidance on] include, but not be limited to, (1) the use of four performance evaluations designators: Exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard; (2) the use of multiple indicators of student academic growth and development in teacher evaluations; [. Such guidelines shall include, but not be limited to: (1) Methods] (3) methods for assessing student academic growth and development; [(2)] (4) a consideration of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school information system, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-10a, that may influence teacher performance ratings, including, but not limited to, student characteristics, student attendance and student mobility; [and (3)] (5) minimum requirements for teacher evaluation instruments and procedures, including scoring systems to determine exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard ratings; (6) the development and implementation of periodic training programs regarding the teacher evaluation and support program to be offered by the local or regional board of education or regional educational service center for the school district to teachers who are employed by such local or regional board of education and whose performance is being evaluated and to administrators who are employed by such local or regional board of education and who are conducting performance evaluations; (7) the provision of professional development services based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process; (8) the creation of individual teacher improvement and remediation plans for teachers whose performance is developing or below standard, designed in consultation with such teacher and his or her exclusive bargaining representative for certified teachers chosen pursuant to section 10-153b, and that (A) identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies, (B) 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 (C) include indicators of success including a summative rating of proficient or better immediately at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan; (9) opportunities for career development and professional growth; and (10) a validation procedure to audit evaluation ratings of exemplary or below standard by the department, or a third-party entity approved by the department, to validate such exemplary or below standard evaluation ratings. The State Board of Education, following the completion of the teacher evaluation and support pilot program, pursuant to section 52 of this act, and the submission of the study of such pilot program, pursuant to section 53 of this act, shall validate the guidelines adopted under this subsection.

(d) The State Board of Education may waive the provisions of subdivision (1) of subsection (b) of this section for any local or regional board of education that has developed a teacher evaluation program prior to the validation of the model teacher evaluation and support program guidelines described in subsection (c) of this section and that the State Board of Education determines is in substantial compliance with such model teacher evaluation and support program guidelines.

Sec. 52. (NEW) (*Effective from passage*) (a) For the school year commencing July 1, 2012, the Commissioner of Education shall administer a teacher evaluation and support pilot program. Not later than June 1, 2012, the commissioner shall select, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section, at least eight school districts *or consortia of school districts*, but not more than ten school districts *or consortia of school districts* to participate in a teacher evaluation and support program based on the guidelines adopted pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-151b of the general statutes, as amended by *public act 12-116* 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.

(b) The teacher evaluation and support pilot program described in subdivision (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall (1) assess and evaluate the implementation of a teacher evaluation and support program developed by a local or regional board of education pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-151b of the general statutes, as amended by *public act 12-116*, that is in compliance with the guidelines for a teacher evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-151b of the general statutes, as amended by *public act 12-116* (2) identify district needs for technical assistance and support in implementing such teacher evaluation and support program, (3) provide *orientation* to administrators in how to conduct performance evaluations under the teacher evaluation and support program, (4) provide training to teachers being evaluated under the teacher evaluation and support program, (5) include a validation process for performance evaluations to be conducted by the Department of Education, or the department's designee, and (6) provide funding for the administration of the teacher evaluation and support program developed by the local or regional board of education.

(c) On or before May 25, 2012, a local or regional board of education may apply, on a form provided and in a manner prescribed by the commissioner, to participate in the teacher evaluation and support pilot program.

(d) The commissioner shall select a diverse group of rural, suburban and urban school districts with varying levels of student academic performance to participate in the teacher evaluation and support pilot program. If the commissioner does not receive an adequate amount of applications for participation in the teacher evaluation and support pilot program, the commissioner shall select school districts for participation in such teacher evaluation and support pilot program to satisfy the representation requirements under this subsection.

Sec. 53. (NEW) (*Effective from passage*) (a) The Neag School of Education at The University of Connecticut shall study the implementation of the teacher evaluation and support pilot program described in section 52 of this act. Such study shall (1) analyze and evaluate the implementation of the teacher evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-151b of the general statutes, as amended by this act, for each local or regional board of education participating in the teacher evaluation and support pilot program, (2) compare such teacher evaluation and support program adopted by each local or regional board of education pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-151b of the general statutes, as amended by this act, to the teacher evaluation and support program guidelines adopted by the State Board of Education pursuant to subsection (c) of said section 10-151b, and (3) compare and evaluate the use of student performance data on the state-wide mastery examination, pursuant to section 10-14n of the general statutes, and the use of student performance data on progress monitoring tests approved by the State Board of Education as an indicator of and method for student academic growth and development.



(b) Upon completion of such study, but not later than January 1, 2014, the Neag School of Education at The University of Connecticut shall (1) submit to the State Board of Education such study and any recommendation concerning validation of the teacher evaluation and support program guidelines adopted by the State Board of Education pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-151b of the general statutes, as amended by this act, and (2) submit such study to the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to education, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a of the general statutes.

Sec. 54. (NEW) (*Effective July 1, 2012*) Prior to the implementation of the teacher evaluation and support program developed pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-151b of the general statutes, as amended by this act, but not later than July 1, 2014, each local and regional board of education shall conduct training programs for all evaluators and orientation for all teachers employed by such board relating to the provisions of such teacher evaluation and support program developed by such board of education. Such training shall provide instruction to evaluators in how to conduct proper performance evaluations prior to conducting an evaluation under the teacher evaluation and support program. Such orientation shall be completed by each teacher before a teacher receives an evaluation under the teacher evaluation and support program. 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.

Sec. 55. (NEW) (*Effective July 1, 2012*) On July 1, 2014, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner of Education shall randomly select, within available appropriations, at least ten teacher evaluation and support programs developed pursuant to section 10-151b of the general statutes, as amended by this act, to be subject to a comprehensive audit conducted by the Department of Education. The department shall submit the results of such audits to the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to education, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a of the general statutes.

Sec. 56. Subsection (a) of section 10-220a of the 2012 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2012*): (a) Each local or regional board of education shall provide an in-service training program for its teachers, administrators and pupil personnel who hold the initial educator, provisional educator or professional educator certificate. Such program shall provide such teachers, administrators and pupil personnel with information on (1) the nature and the relationship of drugs, as defined in subdivision (17) of section 21a-240, and alcohol to health and personality development, and procedures for discouraging their abuse, (2) health and mental health risk reduction education which includes, but need not be limited to, the prevention of risk-taking behavior by children and the relationship of such behavior to substance abuse, pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV-infection and AIDS, as defined in section 19a-581, violence, teen dating violence, domestic violence, child abuse and youth suicide, (3) the growth and development of exceptional children, including handicapped and gifted and talented children and children who may require special education, including, but not limited to, children with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder or learning disabilities, and methods for identifying, planning for and working effectively with special needs children in a regular classroom, (4) school violence prevention, conflict resolution, the prevention of and response to youth suicide and the identification and prevention of and response to bullying, as defined in subsection (a) of section 10-222d, except that those boards of education that implement any evidence-based model approach that is approved by the Department of Education and is consistent with subsection (d) of section 10-145a, subsection (a) of section 10-220a, as amended by this act, sections 10-222d, 10-222g and 10-222h, subsection (g) of section 10-233c and sections 1 and 3 of

public act 08-160, shall not be required to provide in-service training on the identification and prevention of and response to bullying, (5) cardiopulmonary resuscitation and other emergency life saving procedures, (6) computer and other information technology as applied to student learning and classroom instruction, communications and data management, (7) the teaching of the language arts, reading and reading readiness for teachers in grades kindergarten to three, inclusive, (8) second language acquisition in districts required to provide a program of bilingual education pursuant to section 10-17f, [and] (9) the requirements and obligations of a mandated reporter. Each local and regional board of education may allow any paraprofessional or noncertified employee to participate, on a voluntary basis, in any in-service training program provided pursuant to this section, and (10) the teacher evaluation and support program developed pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-151b, as amended by this act. The State Board of Education, within available appropriations and utilizing available materials, shall assist and encourage local and regional boards of education to include: (A) Holocaust and genocide education and awareness; (B) the historical events surrounding the Great Famine in Ireland; (C) African-American history; (D) Puerto Rican history; (E) Native American history; (F) personal financial management; (G) domestic violence and teen dating violence; and (H) topics approved by the state board upon the request of local or regional boards of education as part of in-service training programs pursuant to this subsection.

\*Underlined language was added in P.A. 12-116. Italicized language indicates amendments enacted in sections 23 and 24 of P.A. 12-2 of the June Special Session.

## **II. Section 10-151b of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.), as amended by Section 51 of P.A. 12-116—Evaluation by superintendent of certain educational personnel**

(a) The superintendent of each local or regional board of education shall [continuously] annually evaluate or cause to be evaluated each teacher, in accordance with guidelines established by the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, and such other guidelines as may be established by mutual agreement between the local or regional board of education and the teachers' representative chosen pursuant to section 10-153b, and may conduct additional formative evaluations toward producing an annual summative evaluation. An evaluation pursuant to this subsection shall include, but need not be limited to, strengths, areas needing improvement, strategies for improvement and multiple indicators of student academic growth. Claims of failure to follow the established procedures of such evaluation and support programs shall be subject to the grievance procedure in collective bargaining agreements negotiated subsequent to July 1, 2004. In the event that a teacher does not receive a summative evaluation during the school year, such teacher shall receive a "not rated" designation for such school year. The superintendent shall report the status of teacher evaluations to the local or regional board of education on or before June first 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.

(b) [Each] (1) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, each local and regional board of education shall develop and implement teacher evaluation programs consistent with guidelines [established] adopted by the State Board of Education, pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, and consistent with the plan developed in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of section 10-220a.

(2) Not later than June thirtieth of each year, each superintendent shall report to the Commissioner of Education the status of the implementation of teacher evaluations, including the frequency of evaluations, aggregate evaluation ratings, the number of teachers who have not been evaluated and other requirements as determined by the Department of Education.

(c) On or before July 1, 2012, the State Board of Education shall adopt, in consultation with the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council established pursuant to section 10-151d, guidelines for a model teacher evaluation and support program. Such guidelines shall [provide guidance on] include, but not be limited to, (1) the use of four performance evaluations designators: Exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard; (2) the use of multiple indicators of student academic growth and development in teacher evaluations; [.Such guidelines shall include, but not be limited to: (1) Methods] (3) methods for assessing student academic growth and development; [(2)] (4) a consideration of control factors tracked by the state-wide public school information system, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-10a, that may influence teacher performance ratings, including, but not limited to, student characteristics, student attendance and student mobility; [and (3)] (5) minimum requirements for teacher evaluation instruments and procedures, including scoring systems to determine exemplary, proficient, developing and below standard ratings; (6) the development and implementation of periodic training programs regarding the teacher evaluation and support program to be offered by the local or regional board of education or regional educational service center for the school district to teachers who are employed by such local or regional board of education and whose performance is being evaluated and to administrators who are employed by such local or regional board of education and who are conducting performance evaluations; (7) the provision of professional development services based on the individual or group of individuals' needs that are identified through the evaluation process; (8) the creation of individual teacher improvement and remediation plans for teachers whose performance is developing or below standard, designed in consultation with such teacher and his or her exclusive bargaining representative for certified teachers chosen pursuant to section 10-153b, and that (A) identify resources, support and other strategies to be provided by the local or regional board of education to address documented deficiencies, (B) 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 (C) include indicators of success including a summative rating of proficient or better immediately at the conclusion of the improvement and remediation plan; (9) opportunities for career development and professional growth; and (10) a validation procedure to audit evaluation ratings of exemplary or below standard by the department, or a third-party entity approved by the department, to validate such exemplary or below standard evaluation ratings. The State Board of Education, following the completion of the teacher evaluation and support pilot program, pursuant to section 52 of this act, and the submission of the study of such pilot program, pursuant to section 53 of this act, shall validate the guidelines adopted under this subsection.

(d) The State Board of Education may waive the provisions of subdivision (1) of subsection (b) of this section for any local or regional board of education that has developed a teacher evaluation program prior to the validation of the model teacher evaluation and support program guidelines described in subsection (c) of this section and that the State Board of Education determines is in substantial compliance with such model teacher evaluation and support program guidelines.

Sec. 52. (NEW) (Effective from passage) (a) For the school year commencing July 1, 2012, the Commissioner of Education shall administer a teacher evaluation and support pilot program. Not later than June 1, 2012, the commissioner shall select, in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of this section, at least eight school districts, but not more than ten school districts to participate in a

teacher evaluation and support program based on the guidelines adopted pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-151b of the general statutes, as amended by this act. 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.

(b) The teacher evaluation and support pilot program described in subdivision (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall (1) assess and evaluate the implementation of a teacher evaluation and support program developed by a local or regional board of education pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-151b of the general statutes, as amended by this act, that is in compliance with the guidelines for a teacher evaluation and support program adopted pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-151b of the general statutes, as amended by this act, (2) identify district needs for technical assistance and support in implementing such teacher evaluation and support program, (3) provide training to administrators in how to conduct performance evaluations under the teacher evaluation and support program, (4) provide training to teachers being evaluated under the teacher evaluation and support program, (5) include a validation process for performance evaluations to be conducted by the Department of Education, or the department's designee, and (6) provide funding for the administration of the teacher evaluation and support program developed by the local or regional board of education.

(c) On or before May 25, 2012, a local or regional board of education may apply, on a form provided and in a manner prescribed by the commissioner, to participate in the teacher evaluation and support pilot program.

(d) The commissioner shall select a diverse group of rural, suburban and urban school districts with varying levels of student academic performance to participate in the teacher evaluation and support pilot program. If the commissioner does not receive an adequate amount of applications for participation in the teacher evaluation and support pilot program, the commissioner shall select school districts for participation in such teacher evaluation and support pilot program to satisfy the representation requirements under this subsection.

### **III. Section 10-151d of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.)—Performance Evaluation Advisory Council**

(a) There is established a Performance Evaluation Advisory Council within the Department of Education. Membership of the council shall consist of: (1) The Commissioners of Education and Higher Education, or their designees, (2) one representative from each of the following associations, designated by the association, the Connecticut Association of Boards of Education, the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents, Connecticut Federation of School Administrators, the Connecticut Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers-Connecticut, and (3) persons selected by the Commissioner of Education who shall include, but not be limited to, teachers, persons with expertise in performance evaluation processes and systems, and any other person the commissioner deems appropriate.

(b) The council shall be responsible for (1) assisting the State Board of Education in the development and implementation of the teacher evaluation guidelines, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-151b of the general statutes, as amended by this act, and (2) the data collection and evaluation support system, pursuant to subsection (c) of section 10-10a of the general statutes. The council shall meet at least quarterly.

#### **IV. Section 10-10a of the 2012 Supplement (C.G.S.)—Public school information system.**

(1) "Teacher" means any certified professional employee below the rank of superintendent employed by a board of education for at least ninety days in a position requiring a certificate issued by the State Board of Education;

(2) "Teacher preparation program" means a program designed to qualify an individual for professional certification as an educator provided by institutions of higher education or other providers approved by the Department of Education, including, but not limited to, an alternate route to certification program.

[(a)] (b) The Department of Education shall develop and implement a state-wide public school information system. The system shall be designed for the purpose of establishing a standardized electronic data collection and reporting protocol that will facilitate compliance with state and federal reporting requirements, improve school-to-school and district-to-district information exchanges, and maintain the confidentiality of individual student and staff data. The initial design shall focus on student information, provided the system shall be created to allow for future compatibility with financial, facility and staff data. The system shall provide for the tracking of the performance of individual students on each of the state-wide mastery examinations under section 10-14n in order to allow the department to compare the progress of the same cohort of students who take each examination and to better analyze school performance. The department shall assign a unique student identifier to each student prior to tracking the performance of a student in the public school information system.

(c) On or before July 1, 2013, the department shall expand the state-wide public school information system as follows:

(1) Track and report data relating to student, teacher and school and district performance growth and make such information available to local and regional boards of education for use in evaluating educational performance and growth of teachers and students enrolled in public schools in the state. Such information shall be collected or calculated based on information received from local and regional boards of education and other relevant sources. Such information shall include, but not be limited to:

(A) In addition to performance on state-wide mastery examinations pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, data relating to students shall include, but not be limited to, (i) the primary language spoken at the home of a student, (ii) student transcripts, (iii) student attendance and student mobility, and (iv) reliable, valid assessments of a student's readiness to enter public school at the kindergarten level;

(B) Data relating to teachers shall include, but not be limited to, (i) teacher credentials, such as master's degrees, teacher preparation programs completed and certification levels and endorsement areas, (ii) teacher assessments, such as whether a teacher is deemed highly qualified pursuant to the No Child Left Behind Act, P.L. 107-110, or deemed to meet such other designations as may be established by federal law or regulations for the purposes of tracking the equitable distribution of instructional staff, (iii) the presence of substitute teachers in a teacher's classroom, (iv) class size, (v) numbers relating to absenteeism in a teacher's classroom, and (vi) the presence of a teacher's aide. The department shall assign a unique teacher identifier to each teacher prior to collecting such data in the public school information system;

(C) Data relating to schools and districts shall include, but not be limited to, (i) school population, (ii) annual student graduation rates, (iii) annual teacher retention rates, (iv) school disciplinary records, such as data relating to suspensions, expulsions and other disciplinary actions, (v) the percentage of students whose primary language is not English, (vi) the number of and professional credentials of support personnel, and (vii) information relating to instructional technology, such as access to computers.

(2) Collect data relating to student enrollment in and graduation from institutions of higher education for any student who had been assigned a unique student identifier pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, provided such data is available.

(3) Develop means for access to and data sharing with the data systems of public institutions of higher education in the state.

(d) On or before July 1, 2011, and each year thereafter until July 1, 2013, the Commissioner of Education shall report, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a, to the joint standing committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to education on the progress of the department's efforts to expand the state-wide public school information system pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. The report shall include a full statement of those data elements that are currently included in the system and those data elements that will be added on or before July 1, 2013.

[(b)] (e) The system database of student information shall not be considered a public record for the purposes of section 1-210. Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the ability of a full-time permanent employee of a nonprofit organization that is exempt from taxation under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or any subsequent corresponding internal revenue code of the United States, as from time to time amended, and that is organized and operated for educational purposes, to obtain information in accordance with the provisions of subsection [(e)] (h) of this section.

[(c)] (f) All school districts shall participate in the system, and report all necessary information required by this section, provided the department provides for technical assistance and training of school staff in the use of the system.

[(d)] (g) Local and regional boards of education and preschool programs which receive state or federal funding shall participate, in a manner prescribed by the Commissioner of Education, in the state-wide public school information system described in subsection [(a)] (b) of this section. Participation for purposes of this subsection shall include, but not be limited to, reporting on (1) student experiences in preschool by program type and by numbers of months in each such program, and (2) the readiness of students entering kindergarten and student progress in kindergarten. Such reporting shall be done by October 1, 2007, and annually thereafter.

#### **V. Subsection (b) of Sec. 10-220a (C.G.S.) of the 2012 Supplement— Professional Development Committee**

Pursuant to Public Act No. 09-1 each local and regional board of education shall establish a professional development committee consisting of certified employees, and such other school personnel as the board deems appropriate, including representatives of the exclusive bargaining representative for such employees chosen pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-153. The duties of such committees shall include, but not be limited to, the development, evaluation and annual updating of a comprehensive local professional development plan for certified employees of the district. Such plan shall: (1) Be

directly related to the educational goals prepared by the local or regional board of education pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-220, (2) on and after July 1, 2011, be developed with full consideration of the priorities and needs related to student outcomes as determined by the State Board of Education, and (3) provide for the ongoing and systematic assessment and improvement of both teacher evaluation and professional development of the professional staff members of each such board, including personnel management and evaluation training or experience for administrators, shall be related to regular and special student needs and may include provisions concerning career incentives and parent involvement. The State Board of Education shall develop guidelines to assist local and regional boards of education in determining the objectives of the plans and in coordinating staff development activities with student needs and school programs.

(c) The Department of Education, in cooperation with one or more regional educational service centers, is authorized to provide institutes annually for Connecticut educators. Such institutes shall serve as model programs of professional development and shall be taught by exemplary Connecticut teachers and administrators and by other qualified individuals as selected by the Department of Education. The Department of Education shall charge fees for attending such institutes provided such fees shall be based on the actual cost of such institutes.

(d) The Department of Education may fund, within available appropriations, in cooperation with one or more regional educational service centers: (1) A cooperating teacher program to train Connecticut public school teachers and certified teachers at private special education facilities approved by the Commissioner of Education and at other facilities designated by the commissioner, who participate in the supervision, training and evaluation of student teachers; and (2) institutes to provide continuing education for Connecticut public school educators and cooperating teachers, including institutes to provide continuing education for Connecticut public school educators offered in cooperation with the Connecticut Humanities Council. Funds available under this subsection shall be paid directly to school districts for the provision of substitute teachers when cooperating teachers are released from regular classroom responsibilities and for the provision of professional development activities for cooperating and student teachers. The cooperating teacher program shall operate in accordance with regulations adopted by the State Board of Education in accordance with chapter 54, except in cases of placement in other countries pursuant to written cooperative agreements between Connecticut institutions of higher education and institutions of higher education in other countries. A Connecticut institution may enter such an agreement only if the State Board of Education and Board of Governors of Higher Education have jointly approved the institution's teacher preparation program to enter into such agreements. Student teachers shall be placed with trained cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers who are Connecticut public school teachers shall be selected by local and regional boards of education. Cooperating teachers at such private special education and other designated facilities shall be selected by the authority responsible for the operation of such facilities. If a board of education is unable to identify a sufficient number of individuals to serve in such positions, the commissioner may select qualified persons who are not employed by the board of education to serve in such positions. Such regulations shall require primary consideration of teachers' classroom experience and recognized success as educators. The provisions of sections 10-153a to 10-153n, inclusive, shall not be applicable to the selection, placement and compensation of persons participating in the cooperating teacher program pursuant to the provisions of this section and to the hours and duties of such persons. The State Board of Education shall protect and save harmless, in accordance with the provisions of section 10-235, any cooperating teacher while serving in such capacity.

## **VI. Common Core of Teaching: Domain 6: Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership**

Teachers maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration with others, and leadership by:

6.1 Continually engaging in reflection, self-evaluation and professional development to enhance their understandings of content, pedagogical skills, resources and the impact of their actions on student learning;

6.2 Seeking professional development opportunities to enhance skills related to teaching and meeting the needs of all students;

6.3 Collaborating with colleagues, administrators, students and their families to develop and sustain a positive school climate;

6.4 Collaborating with colleagues and administrators to examine student learning data, instructional strategies, curricula, and organizational structures<sup>16</sup> to support continuous school and district improvement;

6.5 Guiding and coaching paraprofessionals and collaborating with colleagues, administrators, and special services staff to monitor the impact of instructional or behavioral support and interventions;

6.6 Proactively communicating in culturally respectful and sensitive ways with families in order to ensure their ongoing awareness of student progress and encourage opportunities to support their child's learning;

6.7 Understanding the legal rights of students with disabilities and their families within the intervention, referral, and individualized education plan process;

6.8 Understanding how one's race, gender and culture affect professional interactions with students, families and colleagues;

6.9 Using communication technology in a professional and ethical manner;

6.10 Collaborating with colleagues, administrators, and families in the development of individualized student success plans to address goal setting, personal and academic development, post-secondary and career exploration, and/or capstone projects; and

6.11 Conducting themselves as professionals in accordance with the Connecticut's Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators.

### (a) Preamble

The Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators is a set of principles which the education profession expects its members to honor and follow. These principles set forth, on behalf of the education profession and the public it serves, standards to guide conduct and the judicious appraisal of conduct in situations that have professional and ethical implications. The Code adheres to the fundamental belief that the student is the foremost reason for the existence of the profession.



The education profession is vested by the public with a trust and responsibility requiring the highest ideals of professionalism. Therefore, the educator accepts both the public trust and the responsibilities to practice the profession according to the highest possible degree of ethical conduct and standards. Such responsibilities include the commitment to the students, the profession, the community and the family.

Consistent with applicable law, the Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators shall serve as a basis for decisions on issues pertaining to certification and employment. The code shall apply to all educators holding, applying or completing preparation for a certificate, authorization or permit or other credential from the State Board of Education. For the purposes of this section, "educator" includes superintendents, administrators, teachers, special services professionals, coaches, substitute teachers and paraprofessionals.

### **PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT**

#### (b) Responsibility to the student

(1) The professional educator, in full recognition of his or her obligation to the student, shall:

(A) Recognize, respect and uphold the dignity and worth of students as individual human beings, and, therefore, deal justly and considerately with students;

(B) Engage students in the pursuit of truth, knowledge and wisdom and provide access to all points of view without deliberate distortion of content area matter;

(C) Nurture in students lifelong respect and compassion for themselves and other human beings regardless of race, ethnic origin, gender, social class, disability, religion, or sexual orientation;

(D) Foster in students the full understanding, application and preservation of democratic principles and processes;

(E) Guide students to acquire the requisite skills and understanding for participatory citizenship and to realize their obligation to be worthy and contributing members of society;

(F) Assist students in the formulation of worthy, positive goals;

(G) Promote the right and freedom of students to learn, explore ideas, develop critical thinking, problem-solving, and necessary learning skills to acquire the knowledge needed to achieve their full potential;

(H) Remain steadfast in guaranteeing equal opportunity for quality education for all students;

(I) Maintain the confidentiality of information concerning students obtained in the proper course of the educational process, and dispense such information only when prescribed or directed by federal or state law or professional practice;

(J) Create an emotionally and physically safe and healthy learning environment for all students; and

(K) Apply discipline promptly, impartially, appropriately and with compassion.

(c) Responsibility to the profession

(1) The professional educator, in full recognition of his or her obligation to the profession, shall:

(A) Conduct himself or herself as a professional realizing that his or her actions reflect directly upon the status and substance of the profession;

(B) Uphold the professional educator's right to serve effectively;

(C) Uphold the principle of academic freedom;

(D) Strive to exercise the highest level of professional judgment;

(E) Engage in professional learning to promote and implement research-based best educational practices;

(F) Assume responsibility for his or her professional development;

(G) Encourage the participation of educators in the process of educational decision making;

(H) Promote the employment of only qualified and fully certificated, authorized or permitted educators;

(I) Encourage promising, qualified and competent individuals to enter the profession;

(J) Maintain the confidentiality of information concerning colleagues and dispense such information only when prescribed or directed by federal or state law or professional practice;

(K) Honor professional contracts until fulfillment, release, or dissolution mutually agreed upon by all parties to contract;

(L) Create a culture that encourages purposeful collaboration and dialogue among all stakeholders;

(M) Promote and maintain ongoing communication among all stakeholders; and

(N) Provide effective leadership to ensure continuous focus on student achievement.

(d) Responsibility to the community

(1) The professional educator, in full recognition of the public trust vested in the profession, shall:

(A) Be cognizant of the influence of educators upon the community-at-large, obey local, state and national laws;

(B) Encourage the community to exercise its responsibility to be involved in the formulation of educational policy;

(C) Promote the principles and ideals of democratic citizenship; and

(D) Endeavor to secure equal educational opportunities for all students.

(e) Responsibility to the student's family

(1) The professional educator in recognition of the public trust vested in the profession, shall:

(A) Respect the dignity of each family, its culture, customs, and beliefs;

(B) Promote, respond, and maintain appropriate communications with the family, staff and administration;

(C) Consider the family's concerns and perspectives on issues involving its children; and

(D) Encourage participation of the family in the educational process.

**UNPROFESSIONAL CONDUCT\***

(f) The professional educator, in full recognition of his or her obligation to the student, shall not:

(A) Abuse his or her position as a professional with students for private advantage;

(B) Discriminate against students.

(C) Sexually or physically harass or abuse students;

(D) Emotionally abuse students; or

(E) Engage in any misconduct which would put students at risk; and

(g) The professional educator, in full recognition of his or her obligation to the profession, shall not:

(A) Obtain a certificate, authorization, permit or other credential issued by the state board of education or obtain employment by misrepresentation, forgery or fraud;

(B) Accept any gratuity, gift or favor that would impair or influence professional decisions or actions;

(C) Misrepresent his, her or another's professional qualifications or competencies;

(D) Sexually, physically or emotionally harass or abuse district employees;

(E) Misuse district funds and/or district property; or

(F) Engage in any misconduct which would impair his or her ability to serve effectively in the profession; and

(h) The professional educator, in full recognition of the public trust vested in the profession, shall not:

(A) Exploit the educational institution for personal gain;

(B) Be convicted in a court of law of a crime involving moral turpitude or of any crime of such nature that violates such public trust; or

(C) Knowingly misrepresent facts or make false statements.

\*Unprofessional conduct is not limited to the descriptors listed above. When in doubt regarding whether a specific course of action constitutes professional or unprofessional conduct please seek advice from your school district or preparation institution.

(i) Code revision

This Code shall be reviewed for potential revision concurrently with the revision of the Regulations Concerning State Educator Certificates, Permits and Authorizations, by the Connecticut Advisory Council for Teacher Professional Standards. As a part of such reviews, a process shall be established to receive input and comment from all interested parties.

**VII. Example of a matrix rating system**

| Practice Rating |   |                                   |                     |                     |                                   |
|-----------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
|                 |   | 4                                 | 3                   | 2                   | 1                                 |
| Outcome Rating  | 4 | Rate Exemplary                    | Rate Exemplary      | Rate Proficient     | <i>Gather further information</i> |
|                 | 3 | Rate Exemplary                    | Rate Proficient     | Rate Developing     | Rate Below Standard               |
|                 | 2 | Rate Proficient                   | Rate Developing     | Rate Developing     | Rate Below Standard               |
|                 | 1 | <i>Gather further information</i> | Rate Below Standard | Rate Below Standard | Rate Below Standard               |
|                 |   |                                   |                     |                     |                                   |

### **VIII. Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) Members**

| <u>Names</u>       | <u>Title</u>                         | <u>Organization Represented</u>                               |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Bruce Douglas      | Executive Director                   | CREC (RESC)                                                   |
| Carole Clifford    | Consultant, Professional Development | American Federation of Teachers-CT (AFT)                      |
| Dennis Carrithers  | Assistant Executive Director         | CT Association of Schools (CAS)                               |
| Diane Ullman       | Interim Chief Talent Officer         | CSDE                                                          |
| Ed Malin           | Department of Education Chair        | Sacred Heart University                                       |
| Joe Cirusuolo      | Executive Director                   | CT Association of Public School Superintendents, Inc. (CAPSS) |
| Karissa Niehoff    | Executive Director                   | CT Association of Schools (CAS)                               |
| Linette Branham    | Education Issues Specialist          | CT Education Association (CEA)                                |
| Malia Sieve        | Associate Director                   | Board of Regents for Higher Education (BOR)                   |
| Mary Loftus Levine | Executive Director                   | CT Education Association (CEA)                                |
| Mike Buckley       | Associate Executive Director         | CT Association of Schools (CAS)                               |
| Nancy Pugliese     | Bureau Chief                         | CSDE                                                          |
| Patrice McCarthy   | Deputy Executive Director            | CT Association of Boards of Education (CABE)                  |
| Paula Colen        | Executive Director                   | EASTCONN (RESC)                                               |
| Phil Apruzzese     | President                            | CT Education Association (CEA)                                |
| Robert Rader       | Executive Director                   | CT Association of Boards of Education (CABE)                  |
| Roch Girard        | President                            | CT Federation of School Administrators (CFSA)                 |
| Sharon Palmer      | Executive Director                   | CT-American Federation of Teachers (AFT)                      |
| Stefan Pryor       | Commissioner                         | CSDE                                                          |

### **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Approval of the above Connecticut Guidelines for Educator Evaluation, dated June 2012, will allow the Department to institute evaluation systems for teachers and administrators state-wide in accordance with these Guidelines.

### **FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES PLANNED**

The PEAC will meet at least quarterly to discuss the progress of the pilot districts and evaluation study.

Approved by:

---

Stefan Pryor  
Commissioner of Education

# **CAS Request for Proposal**

## **Appendix B**

# CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

### Introduction

#### I. A Vision for Teaching and Learning in Connecticut Public Schools

The CCT (CCT) articulates the knowledge, skills and qualities that Connecticut teachers need in order to prepare students to meet the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the increasingly complex needs of students require sophisticated teaching strategies. As stated in Wagner (2008), Wagner et al. (2006) and cited in *Connecticut's Plan for Secondary School Reform*, “the old ‘basics’ of reading, writing, and mathematics are still essential, but not sufficient. Today’s and tomorrow’s students must learn to locate, analyze, interpret and communicate information in a variety of media and formats, and solve problems creatively and logically. Living and competing successfully in a global society and economy will require an understanding of our interconnectedness, collaboration and leadership skills, habits of personal and social responsibility, and adaptability to change.” Teachers must help students foster the academic and social competence to become both independent and interdependent learners and workers who can successfully navigate a rapidly changing world.

The effectiveness of Connecticut schools depends upon skillful teaching. Teacher quality is one of the most significant contributors to student learning and achievement; what teachers know and do directly influences what students learn (National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Rice, 2003; National Council for Teacher Quality, 2004; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Goe & Stickler, 2008). Effective teachers have deep knowledge of their content area and can present core ideas of the discipline in clear, compelling ways. They engage students in stimulating, challenging learning, support exploration of content, and lead students toward developing critical reasoning and leadership skills. They create [rigorous and relevant](#)<sup>1</sup> learning experiences characterized by higher-order thinking and the application of knowledge and skills in the world beyond the four walls of school.

The philosophy behind the CCT is that teaching requires more than simply demonstrating a certain set of technical skills. It requires command of subject matter and pedagogical skills combined with caring deeply about students and their successes. Effective teaching also requires:

- ◆ a deep commitment to student achievement and the belief that *all* students should be challenged to achieve,
- ◆ a willingness to work in collaboration with colleagues and families to meet the diverse learning needs of all students, and
- ◆ a commitment to analysis of one’s teaching and continuous professional development.

The best teachers model a passion for learning and ignite the curiosity of their students. Teachers help students develop a sense of who they want to be in the world and find their own passions and directions for future learning.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rigorous learning stretches students beyond their “comfort zone,” focusing on integrating knowledge in various disciplines and the world at large. Rigor in this context does not refer to difficulty of a course or content. Rigor is motivated by relevance which refers to helping students understand how their learning connects to their further studies and future work settings. (Wagner, 2006)

# CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

*To be a passionate teacher is to be someone in love with a field of knowledge, deeply stirred by issues and ideas that challenge our world, drawn to the dilemmas and potentials of the young people who come into class each day ...only when teachers bring their passions about learning and life into their daily work can they dispel the fog of passive compliance or active disinterest that surrounds so many students... (Fried, 1995)*

### II. The Structure of the CCT

The CCT contains teaching standards which describe two levels of effective knowledge, skills and qualities:

1. The six domains and 46 indicators that identify the foundational skills and competencies that pertain to all teachers, regardless of the subject matter, field or age group they teach; and
2. The discipline-specific professional teaching standards that further define and expand the definition of effective teaching within a particular subject matter or field.

### III. Uses of the CCT

The CCT is linked by state law and regulations to requirements across a teacher's career including preparation, induction and teacher evaluation:

| Career Phase                         | Uses of the CCT                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Preparation &amp; Pre-Service</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>◆ State Program Approval and NCATE Accreditation to ensure that preparation programs are aligned with state teaching standards</li><li>◆ Guidance and information for testing of candidates seeking certification (Praxis I, Praxis II, etc.)</li><li>◆ Standards for evaluation of field and student teaching experiences</li></ul> |
| <b>Beginning Teaching</b>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>◆ Standards for state and district induction of beginning teachers</li><li>◆ Foundation for teacher evaluation and professional development</li></ul>                                                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>Experienced Teaching</b>          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>◆ Foundation for teacher evaluation and professional development</li></ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |



# CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

### References for Introduction

- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. S. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). In R. Baron & J.D. Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Connecticut State Department of Education (2009). *The Connecticut Plan for Secondary School Reform: Academic and Personal Success for Every Middle and High School Student*. Hartford, CT: Connecticut State Department of Education.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1). Retrieved June 28, 2009 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1>
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fried, R. (1995). *The passionate teacher: A practical guide*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Goe, L., & Stickler, L. (2008). *Teacher quality and student achievement: Making the most of recent research*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- King, J. (2003). *Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- National Council on Teacher Quality. (2004). *Increasing the odds: How good policies can yield better teachers*. Washington, DC: National Council on Teacher Quality.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York, NY: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- Rice, J. K. (2003). *Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Wagner, T. (2008). *The Global Achievement Gap*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Wagner, T., Kegan, R., Lahey, L., Lemons, R., Garnier, J., Helsing, D, Howell, A., & Thurber Rasmussen, H. (2006). *Change leadership: A practical guide to transforming our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

# CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

### Overview

The Common Core of Teaching articulates the art and science of teaching as essential knowledge, skills and qualities. These foundational skills and competencies are grouped by domains but, in practice, are to be viewed as integrated parts of the complex and dynamic process of effective teaching. The CCT should be used to help guide and build teacher competence beginning with pre-service and continuing throughout a teacher's career.

### Domains of Teacher Performance

**Domain 1. Content and Essential Skills:**

*Teachers understand and apply essential skills, central concepts and tools of inquiry in their subject matter or field.*

**Domain 2. Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning:**

*Teachers promote student engagement, independence and interdependence in learning by facilitating a positive learning community.*

**Domain 3. Planning for Active Learning:**

*Teachers plan instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large.*

**Domain 4. Instruction for Active Learning:**

*Teachers implement instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large.*

**Domain 5. Assessment for Learning:**

*Teachers use multiple measures to analyze student performance and to inform subsequent planning and instruction.*

**Domain 6. Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership:**

*Teachers maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration with others, and leadership.*

On the following pages, the detailed indicators of each of the six core domains are outlined.

# CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

### **Domain 1. Content and Essential Skills:**

*Teachers understand and apply essential skills, central concepts and tools of inquiry in their subject matter or field by:*

- 1.1 Demonstrating proficiency in reading, writing, and mathematics skills;
- 1.2 Demonstrating discipline-specific knowledge and skills as described in the relevant national and state professional teaching standards;
- 1.3 Using developmentally appropriate verbal, non-verbal and technological communications;
- 1.4 Using technological and digital resources to promote learning, collaboration with colleagues and communication within a learning community;
- 1.5 Demonstrating understanding of how to use content area literacy skills to enable students to construct meaning through reading, writing, listening, speaking, viewing and presenting; and
- 1.6 Demonstrating understanding of how to use content area numeracy and analytical skills to enable students to problem solve, interpret and use data and numerical representations.

# CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

### **Domain 2. Classroom Environment, Student Engagement and Commitment to Learning**

*Teachers promote student engagement, independence and interdependence in learning by facilitating a positive learning community by:*

- 2.1 Creating a class climate that is responsive to and respectful of the [learning needs of students](#)<sup>2</sup> with diverse backgrounds, interests and performance levels;
- 2.2 Promoting engagement in and shared responsibility for the learning process and providing opportunities for students to initiate their own questions and inquiries;
- 2.3 Providing explicit instruction about social skills to develop students' [social competence](#)<sup>3</sup> and responsible and ethical behavior by using a continuum of [proactive strategies](#)<sup>4</sup> that may be individualized to student needs;
- 2.4 Fostering appropriate standards of behavior that support a productive learning environment for all students; and
- 2.5 Maximizing the amount of time spent on learning by effectively managing [routines and transitions](#)<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Addressing **student learning needs** includes understanding typical and atypical growth and development of PK-12 students including characteristics and functioning of students with disabilities, gifted students, and English language learners. Teachers understand the impact of culture, language, poverty and environment on the learning needs of students.

<sup>3</sup> **Social competence** "is observed when a person demonstrates the competencies that constitute self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skills at appropriate times and ways in sufficient frequency to be effective in the situation." (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Rhee, 2000).

<sup>4</sup> **Proactive strategies** include self-regulation strategies, problem-solving strategies, conflict resolution processes, interpersonal communication and responsible decision making.

<sup>5</sup> **Routines** are non-instructional organizational activities such as attendance, or distribution of materials in preparation for instruction. **Transitions** are non-instructional activities such as moving from one classroom activity, grouping, task or context to another.

# CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

### **Domain 3. Planning for Active Learning:**

*Teachers plan instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:*

- 3.1 Determining students' prior knowledge to ensure that content instruction is at an appropriate level of challenge and differentiated to meet their [learning needs](#)<sup>2</sup>;
- 3.2 Developing and organizing coherent and relevant units, lessons and learning tasks that build on students' prior knowledge, skills and interests and engage students in the work of the discipline;
- 3.3 Promoting the development and application of skills with conceptual understanding, and anticipating students' content misconceptions;
- 3.4 Selecting appropriate assessment strategies to monitor ongoing student progress;
- 3.5 Selecting or designing instructional strategies, [resources](#)<sup>6</sup> and flexible groupings that provide opportunity for students to think critically and creatively, and solve problems;
- 3.6 Integrating learning activities that make real-world, career or global connections, and promote interdisciplinary connections whenever possible;
- 3.7 Designing or selecting academic and/or behavioral interventions through differentiated, supplemental, specialized instruction for students who do not respond to primary instruction alone;
- 3.8 Designing strategic questions and opportunities that appropriately challenge students and actively engage them in exploring the content through strategies such as [discourse](#)<sup>7</sup> and/or [inquiry-based learning](#)<sup>8</sup>; and
- 3.9 Including strategies for teaching and supporting content area literacy skills and, when appropriate, numeracy skills.

---

<sup>6</sup> **Instructional resources** may include materials, technology, and other support personnel such as paraprofessionals, parent volunteers, special service staff, or other educators.

<sup>7</sup> **Discourse** is defined as the purposeful interaction between and among teachers and students, in which ideas and multiple perspectives are represented, communicated and challenged, with the goal of creating greater meaning or understanding. Discourse can be oral dialogue (conversation), written dialogue (reaction, thoughts, feedback), visual dialogue (charts, graphs, paintings or images that represent student and teacher thinking/reasoning), or dialogue through technological or digital resources.

<sup>8</sup> **Inquiry-based learning** occurs when students generate knowledge and meaning from their experiences and work collectively or individually to study a problem or answer a question. Work is often structured around projects that require students to engage in the solution of a particular community-based, school-based or regional or global problem which has relevance to their world. The teacher's role in inquiry-based learning is one of facilitator or resource, rather than dispenser of knowledge.

# CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

### **Domain 4. Instruction for Active Learning:**

*Teachers implement instruction in order to engage students in rigorous and relevant learning and to promote their curiosity about the world at large by:*

- 4.1 Using a variety of evidence-based strategies to enable students to apply and construct new learning;
- 4.2 Using technological and digital resources strategically to promote learning;
- 4.3 Leading students to construct meaning through the use of active learning strategies such as purposeful [discourse](#)<sup>7</sup> and/or [inquiry-based learning](#)<sup>8</sup>;
- 4.4 Varying the student and [teacher roles](#)<sup>9</sup> in ways that develop independence and interdependence with the gradual release of responsibility to students;
- 4.5 Using differentiated instruction and supplemental interventions to support students with learning difficulties, disabilities and/or particular gifts and talents;
- 4.6 Monitoring student learning and adjusting teaching during instruction in response to student performance and engagement in learning tasks; and
- 4.7 Providing meaningful, appropriate and specific feedback to students during instruction to improve their performance.

---

<sup>9</sup> Teachers vary their roles by knowing when to provide information, clarify an issue, model, lead or let students grapple with issues or questions.

# CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

### Domain 5. Assessment for Learning

*Teachers use multiple measures to analyze student performance and to inform subsequent planning and instruction by:*

- 5.1 Understanding the different [purposes](#)<sup>10</sup> and [types of assessment](#)<sup>11</sup> that capture the complexity of student learning across the [hierarchy of cognitive skills](#)<sup>12</sup>;
- 5.2 Using and/or designing a variety of [formative](#)<sup>13</sup> and [summative](#)<sup>14</sup> assessments and criteria that directly align with the learning objectives and value the diversity of ways in which students learn;
- 5.3 Using a comprehensive set of data that provides depth and breadth of understanding of student achievement at a particular point in time and over time;
- 5.4 Collaborating with colleagues to review and interpret assessment data to monitor and adjust instruction to ensure students' progress;
- 5.5 Providing students with assessment criteria and individualized, descriptive feedback to help them improve their performance and assume responsibility for their learning;
- 5.6 Supporting students' progress by communicating academic and behavioral performance expectations and results with students, their families and other educators;
- 5.7 Understanding the role that lack of opportunity to learn, lack of effective instruction, and assessment bias can play in the overrepresentation in special education of students with cultural, ethnic, gender and linguistic differences; and
- 5.8 Using academic, behavioral and health data to select and/or design interventions, and assist in the development of individualized education programs for students with disabilities.

---

<sup>10</sup> **Assessment purposes** include but are not limited to screening, instructional planning, monitoring student progress, diagnostics, and program/curriculum evaluation.

<sup>11</sup> **Assessment types** may be created by the teacher or externally produced and include, but are not limited to, observation, functional behavior assessment, performance-based assessment of application of learning, or criterion referenced.

<sup>12</sup> **The hierarchy** of cognitive skills (Bloom's 1956 taxonomy of cognitive skills as revised by Anderson and Krathwohl, 2001) includes the following lower order to higher order thinking skills:

- **Remembering:** Retrieving, recognizing, and recalling relevant knowledge from long-term memory.
- **Understanding:** Constructing meaning from oral, written, and graphic messages through interpreting, exemplifying, classifying, summarizing, inferring, comparing, and explaining.
- **Applying:** Carrying out or using a procedure through executing or implementing.
- **Analyzing:** Breaking material into constituent parts, determining how the parts relate to one another and to an overall structure or purpose through differentiating, organizing, and attributing.
- **Evaluating:** Making judgments based on criteria and standards through checking and critiquing.
- **Creating:** Putting elements together to form a coherent or functional whole; reorganizing elements into a new pattern or structure through generating, planning, or producing.

<sup>13</sup> **Formative assessments** are designed and scored by an individual teacher or grade level or department team to assess student understanding of particular standards or objectives in order to inform instruction and guide teachers to adjust or differentiate instruction to meet the learner's needs. (Ainsworth, 2006)

<sup>14</sup> **Summative assessments** identify the learner's achievement or progress made at a certain point in time against predetermined criteria.

# CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

### **Domain 6. Professional Responsibilities and Teacher Leadership:**

*Teachers maximize support for student learning by developing and demonstrating professionalism, collaboration with others, and leadership by:*

- 6.1 Continually engaging in reflection, self-evaluation and professional development to enhance their understandings of content, pedagogical skills, resources and the impact of their actions on student learning;
- 6.2 Seeking professional development opportunities to enhance skills related to teaching and meeting the needs of [all students](#)<sup>15</sup>;
- 6.3 Collaborating with colleagues, administrators, students and their families to develop and sustain a positive school climate;
- 6.4 Collaborating with colleagues and administrators to examine student learning data, instructional strategies, curricula, and [organizational structures](#)<sup>16</sup> to support continuous school and district improvement;
- 6.5 Guiding and coaching paraprofessionals and collaborating with colleagues, administrators, and special services staff to monitor the impact of instructional or behavioral support and interventions;
- 6.6 Proactively communicating in culturally respectful and sensitive ways with families in order to ensure their ongoing awareness of student progress and encourage opportunities to support their child's learning;
- 6.7 Understanding the legal rights of students with disabilities and their families within the intervention, referral, and individualized education plan process;
- 6.8 Understanding how one's race, gender and culture affect professional interactions with students, families and colleagues;
- 6.9 Using communication technology in a professional and ethical manner;
- 6.10 Collaborating with colleagues, administrators, and families in the development of individualized student success plans to address goal setting, personal and academic development, post secondary and career exploration, and/or capstone projects; and
- 6.11 Conducting themselves as professionals in accordance with the Connecticut's [Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators](#).

---

<sup>15</sup> “All students” includes, but is not limited to, students with disabilities, English language learners, students with diverse cultural or linguistic backgrounds and students with gifts and talents.

<sup>16</sup> **Organizational structures** include, but are not limited to, grade level teams, departments, committees, learning communities, common collaboration or planning time, multidisciplinary teams, etc.



# CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

### Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators

(a) Preamble

The Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators is a set of principles which the education profession expects its members to honor and follow. These principles set forth, on behalf of the education profession and the public it serves, standards to guide conduct and the judicious appraisal of conduct in situations that have professional and ethical implications. The Code adheres to the fundamental belief that the student is the foremost reason for the existence of the profession.

The education profession is vested by the public with a trust and responsibility requiring the highest ideals of professionalism. Therefore, the educator accepts both the public trust and the responsibilities to practice the profession according to the highest possible degree of ethical conduct and standards. Such responsibilities include the commitment to the students, the profession, the community and the family.

Consistent with applicable law, the Code of Professional Responsibility for Educators shall serve as a basis for decisions on issues pertaining to certification and employment. The code shall apply to all educators holding, applying or completing preparation for a certificate, authorization or permit or other credential from the State Board of Education. For the purposes of this section, "educator" includes superintendents, administrators, teachers, special services professionals, coaches, substitute teachers and paraprofessionals.

### PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

(b) Responsibility to the student

- (1) The professional educator, in full recognition of his or her obligation to the student, shall:
  - (A) Recognize, respect and uphold the dignity and worth of students as individual human beings, and, therefore, deal justly and considerately with students;
  - (B) Engage students in the pursuit of truth, knowledge and wisdom and provide access to all points of view without deliberate distortion of content area matter;
  - (C) Nurture in students lifelong respect and compassion for themselves and other human beings regardless of race, ethnic origin, gender, social class, disability, religion, or sexual orientation;
  - (D) Foster in students the full understanding, application and preservation of democratic principles and processes;
  - (E) Guide students to acquire the requisite skills and understanding for participatory citizenship and to realize their obligation to be worthy and contributing members of society;
  - (F) Assist students in the formulation of worthy, positive goals;
  - (G) Promote the right and freedom of students to learn, explore ideas, develop critical thinking, problem-solving, and necessary learning skills to acquire the knowledge needed to achieve their full potential;
  - (H) Remain steadfast in guaranteeing equal opportunity for quality education for all students;
  - (I) Maintain the confidentiality of information concerning students obtained in the proper course of the educational process, and dispense such information only when prescribed or directed by federal or state law or professional practice;
  - (J) Create an emotionally and physically safe and healthy learning environment for all students; and

# CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## 2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

(K) Apply discipline promptly, impartially, appropriately and with compassion.

(c) Responsibility to the profession

(1) The professional educator, in full recognition of his or her obligation to the profession, shall:

- (A) Conduct himself or herself as a professional realizing that his or her actions reflect directly upon the status and substance of the profession;
- (B) Uphold the professional educator's right to serve effectively;
- (C) Uphold the principle of academic freedom;
- (D) Strive to exercise the highest level of professional judgment;
- (E) Engage in professional learning to promote and implement research-based best educational practices;
- (F) Assume responsibility for his or her professional development;
- (G) Encourage the participation of educators in the process of educational decision-making;
- (H) Promote the employment of only qualified and fully certificated, authorized or permitted educators;
- (I) Encourage promising, qualified and competent individuals to enter the profession;
- (J) Maintain the confidentiality of information concerning colleagues and dispense such information only when prescribed or directed by federal or state law or professional practice;
- (K) Honor professional contracts until fulfillment, release, or dissolution mutually agreed upon by all parties to contract;
- (L) Create a culture that encourages purposeful collaboration and dialogue among all stakeholders;
- (M) Promote and maintain ongoing communication among all stakeholders; and
- (N) Provide effective leadership to ensure continuous focus on student achievement.

(d) Responsibility to the community

(1) The professional educator, in full recognition of the public trust vested in the profession, shall:

- (A) Be cognizant of the influence of educators upon the community-at-large, obey local, state and national laws;
- (B) Encourage the community to exercise its responsibility to be involved in the formulation of educational policy;
- (C) Promote the principles and ideals of democratic citizenship; and
- (D) Endeavor to secure equal educational opportunities for all students.

(e) Responsibility to the student's family

(1) The professional educator in recognition of the public trust vested in the profession, shall:

- (A) Respect the dignity of each family, its culture, customs, and beliefs;
- (B) Promote, respond, and maintain appropriate communications with the family, staff and administration;
- (C) Consider the family's concerns and perspectives on issues involving its children; and
- (D) Encourage participation of the family in the educational process.

**CONNECTICUT STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
2010 Common Core of Teaching: Foundational Skills

**UNPROFESSIONAL CONDUCT\***

- (f) The professional educator, in full recognition of his or her obligation to the student, shall not:
  - (A) Abuse his or her position as a professional with students for private advantage;
  - (B) Discriminate against students.
  - (C) Sexually or physically harass or abuse students;
  - (D) Emotionally abuse students; or
  - (E) Engage in any misconduct which would put students at risk; and
  
- (g) The professional educator, in full recognition of his or her obligation to the profession, shall not:
  - (A) Obtain a certificate, authorization, permit or other credential issued by the state board of education or obtain employment by misrepresentation, forgery or fraud;
  - (B) Accept any gratuity, gift or favor that would impair or influence professional decisions or actions;
  - (C) Misrepresent his, her or another's professional qualifications or competencies;
  - (D) Sexually, physically or emotionally harass or abuse district employees;
  - (E) Misuse district funds and/or district property; or
  - (F) Engage in any misconduct which would impair his or her ability to serve effectively in the profession; and
  
- (h) The professional educator, in full recognition of the public trust vested in the profession, shall not:
  - (A) Exploit the educational institution for personal gain;
  - (B) Be convicted in a court of law of a crime involving moral turpitude or of any crime of such nature that violates such public trust; or
  - (C) Knowingly misrepresent facts or make false statements.

\*Unprofessional conduct is not limited to the descriptors listed above. When in doubt regarding whether a specific course of action constitutes professional or unprofessional conduct please seek advice from your school district or preparation institution.

- (i) Code revision

This Code shall be reviewed for potential revision concurrently with the revision of the Regulations Concerning State Educator Certificates, Permits and Authorizations, by the Connecticut Advisory Council for Teacher Professional Standards. As a part of such reviews, a process shall be established to receive input and comment from all interested parties.