

Revisions to the CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching

<i>CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2013</i>	<i>CCT Rubric for Effective Teaching 2014</i>
5 Domains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Environment Planning Instruction Assessment Professional Responsibility 	4 Domains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classroom Environment Planning Instruction Professional Responsibility <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle; margin-left: 20px;"> } <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;"> <i>Assessment embedded within other 4 domains</i> </div> </div>
17 Indicators: <i>no clarification about where to collect evidence with respect to in-class and non-classroom observations/review of practice</i>	12 Indicators: <i>provides clarification on which indicators are generally observable in-class as compared with non-classroom observations/reviews of practice</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 indicators: generally in-class 6 indicators: generally non-classroom/reviews of practice
Areas of Confusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement in classroom environment vs. engagement in instruction 	Clarifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement in classroom environment is about creating an environment that is conducive to learning. Engagement in instruction is about giving sustained cognitive attention to the learning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literacy through the content areas Assessment overlap with other domains 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literacy strategies that promote learning in the content areas Assessment appropriately embedded in the other 4 domains
Language and Terminology: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redundant, subjective and confusing language Confusion over many terms 	Improved Language and Footnotes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced redundancies and simplified descriptions to capture the essence of a teacher's practice Key terminology is footnoted at the bottom of relevant pages to ensure a shared understanding
Common Core State Standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Embedded references 	Common Core State Standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key instructional shifts required by the CCSS are more deliberately embedded throughout the rubric
Feedback from the Focus Groups and Independent Reviews	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language is clear and shows a progression between developing, proficient, & exemplary - clarification of "all students" and "students learning needs" is helpful The continuum is appropriate in my opinion. The attributes are clearly defined in relation to the learning environment. If we want to lift the level of teaching and learning, we need to provide high quality observable 'look fors' like use of explicit clarification of outcomes (student exemplars, rubric design, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I like the emphasis on literacy through the content areas and emphasis on academic vocabulary. The <i>CCT Rubric</i> can apply to all teachers; the issue and clarity is how districts use the rubric. The footnotes are clarifying in understanding the language of the document. Based on my work with districts, I believe the notes describing Depth of Knowledge, Literacy Strategies through the content areas and Inquiry-based learning will be most helpful.
Next Steps	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of evidence guides by grade(s) and content areas Validation study of the implementation (through this year and 2014-15) Revision of SESS Rubric and CT Leader Evaluation Rubric (using a similar process) (through 2014-15) 	

March 20, 2014

March 20, 2014