Section 1249 Teacher and School Administrator Evaluation Tools
Public Website Report
Onsted Community Schools

The following information is intended to comply with the requirements of Sections 1249 and 1249b of the Revised School Code, which requires that this information be available on the District's public website. **Nothing contained in this web report is intended to eliminate any requirement to comply or otherwise prevent the Onsted Community Schools from complying with the requirements of Michigan's Revised School Code, Onsted Community Schools Board Policy, and/or other applicable laws, policies, or guidelines related to the performance evaluation of teachers and school administrators.**

A Description of the Evaluation Tool(s) Adopted and Implemented by the District

Teacher Evaluation Tool(s)	**Is the Evaluation Tool on MDE's List?**	**If on the list, has the Evaluation Tool been modified?**	**Is the Evaluation Tool a locally developed tool?**
1. Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching	Yes	No	No
District-level (excluding the Superintendent) and Building-level School Administrator Evaluation Tool(s)	**Is the Evaluation Tool on MDE's List?**	**If on the list, has the Evaluation Tool been modified?**	**Is the Evaluation Tool a locally developed tool?**
1. MASA School ADvance Administrator Evaluation Instrument	Yes	No	No
Superintendent Tool(s)	**Is the Evaluation Tool on MDE's List?**	**If on the list, has the Evaluation Tool been modified?**	**Is the Evaluation Tool a locally developed tool?**
1. Michigan Association of School Boards Superintendent Evaluation	No	NA	No

Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching

(a) *The research base for Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching evaluation framework, instrument, and process is:*

The Framework for Teaching evaluation tool was developed by Charlotte Danielson. During her career, Ms. Danielson has served as a teacher, school administrator, and educational consultants in school districts throughout the United States. She is a recognized expert in the areas

of teacher quality and evaluation, performance assessment, and evaluation. She has also authored several books and articles related to performance evaluation of educators.

> "The framework for teaching is based on the Praxis III criteria developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) after extensive surveys of the research literature, consultation with expert practitioners and researchers, wide-ranging job analyses, summaries of the demands of state licensing programs, and fieldwork. The knowledge base for the assessment criteria used in Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments was derived over an extended period (1987 to 1993) from three distinct sources: the "wisdom of practice" (Shulman, 1987) of experienced teachers, the theory and data developed by educational researchers, and the requirements developed by state teacher-licensing authorities." *Enhancing Professional Practice a Framework for Teaching*. 2nd edition, p. 184, 2007.

The Framework for Teaching evaluation tool is comprised of four domains: (1) planning and preparation, (2) the classroom environment, (3) instruction, and (4) professional responsibilities. Each domain includes separate components, which are used to assess the individual's performance in the domain. Because the domains focus on separate and distinct areas of individual's job responsibilities, the research relied upon to validate each domain varies.

A significant amount of research contributed to the development of Charlotte Danielson's A Framework for Teaching evaluation tool. The following excerpts reflect various research that contributed to the development of the A Framework for Teaching evaluation tool. This information was taken from *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching, 2nd Edition,* by Charlotte Danielson, Alexandria, VA: ASCD. © 2007 by ASCD. It is being reprinted with permission.

DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION

> "Good planning sets the stage for good teaching, which in turn fosters optimal learning. Teachers who know how to plan know precisely what they want to accomplish – or more exactly, what they want their students to accomplish. Poor planning results in no one, including the teacher, having a clear understanding of what is to be accomplished. Effective instruction starts with an organized instructional plan." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Skowron, J. *Powerful lesson planning models: The art of 1,000 decisions.* Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Training and Publishing (2001).

> "We expect teachers to understand what they teach and, when possible, to understand it in several ways. They should understand how a given idea related to other ideas within the same subject area and to ideas in other subjects as well." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd

Edition, 2007. referencing Shulman, L.S. Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22 (1987).

"The key to distinguishing the knowledge base of teaching lies at the intersection of content and pedagogy, in the capacity of a teacher to transform the content knowledge he or she possesses into forms that are pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive to the variations in ability and background presented by the students." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Shulman, L.S. Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22 (1987).

"The importance of becoming familiar with and building on students' knowledge and skills (Component 1b) is also the focus of much research and writing. The work of Sykes and Bird (1992) strongly demonstrates that prior conceptions exert a powerful hold and are difficult to alter. Therefore, teachers are best positioned to help students engage in meaningful learning or dispel misconceptions when they understand and recognize the value of their students' knowledge and strive to add to it. Marzano addresses major factors that influence the development of academic background knowledge. He believe that the number of experiences that students encounter in school will directly add to their knowledge of content." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Sykes, G. & Byrd, T. Teacher education and the case idea. *Review of Research in Education*, 18, 457-521 (1992).

"[w]hen teachers recognize and honor the human impulse to construct new understandings, they create unlimited possibilities for students. Also consistent with these findings, an American Psychological Association publication defines learning as 'an individual process of constructing meaning from information and experience, filtered through each individual's unique perceptions, thoughts, and feelings." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M.G., *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (1993).

"School success depends upon how effectively we select, define, and measure progress and how well we adjust toward goals." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Jones, J. *Praxis III teacher assessment criteria research base*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services (1992).

"If you think your students can't achieve very much, are perhaps not too bright, you may be included to teach simple stuff, do a lot of drills, read from your lecture notes, give simple assignments calling for simplistic

factual answers." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Rhem, J. Pygmalion in the classroom. *The National Teaching and Learning Forum*, 8(2) (1999).

"Connect what happens in the classroom to the students, either directly or by helping them discover links to the world beyond the classroom, since people learn best when what they are learning has relevance to themselves or their society." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Jackson, A.W. & Davis, G.A., *Turning Points 2000: Educating adolescents in the 21st century*. New York: Teachers College Press (2000).

"To decide what assessments will reveal evidence of familiarity, mastery, and enduring understanding, teachers must consider a range of assessment methods that allow for ongoing and cumulative feedback, otherwise known as formative and summative assessment." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Jackson, A.W. & Davis, G.A., *Turning Points 2000: Educating adolescents in the 21st century*. New York: Teachers College Press (2000).

"Teachers are designers. An essential act of our profession is the design of curriculum and learning experiences to meet specified purposes. We are also designers of assessments to diagnose student needs to guide our teaching and to enable us, our students, and others (parents and administrators) to determine whether our goals have been achieved; that is, did the student learn and understand the desired knowledge." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Wiggins, G. *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve performance*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass (1998).

DOMAIN 2: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

"Distinguished teachers demonstrate general caring and respect for individual students. Whitaker notes that one of the hallmarks of effective teaches is that they create a positive atmosphere in their classrooms and schools … [e]ffective teachers treat everyone with respect every day." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Whitaker, T. *What great teachers do differently: Fourteen things that matter most.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on education (2004).

"[T]eachers must appreciate each child as an individual and recognize that all children have intellect, emotions, and changing physical needs." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework*

for Teaching, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Tomlinson, C.A. *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1999).

"[T]eachers provide students with rich learning environments." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Jackson, A.W. & Davis, G.A., *Turning Points 2000: Educating adolescents in the 21st century*. New York: Teachers College Press (2000).

"[T]eachers should provide predictability through school and classroom rituals, which serve as a way to reduce environmental stress for students." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Evertson, C.M. & Harris, A.H., What we know about managing classrooms. *Educational Leadership, 49(7)*, 74-78 (1992).

"Great teachers are very clear about their approach to student behavior. They establish clear expectations at the start of the year and follow them consistently as the year progresses." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Whitaker, T. *What great teachers do differently: Fourteen things that matter most.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on education (2004).

"[W]arm, well-run classrooms begin with the room's physical layout – the arrangement of desks and working space, the attractiveness and appeal of bulleting boards, the storage of materials and supplies. [E]asily accessible materials and supplies can eliminate delays, disruptions, and confusion as students prepare for activities." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Shalaway, L. *Learning to Teach … not just for beginners: The essential guide for all teachers.* New York: Scholastic (2005).

DOMAIN 3: INSTRUCTION

"Effective teachers encourage student inquiry by asking thoughtful, open-ended questions and encouraging students to ask questions of each other. They assert that complex, thoughtful questions of each other. They assert that complex, thoughtful questions challenge students to look beyond the apparent, to delve into issues deeply and broadly, and to form their own understandings of events and phenomena." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M.G., *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (1993).

"In teaching students to think, the teacher deliberately structures and uses teaching methods and learning tasks that actively involve students in ample opportunities to develop concepts and skills in generating, structuring, transferring, and restructuring knowledge." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. Referencing Ellet, C. *A new generation of classroom-based assessments of teaching and learning: Concepts, issues and controversies from pilots of the Louisiana STAR*, Baton Rouge College of Education, Louisiana State University, (1990).

"The purpose of engagement is to involve students in developing important concepts, skills, and processes. Engagement provides the condition in which concepts are made meaningful." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Skowron, J. *Powerful lesson planning models: The art of 1,000 decisions.* Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Training and Publishing (2001).

"Monitoring students as they engage in a learning task is a crucial part of teaching. It is important for students to receive feedback in their progress throughout the learning activity. At time encouragement or positive affirmation is all that is needed. At other time clarification or instructional guidance is necessary to prevent misunderstandings. When confused, some students willingly ask for help. Other students do not. And still others do not even know they are confused. Monitoring all students is important to obtain diagnostic feedback and determine when intervention through reteaching or additional practice is necessary. Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Skowron, J. *Powerful lesson planning models: The art of 1,000 decisions.* Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Training and Publishing (2001).

"Reflecting on the patterns and making instructional changes based on authentic evidence (assignments, performance, and observations of student work) is a natural part of this process for teachers who are experienced teacher researchers." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Moore, R.A., *Classroom research for teachers: A practice guide.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers (2004).

DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

"[B]ecoming an exceptional teacher is a learning process that some believe never ends. The teacher is in a continual state of learning, building, and refining teaching practices." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Skowron, J. *Powerful lesson planning models: The art of 1,000 decisions.* Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Training and Publishing (2001).

"[T]he reflective process is at the very heart of accountability. [T]hrough the process of reflection, educators are able to distinguish between the popularity of teaching techniques and their effectiveness." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. Referencing Reeves, D.B. *Accountability for learning: How teachers and school leaders can take charge*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (2004).

"[Q]ualities of effective teachers include collegiality, collaboration, a strong belief in efficacy, and contributions to the school and community." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. Referencing Tucker, P.D., & Stronge, J.H. *Linking teacher evaluation and student learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (2005).

"The most promising strategy for sustained, substantive school improvement is developing the ability of school personnel to function as professional leaning communities." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing DuFour, R., & and Eaker, R. *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement.* Bloomington, IN: National Education Service (1998).

"[A] commitment to not only one's practice, but to the practice itself [is] one of the four dimensions of professional ideal toward which all should strive." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing MacIntyre, Flores, and Noddings as cited in Sergiovanni, T.J., *Building community in schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass (1994).

"Practitioners who engaged in action research inevitably find it to be an empowering experience. Action research has this positive effect for many reasons. Obviously, the most important is that action research is always relevant to the participants. Relevance is guaranteed because the focus of each research project is determined by the researchers, who are also the primary consumers of the findings. Perhaps even more important is the fact that action research helps educators be more effective at what they care most about – their teaching and the development of their students. Seeing students grow is probably the greatest joy educators can experience. When teachers have convincing evidence that their work has made a real difference in their students' lives, the countless hours and endless efforts of teaching seem worth it." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Sagor, R., *Guilding school improvement with action research.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (2000).

"Teachers who are most effective implement efficient systems to maintain accurate records, while empowering students to participate in monitoring and maintaining such records." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007.

"[S]tudents should have adults to act on their behalf to marshal every school and community resource needed for students to succeed, and help to fashion a promising vision for the future." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. Referencing *Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century.*

"[S]tudent learning is enhanced when teachers work at parent involvement." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Jones, J. *Praxis III teacher assessment criteria research base*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services (1992).

"[P]arent involvement is intimately associated with academic achievement and that there are a variety of ways for teachers to establish and enhance such involvement." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. Referencing Powell, J.H., Casanova, U., & and Berliner, D.C. *Parental involvement: Readings in educational research, a program for professional development.* Washington, DC: National Education Association (2004).

"Successful partnerships are those that involve the sustained mutual collaboration, support, and participation of school staffs and families at home and at school in activities and efforts that can directly and positively affect the success of children's learning and progress in school." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing the US Department of Education's *Family Involvement in Children's Education: Successful Local Approaches.*

"[S]chools that involve parents and community in their day-to-day operations have lower absenteeism, truancy, and dropout rates." Danielson, Charlotte, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition, 2007. referencing Bucknam as cited in Marzano, R.J., *What works in schools: Translating research into action.* Alexandria, VE: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (2003).

For additional information about the research base used in the development of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching, visit https://www.danielsongroup.org/research/ or Appendix: The Research Foundation found on pages 183-192 of Charlotte Danielson's *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition.

(b) *The identity and qualifications of the Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching author is:*

Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching was authored by Charlotte Danielson. Ms. Danielson is an educational consultant who has taught at various levels of the K-12 and postsecondary education system. Additionally, she has served as a school administrator, curriculum director, and staff developer in several different regions of the United States. She has provided educational consulting services to a significant number of school districts, higher education institutions, and state education departments in the areas of teacher quality and evaluation, curriculum planning, performance assessment, and professional development. She has provided training on instruction and assessment and designed instruments for use in evaluating teachers. For several years, Ms. Danielson served on staff at Educational Testing Services (ETS), where she was involved in the design of the assessment training program for Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments. She has authored a number of books for teachers and administrators including, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, *Teaching for Understanding*; *Teacher Evaluation to Enhance Professional Practice*, *Enhancing Student Achievement: A Framework for School Improvement*, and *Teacher Leadership that Strengthens Professional Practice*.[1]

(c) *Evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching is:*

In addition to the substantial research that contributed to the creation of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching, studies have been conducted post implementation, which help demonstrate the reliability, validity, and efficacy of the tool. In Chicago, the University of Chicago conducted a two-year study on Chicago Public School's Excellence in Teaching Pilot, which incorporated use of Danielson's Framework for Teaching evaluation tool. Overall, the study determined that the tool "worked as it was designed and intended, introducing an evidence-based observation approach to evaluating teachers and creating a shared definition of effective teaching." Sartain, Lauren, Stoelinga, Sara, Brown, Eric, *Rethinking Teacher Evaluation in Chicago*, Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago, p. 1, November 2011. The study also found that: (1) "The classroom observation ratings were valid measures of teaching practice; that is, students showed the greatest growth in test scores in the classrooms where teachers received the highest ratings on the Danielson Framework, and students showed the least growth in test score in classrooms where teachers received the lowest ratings." (2) "The classroom observation ratings were reliable measures of teaching practice, that is, principals and trained observers who watched the same lesson consistently gave the teacher the same ratings." (3) "Principals and teachers said that conferences were more reflective and objective than in the past and were focused on instructional practice and improvement." *Id* at 2.

In Hillsborough County, Florida, the school district's use of Danielson's Framework for Teachers was studied as part of the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project underwritten by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. That study compared district administrator's assessment and scores of teacher lesson delivery against those of school administrators that were not connected to the district who watched the lesson on video and performed their own assessments and ratings. They found that while school administrators "gave higher score to their own teachers, their rankings of their teachers were similar to those produced by peer observers and administrators from other schools." *Culminating*

[1] Biographical information about Charlotte Danielson was provided by Charlotte Danielson and taken from her *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching*, 2nd Edition book.

Findings from the MET Project's Three-Year Study, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, p. 18, January 2013. This comparison study helps to demonstrate the reliability of the Framework for Teaching evaluation tool as similar results were produced despite the use of different evaluators.

(d) *The Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching evaluation frameworks and rubrics with detailed descriptors for each performance level on key summative indicators are:*

Four separate performance ratings within the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching tool are to be decided upon by the evaluator and assigned to reflect the teacher's performance related to each separate evaluation component which are (from lowest to highest): *Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, and Distinguished*. Section 1249 of Michigan's Revised School Code requires that the District's performance evaluation system assign an effectiveness rating to each teacher of highly effective, effective, minimally effective, or ineffective. MCL 380.1249(2)(g). The Onsted Community Schools annual performance evaluation tool recognizes each of the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching ratings, for purposes of scoring and determining the overall annual performance evaluation rating given, to equal the following:

Unsatisfactory	=	Ineffective
Basic	=	Minimally Effective
Proficient	=	Effective
Distinguished	=	Highly Effective

DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION

Component 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy

Elements: Knowledge of content and the structure of the discipline • Knowledge of prerequisite relationships • Knowledge of content-related pedagogy

ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Knowledge of content and the structure of the discipline	In planning and practice, teacher makes content errors or does not correct errors made by students.	Teacher is familiar with the important concepts in the discipline but may display lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another.	Teacher displays solid knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate to one another.	Teacher displays extensive knowledge of the important concepts in the discipline and how these relate both to one another and to other disciplines.
Knowledge of prerequisite relationships	Teacher's plans and practice display little understanding of prerequisite relationships important to student learning of the content.	Teacher's plans and practice indicate some awareness of prerequisite relationships, although such knowledge may be inaccurate or incomplete.	Teacher's plans and practice reflect accurate understanding of prerequisite relation- ships among topics and concepts.	Teacher's plans and practices reflect understanding of pre-requisite relationships among topics and concepts and a link to necessary cognitive structures by students to ensure understanding.
Knowledge of content-related pedagogy	Teacher displays little or no understanding of the range of pedagogical approaches suit-able to student learning of the content.	Teacher's plans and practice reflect a limited range of pedagogical approaches or some approaches that are not suit- able to the discipline or to the students.	Teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline.	Teacher's plans and practice reflect familiarity with a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline, anticipating student misconceptions.

DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION

Component 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students

Elements: Knowledge of child and adolescent development • Knowledge of the learning process • Knowledge of students' skills, knowledge, and language proficiency • Knowledge of students' interests and cultural heritage • Knowledge of students' special needs

ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Knowledge of child and adolescent development	Teacher displays little or no knowledge of the developmental characteristics of the age group.	Teacher displays partial knowledge of the developmental characteristics of the age group.	Teacher displays accurate understanding of the typical developmental characteristics of the age group, as well as exceptions to the general patterns.	In addition to accurate knowledge of the typical developmental characteristics of the age group and exceptions to the general patterns, teacher displays knowledge of the extent to which individual students follow the general patterns.
Knowledge of the learning process	Teacher sees no value in understanding how students learn and does not seek such information.	Teacher recognizes the value of knowing how students learn, but this knowledge is limited or outdated.	Teacher's knowledge of how students learn is accurate and current. Teacher applies this knowledge to the class as a whole and to groups of students.	Teacher displays extensive and subtle understanding of how students learn and applies this knowledge to individual students.
Knowledge of students' skills, knowledge, and language proficiency	Teacher displays little or no knowledge of students' skills, knowledge, and language proficiency and does not indicate that such knowledge is valuable.	Teacher recognizes the value of understanding students' skills, knowledge, and language proficiency but displays this knowledge only for the class as a whole.	Teacher recognizes the value of understanding students' skills, knowledge, and language proficiency and displays this knowledge for groups of students.	Teacher displays understanding of individual students' skills, knowledge, and languageproficiency and has a strategy for maintaining such information.

Knowledge of students' interests and cultural heritage	Teacher displays little or no knowledge of students' interests or cultural heritage and does not indicate that such knowledge is valuable.	Teacher recognizes the value of understanding students' interests and cultural heritage but displays this knowledge only for the class as a whole.	Teacher recognizes the value of understanding students' interests and cultural heritage and displays this knowledge for groups of students.	Teacher recognizes the value of understanding students' interests and cultural heritage and displays this knowledge for individual students.
Knowledge of students' special needs	Teacher displays little or no understanding of students' special learning or medical needs or why such knowledge is important.	Teacher displays awareness of the importance of knowing students' special learning or medical needs, but such knowledge may be incomplete or inaccurate.	Teacher is aware of students' special learning and medical needs.	Teacher possesses information about each student's learning and medical needs, collecting such information from a variety of sources.

DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION Component 1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes Elements: Value, sequence, and alignment • Clarity • Balance • Suitability for diverse learners				
ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Value, sequence, and alignment	Outcomes represent low expectations for students and lack of rigor. They do not reflect important learning in the discipline or a connection to a sequence of learning.	Outcomes represent moderately high expectations and rigor. Some reflect important learning in the discipline and at least some connection to a sequence of learning.	Most outcomes represent high expectations and rigor and important learning in the discipline. They are connected to a sequence of learning.	All outcomes represent high expectations and rigor and important learning in the discipline. They are connected to a sequence of learning both in the discipline and in related disciplines.
Clarity	Outcomes are either not clear or are stated as activities, not as student learning. Outcomes do not permit viable methods of assessment.	Outcomes are only moderately clear or consist of a combination of outcomes and activities. Some outcomes do not permit viable methods of assessment.	All the instructional outcomes are clear, written in the form of student learning. Most suggest viable methods of assessment.	All the outcomes are clear, written in the form of student learning, and permit viable methods of assessment.
Balance	Outcomes reflect only one type of learning and only one discipline or strand.	Outcomes reflect several types of learning, but teacher has made no attempt at coordination or integration.	Outcomes reflect several different types of learning and opportunities for coordination.	Where appropriate, outcomes reflect several different types of learning and opportunities for both coordination and integration.
Suitability for diverse learners	Outcomes are not suitable for the class or are not based on any assessment of student needs.	Most of the outcomes are suitable for most of the students in the class based on global assessments of student learning.	Most of the outcomes are suitable for all students in the class and are based on evidence of student proficiency. However, the needs of some individual students may not be accommodated.	Outcomes are based on a comprehensive assessment of student learning and take into account the varying needs of individual students or groups.

DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION

Component 1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources

Elements: Resources for classroom use • Resources to extend content knowledge and pedagogy • Resources for students

ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Resources for classroom use	Teacher is unaware of resources for classroom use available through the school or district.	Teacher displays awareness of resources available for classroom use through the school or district but no knowledge of resources available more broadly.	Teacher displays awareness of resources available for classroom use through the school or district and some familiarity with resources external to the school and on the Internet.	Teacher's knowledge of resources for classroom use is extensive, including those available through the school or district, in the community, through professional organizations and universities, and on the Internet.
Resources to extend content knowledge and pedagogy	Teacher is unaware of resources to enhance content and pedagogical knowledge available through the school or district.	Teacher displays awareness of resources to enhance content and pedagogical knowledge available through the school or district but no knowledge of resources available more broadly.	Teacher displays awareness of resources to enhance content and pedagogical knowledge available through the school or district and some familiarity with resources external to the school and on the Internet.	Teacher's knowledge of resources to enhance content and pedagogical knowledge is extensive, including those available through the school or district, in the community, through professional organizations and universities, and on the Internet.
Resources for students	Teacher is unaware of resources for students available through the school or district.	Teacher displays awareness of resources for students available through the school or district but no knowledge of resources available more broadly.	Teacher displays awareness of resources for students available through the school or district and some familiarity with resources external to the school and on the Internet.	Teacher's knowledge of resources for students is extensive, including those available through the school or district, in the community, and on the Internet.

DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION Component 1e: Designing Coherent Instruction Elements: Learning activities • Instructional materials and resources • Instructional groups • Lesson and unit structure				
ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Learning activities	Learning activities are not suitable to students or to instructional outcomes and are not designed to engage students in active intellectual activity.	Only some of the learning activities are suitable to students or to the instructional outcomes. Some represent a moderate cognitive challenge, but with no differentiation for different students.	All of the learning activities are suitable to students or to the instructional outcomes, and most represent significant cognitive challenge, with some differentiation for different groups of students.	Learning activities are highly suitable to diverse learners and support the instructional outcomes. They are all designed to engage students in high-level cognitive activity and are differentiated, as appropriate, for individual learners.
Instructional materials and resources	Materials and resources are not suitable for students and do not support the instructional outcomes or engage students in meaningful learning.	Some of the materials and resources are suitable to students, support the instructional outcomes, and engage students in meaningful learning.	All of the materials and resources are suitable to students, support the instructional outcomes, and are designed to engage students in meaningful learning.	All of the materials and resources are suitable to students, support the instructional outcomes, and are designed to engage students in meaningful learning. There is evidence of appropriate use of technology and of student participation in selecting or adapting materials.
Instructional groups	Instructional groups do not support the instructional outcomes and offer no variety.	Instructional groups partially support the instructional outcomes, with an effort at providing some variety.	Instructional groups are varied as appropriate to the students and the different instructional outcomes.	Instructional groups are varied as appropriate to the students and the different instructional outcomes. There is evidence of student choice in selecting the different patterns of instructional groups.

Lesson and unit structure	The lesson or unit has no clearly defined structure, or the structure is chaotic. Activities do not follow an organized progression, and time allocations are unrealistic.	The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure, although the structure is not uniformly maintained throughout. Progression of activities is uneven, with most time allocations reasonable.	The lesson or unit has a clearly defined structure around which activities are organized. Progression of activities is even, with reason- able time allocations.	The lesson's or unit's structure is clear and allows for different pathways according to diverse student needs. The progression of activities is highly coherent.

DOMAIN 1: PLANNING AND PREPARATION

Component 1f: Designing Student Assessments

Elements: Congruence with instructional outcomes • Criteria and standards • Design of formative assessments • Use for planning

ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Congruence with instructional outcomes	Assessment procedures are not congruent with instructional outcomes.	Some of the instructional out-comes are assessed through the proposed approach, but many are not.	All the instructional outcomes are assessed through the approach to assessment; assessment methodologies may have been adapted for groups of students.	Proposed approach to assessment is fully aligned with the instructional outcomes in both content and process. Assessment methodologies have been adapted for individual students, as needed.
Criteria and standards	Proposed approach contains no criteria or standards.	Assessment criteria and standards have been developed, but they are not clear.	Assessment criteria and standards are clear.	Assessment criteria and standards are clear; there is evidence that the students contributed to their development.
Design of formative assessments	Teacher has no plan to incorporate formative assessment in the lesson or unit.	Approach to the use of formative assessment is rudimentary, including only some of the instructional outcomes.	Teacher has a well-developed strategy to using formative assessment and has designed particular approaches to be used.	Approach to using formative assessment is well designed and includes student as well as teacher use of the assessment information.

Use for planning	Teacher has no plans to use assessment results in designing future instruction.	Teacher plans to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for the class as a whole.	Teacher plans to use assessment results to plan for future instruction for groups of students.	Teacher plans to use assessment results to plan future instruction for individual students.

DOMAIN 2:THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

Component 2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport

Elements: Teacher interaction with students • Student interactions with other students

ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Teacher interaction with students	Teacher interaction with at least some students is negative, demeaning, sarcastic, or inappropriate to the age or culture of the students. Stu- dents exhibit disrespect for the teacher.	Teacher-student interactions are generally appropriate but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism,or disregard for students' cultures. Students exhibit only minimal respect for the	Teacher-student interactions are friendly and demonstrate general caring and respect. Such interactions are appropriate to the age and cultures of the students. Students exhibit respect for the teacher.	Teacher interactions with students reflect genuine respect and caring for individuals as well as groups of students. Students appear to trust the teacher with sensitive information.
Student interactions with other students	Student interactions are characterized by conflict, sarcasm, or put-downs.	Students do not demonstrate disrespect for one another.	Student interactions are generally polite and respectful.	Students demonstrate genuine caring for one another and monitor one another's treatment of peers, correcting class- mates respectfully when needed.

DOMAIN 2: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

Component 2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning

Elements: Importance of the content • Expectations for learning and achievement • Student pride in work

ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Importance of the content	Teacher or students convey a negative attitude toward the content, suggesting that it is not important or has been mandated by others.	Teacher communicates importance of the work but with little conviction and only mini- mal apparent buy-in by the students.	Teacher conveys genuine enthusiasm for the content, and students demonstrate consistent commitment to its value.	Students demonstrate through their active participation, curiosity, and taking initiative that they value the importance of the content.
Expectations for learning and achievement	Instructional outcomes, activities and assignments, and class- room interactions convey low expectations for at least some students.	Instructional outcomes, activities and assignments, and classroom interactions convey only modest expectations for student learning and achievement.	Instructional outcomes, activities and assignments, and class- room interactions convey high expectations for most students.	Instructional outcomes, activities and assignments, and classroom interactions convey high expectations for all students. Students appear to have internalized these expectations.
Student pride in work	Students demonstrate little or no pride in their work. They seem to be motivated by the desire to complete a task rather than to do high-quality work.	Students minimally accept the responsibility to do good work but invest little of their energy into its quality.	Students accept the teacher's insistence on work of high quality and demonstrate pride in that work.	Students demonstrate attention to detail and take obvious pride in their work, initiating improvements in it by, for example, revising drafts on their own or helping peers.

DOMAIN 2: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

Component 2c: Managing Classroom Procedures

Elements: Management of instructional groups • Management of transitions • Management of materials and supplies • Performance of noninstructional duties • Supervision of volunteers and paraprofessionals

ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Management of instructional groups	Students not working with the teacher are not productively engaged in learning.	Students in only some groups are productively engaged in learning while unsupervised by the teacher.	Small-group work is well organized, and most students are productively engaged in learning while unsupervised by the teacher.	Small-group work is well organized, and students are productively engaged at all times, with students assuming responsibility for productivity.
Management of transitions	Transitions are chaotic, with much time lost between activities or lesson segments.	Only some transitions are efficient, resulting in some loss of instructional time.	Transitions occur smoothly, with little loss of instructional time.	Transitions are seamless, with students assuming responsibility in ensuring their efficient operation.
Management of materials and supplies	Materials and supplies are handled inefficiently, resulting in significant loss of instructional time.	Routines for handling materials and supplies function moderately well, but with some loss of instructional time.	Routines for handling materials and supplies occur smoothly, with little loss of instructional time.	Routines for handling materials and supplies are seamless, with students assuming some responsibility for smooth operation.
Performance of noninstructional duties	Considerable instructional time is lost in performing noninstructional duties.	Systems for performing noninstructional duties are only fairly efficient, resulting in some loss of instructional time.	Efficient systems for performing noninstructional duties are in place, resulting in minimal loss of instructional time.	Systems for performing noninstructional duties are well established, with students assuming considerable responsibility for efficient operation.
Supervision of volunteers and paraprofessionals	Volunteers and paraprofessionals have no clearly defined duties and are idle most of the time.	Volunteers and paraprofessionals are productively engaged during portions of class time but require frequent supervision.	Volunteers and paraprofessionals are productively and independently engaged during the entire class.	Volunteers and paraprofessionals make a substantive contribution to the classroom environment.

DOMAIN 2: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT **Component 2d: Managing Student Behavior** Elements: Expectations • Monitoring of student behavior • Response to student misbehavior				
ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Expectations	No standards of conduct appear to have been established, or students are confused as to what the standards are.	Standards of conduct appear to have been established, and most students seem to understand them.	Standards of conduct are clear to all students.	Standards of conduct are clear to all students and appear to have been developed with student participation.
Monitoring of student behavior	Student behavior is not monitored, and teacher is unaware of what the students are doing.	Teacher is generally aware of student behavior but may miss the activities of some students.	Teacher is alert to student behavior at all times.	Monitoring by teacher is subtle and preventive. Students monitor their own and their peers' behavior, correcting one another respectfully.
Response to student misbehavior	Teacher does not respond to misbehavior, or the response is inconsistent, is overly repressive, or does not respect the student's dignity.	Teacher attempts to respond to student misbehavior but with uneven results, or there are no major infractions of the rules.	Teacher response to misbehavior is appropriate and successful and respects the student's dignity, or student behavior is generally appropriate.	Teacher response to misbehavior is highly effective and sensitive to students' individual needs, or student behavior is entirely appropriate.

DOMAIN 2: THE CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT **Component 2e: Organizing Physical Space** Elements: Safety and accessibility • Arrangement of furniture and use of physical resources				
ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Safety and accessibility	The classroom is unsafe, or learning is not accessible to some students.	The classroom is safe, and at least essential learning is accessible to most students.	The classroom is safe, and learning is equally accessible to all students.	The classroom is safe, and students themselves ensure that all learning is equally accessible to all students.
Arrangement of furniture and use of physical resources	The furniture arrangement hinders the learning activities, or the teacher makes poor use of physical resources.	Teacher uses physical resources adequately. The furniture may be adjusted for a lesson, but with limited effectiveness.	Teacher uses physical resources skillfully, and the furniture arrangement is a resource for learning activities.	Both teacher and students use physical resources easily and skillfully, and students adjust the furniture to advance their learning.

DOMAIN 3: INSTRUCTION Component 3a: Communicating with Students Elements: Expectations for learning • Directions and procedures • Explanations of content • Use of oral and written language				
ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Expectations for learning	Teacher's purpose in a lesson or unit is unclear to students.	Teacher attempts to explain the instructional purpose, with limited success.	Teacher's purpose for the lesson or unit is clear, including where it is situated within broader learning.	Teacher makes the purpose of the lesson or unit clear, including where it is situated within broader learning, linking that purpose to student interests.
Directions and procedures	Teacher's directions and procedures are confusing to students.	Teacher's directions and procedures are clarified after initial student confusion.	Teacher's directions and procedures are clear to students.	Teacher's directions and procedures are clear to students and anticipate possible student misunderstanding.
Explanations of content	Teacher's explanation of the content is unclear or confusing or uses inappropriate language.	Teacher's explanation of the content is uneven; some is done skillfully, but other portions are difficult to follow.	Teacher's explanation of content is appropriate and connects with students' knowledge and experience.	Teacher's explanation of content is imaginative and connects with students' knowledge and experience. Students contribute to explaining concepts to their peers.
Use of oral and written language	Teacher's spoken language is inaudible, or written language is illegible. Spoken or written language contains errors of gram- mar or syntax. Vocabulary may be inappropriate, vague, or used incorrectly, leaving students confused.	Teacher's spoken language is audible, and written language is legible. Both are used correctly and conform to standard English. Vocabulary is correct but limited or is not appropriate to the students' ages or backgrounds.	Teacher's spoken and written language is clear and correct and conforms to standard English. Vocabulary is appropriate to the students' ages and interests.	Teacher's spoken and written language is correct and conforms to standard English. It is also expressive, with well-chosen vocabulary that enriches the lesson. Teacher finds opportunities to extend students' vocabularies.

DOMAIN 3: INSTRUCTION Component 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques Elements: Quality of questions • Discussion techniques • Student participation				
ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Quality of questions	Teacher's questions are virtually all of poor quality, with low cognitive challenge and single correct responses, and they are asked in rapid succession.	Teacher's questions are a combination of low and high quality, posed in rapid succession. Only some invite a thoughtful response.	Most of the teacher's questions are of high quality. Adequate time is provided for students to respond.	Teacher's questions are of uniformly high quality, with adequate time for students to respond. Students formulate many questions.
Discussion techniques	Interaction between teacher and students is predominantly recitation style, with the teacher mediating all questions and answers.	Teacher makes some attempt to engage students in genuine discussion rather than recitation, with uneven results.	Teacher creates a genuine discussion among students, stepping aside when appropriate.	Students assume considerable responsibility for the success of the discussion, initiating topics and making unsolicited contributions.
Student participation	A few students dominate the discussion.	Teacher attempts to engage all students in the discussion, but with only limited success.	Teacher successfully engages all students in the discussion.	Students themselves ensure that all voices are heard in the discussion.

DOMAIN 3: INSTRUCTION Component 3c: Engaging Students in Learning Elements: Activities and assignments • Grouping of students • Instructional materials and resources • Structure and pacing				
ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Activities and assignments	Activities and assignments are inappropriate for students' age or background. Students are not mentally engaged in them.	Activities and assignments are appropriate to some students and engage them mentally, but others are not engaged.	Most activities and assignments are appropriate to students, and almost all students are cognitively engaged in exploring content.	All students are cognitively engaged in the activities and assignments in their exploration of content. Students initiate or adapt activities and projects to enhance their understanding.
Grouping of students	Instructional groups are inappropriate to the students or to the instructional outcomes.	Instructional groups are only partially appropriate to the students or only moderately successful in advancing the instructional out- comes of the lesson.	Instructional groups are productive and fully appropriate to the students or to the instructional purposes of the lesson.	Instructional groups are productive and fully appropriate to the students or to the instructional purposes of the lesson. Students take the initiative to influence the formation or adjustment of instructional groups.
Instructional materials and resources	Instructional materials and resources are unsuitable to the instructional purposes or do not engage students mentally.	Instructional materials and resources are only partially suit- able to the instructional purposes, or students are only partially mentally engaged with them.	Instructional materials and resources are suitable to the instructional purposes and engage students mentally.	Instructional materials and resources are suitable to the instructional purposes and engage students mentally. Stu- dents initiate the choice, adaptation, or creation of materials to enhance their learning.
Structure and pacing	The lesson has no clearly defined structure, or the pace of the lesson is too slow or rushed, or both.	The lesson has a recognizable structure, although it is not uniformly maintained throughout the lesson. Pacing of the lesson is inconsistent.	The lesson has a clearly defined structure around which the activities are organized. Pacing of the lesson is generally appropriate.	The lesson's structure is highly coherent, allowing for reflection and closure. Pacing of the lesson is appropriate for all students.

DOMAIN 3: INSTRUCTION

Component 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction

Elements: Assessment criteria • Monitoring of student learning • Feedback to students • Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress

ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Assessment criteria	Students are not aware of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated.	Students know some of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated.	Students are fully aware of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated.	Students are fully aware of the criteria and performance standards by which their work will be evaluated and have contributed to the development of the criteria.
Monitoring of student learning	Teacher does not monitor student learning in the curriculum.	Teacher monitors the progress of the class as a whole but elicits no diagnostic information.	Teacher monitors the progress of groups of students in the curriculum, making limited use of diagnostic prompts to elicit information.	Teacher actively and systematically elicits diagnostic information from individual students regarding their understanding and monitors the progress of individual students.
Feedback to students	Teacher's feedback to students is of poor quality and not provided in a timely manner.	Teacher's feedback to students is uneven, and its timeliness is inconsistent.	Teacher's feedback to students is timely and of consistently high quality.	Teacher's feedback to students is timely and of consistently high quality, and students make use of the feedback in their learning.
Student self-assessment and monitoring of progress	Students do not engage in self-assessment or monitoring of progress.	Students occasionally assess the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards.	Students frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards.	Students not only frequently assess and monitor the quality of their own work against the assessment criteria and performance standards but also make active use of that information in their learning.

DOMAIN 3: INSTRUCTION Component 3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness Elements: Lesson adjustment • Response to students • Persistence				
ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Lesson adjustment	Teacher adheres rigidly to an instructional plan, even when a change is clearly needed.	Teacher attempts to adjust a lesson when needed, with only partially successful results.	Teacher makes a minor adjustment to a lesson, and the adjustment occurs smoothly.	Teacher successfully makes a major adjustment to a lesson when needed.
Response to students	Teacher ignores or brushes aside students' questions or interests.	Teacher attempts to accommodate students' questions or interests, although the pacing of the lesson is disrupted.	Teacher successfully accommodates students' questions or interests.	Teacher seizes a major opportunity to enhance learning, building on student interests or a spontaneous event.
Persistence	When a student has difficulty learning, the teacher either gives up or blames the student or the student's home environment.	Teacher accepts responsibility for the success of all students but has only a limited repertoire of instructional strategies to draw on.	Teacher persists in seeking approaches for students who have difficulty learning, drawing on a broad repertoire of strategies.	Teacher persists in seeking effective approaches for students who need help, using an extensive repertoire of strategies and soliciting additional resources from the school.

DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES **Component 4a: Reflecting on Teaching** Elements: Accuracy • Use in future teaching				
ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Accuracy	Teacher does not know whether a lesson was effective or achieved its instructional outcomes, or teacher profoundly misjudges the success of a lesson.	Teacher has a generally accurate impression of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which instructional outcomes were met.	Teacher makes an accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes and can cite general references to support the judgment.	Teacher makes a thoughtful and accurate assessment of a lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes, citing many specific examples from the lesson and weighing the relative strengths of each.
Use in future teaching	Teacher has no suggestions for how a lesson could be improved another time the lesson is taught.	Teacher makes general suggestions about how a lesson could be improved another time the lesson is taught.	Teacher makes a few specific suggestions of what could be tried another time the lesson is taught.	Drawing on an extensive repertoire of skills, teacher offers specific alternative actions, complete with the probable success of different courses of action.

DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES Component 4b: Maintaining Accurate Records Elements: Student completion of assignments • Student progress in learning • Noninstructional records				
ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Student completion of assignments	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments is in disarray.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments is rudimentary and only partially effective.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments is fully effective.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student completion of assignments is fully effective. Students participate in maintaining the records.
Student progress in learning	Teacher has no system for maintaining information on student progress in learning, or the system is in disarray.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student progress in learning is rudimentary and only partially effective.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student progress in learning is fully effective.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on student progress in learning is fully effective. Students contribute information and participate in interpreting the records.
Noninstructional records	Teacher's records for non-instructional activities are in disarray, resulting in errors and confusion.	Teacher's records for non-instructional activities are adequate, but they require frequent monitoring to avoid errors.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on noninstructional activities is fully effective.	Teacher's system for maintaining information on noninstructional activities is highly effective, and students contribute to its maintenance.

DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES Component 4c: Communicating with Families Elements: Information about the instructional program • Information about individual students • Engagement of families in the instructional program				
ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Information about the instructional program	Teacher provides little or no information about the instructional program to families.	Teacher participates in the school's activities for family communication but offers little additional information.	Teacher provides frequent information to families, as appropriate, about the instructional program.	Teacher provides frequent information to families, as appropriate, about the instructional program. Students participate in preparing materials for their families.
Information about individual students	Teacher provides minimal information to families about individual students, or the communication is inappropriate to the cultures of the families. Teacher does not respond, or responds insensitively, to family concerns about students.	Teacher adheres to the school's required procedures for communicating with families. Responses to family concerns are minimal or may reflect occasional insensitivity to cultural norms.	Teacher communicates with families about students' progress on a regular basis, respecting cultural norms, and is available as needed to respond to family concerns.	Teacher provides information to families frequently on student progress, with students contributing to the design of the system. Response to family concerns is handled with great professional and cultural sensitivity.
Engagement of families in the instructional program	Teacher makes no attempt to engage families in the instructional program, or such efforts are inappropriate.	Teacher makes modest and partially successful attempts to engage families in the instructional program.	Teacher's efforts to engage families in the instructional program are frequent and successful.	Teacher's efforts to engage families in the instructional program are frequent and successful. Students contribute ideas for projects that could be enhanced by family participation.

DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Component 4d: Participating in a Professional Community

Elements: Relationships with colleagues • Involvement in a culture of professional inquiry • Service to the school • Participation in school and district projects

ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Relationships with colleagues	Teacher's relationships with colleagues are negative or self-serving.	Teacher maintains cordial relationships with colleagues to fulfill duties that the school or district requires.	Relationships with colleagues are characterized by mutual support and cooperation.	Relationships with colleagues are characterized by mutual support and cooperation. Teacher takes initiative in assuming leadership among the faculty.
Involvement in a culture of professional inquiry	Teacher avoids participation in a culture of inquiry, resisting opportunities to become involved.	Teacher becomes involved in the school's culture of inquiry when invited to do so.	Teacher actively participates in a culture of professional inquiry.	Teacher takes a leadership role in promoting a culture of professional inquiry.
Service to the school	Teacher avoids becoming involved in school events.	Teacher participates in school events when specifically asked.	Teacher volunteers to participate in school events, making a substantial contribution.	Teacher volunteers to participate in school events, making a substantial contribution, and assumes a leadership role in at least one aspect of school life.
Participation in school and district projects	Teacher avoids becoming involved in school and district projects.	Teacher participates in school and district projects when specifically asked.	Teacher volunteers to participate in school and district projects, making a substantial contribution.	Teacher volunteers to participate in school and district projects, making a substantial contribution, and assumes a leadership role in a major school or district project.

DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES Component 4e: Growing and Developing Professionally Elements: Enhancement of content knowledge and pedagogical skill • Receptivity to feedback from colleagues • Service to the profession				
ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Enhancement of content knowledge and pedagogical skill	Teacher engages in no professional development activities to enhance knowledge or skill.	Teacher participates in professional activities to a limited extent when they are convenient.	Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development to enhance content knowledge and pedagogical skill.	Teacher seeks out opportunities for professional development and makes a systematic effort to conduct action research.
Receptivity to feedback from colleagues	Teacher resists feedback on teaching performance from either supervisors or more experienced colleagues.	Teacher accepts, with some reluctance, feedback on teaching performance from both supervisors and professional colleagues.	Teacher welcomes feedback from colleagues when made by supervisors or when opportunities arise through professional collaboration.	Teacher seeks out feedback on teaching from both supervisors and colleagues.
Service to the profession	Teacher makes no effort to share knowledge with others or to assume professional responsibilities.	Teacher finds limited ways to contribute to the profession.	Teacher participates actively in assisting other educators.	Teacher initiates important activities to contribute to the profession.

DOMAIN 4: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Component 4f: Showing Professionalism

Elements: Integrity and ethical conduct • Service to students • Advocacy • Decision making • Compliance with school and district regulations

ELEMENT	LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE			
	UNSATISFACTORY	BASIC	PROFICIENT	DISTINGUISHED
Integrity and ethical conduct	Teacher displays dishonesty in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public.	Teacher is honest in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public.	Teacher displays high standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality in interactions with colleagues, students, and the public.	Teacher can be counted on to hold the highest standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality and takes a leader- ship role with colleagues.
Service to students	Teacher is not alert to students' needs.	Teacher's attempts to serve students are inconsistent.	Teacher is active in serving students.	Teacher is highly proactive in serving students, seeking out resources when needed.
Advocacy	Teacher contributes to school practices that result in some students being ill served by the school.	Teacher does not knowingly contribute to some students being ill served by the school.	Teacher works to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to succeed.	Teacher makes a concerted effort to challenge negative attitudes or practices to ensure that all students, particularly those traditionally underserved, are honored in the school.
Decision making	Teacher makes decisions and recommendations based on self-serving interests.	Teacher's decisions and recommendations are based on limited though genuinely professional considerations.	Teacher maintains an open mind and participates in team or departmental decision making.	Teacher takes a leadership role in team or departmental decision making and helps ensure that such decisions are based on the highest professional standards.

Compliance with school and district regulations	Teacher does not comply with school and district regulations.	Teacher complies minimally with school and district regulations, doing just enough to get by.	Teacher complies fully with school and district regulations.	Teacher complies fully with school and district regulations, taking a leadership role with colleagues.

(e) *The Onsted Community Schools will conduct classroom observation, collect evidence, conduct evaluation conferences, develop performance ratings, and develop performance improvement plans as follows:*

The Observation & Evidence Collection Process

The Onsted Community Schools will conduct classroom observations of all Onsted Community Schools teachers, which will help to inform the performance evaluation process for the teacher. At least one classroom observation will be conducted on all teachers, however, unless a teacher received a rating of highly effective or effective on his/her two most recent annual year-end evaluations, there will be at least two classroom observations of the teacher during the school year, and at least one of the observations will be unscheduled. Observations will be performed by individuals trained in the use of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching evaluation tool, and at least one of the classroom observations will be conducted by the school administrator responsible for the teacher's performance evaluation. Classroom observations will minimally include a review of the teacher's lesson plan and the state curriculum standard being used in the lesson and a review of pupil engagement in the lesson. Classroom observations may be for an entire class period, or they may be for a shorter period at the discretion of the person conducting the observation.

Using the evaluation tool adopted by the Onsted Community Schools, the observer will collect evidence during the observation that will inform the performance evaluation and contribute to the teacher's overall performance rating. Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching contains two domains which focus largely on the classroom environment and instructional practices of the teacher (Domain 2: The Classroom Environment and Domain 3: Instruction). To inform the teacher's ratings within these domains, the observer will, to the extent that such is relevant to the class/lesson in which the observation is being conducted, collect evidence about how the teacher: (1) creates an environment of respect and rapport within the classroom, (2) establishes a culture for learning within the classroom, (3) manages classroom procedures, (4) manages student behavior, (5) organizes physical space, (6) communicates with students, (7) uses questioning and discussion techniques, (8) engages students in learning, (9) uses assessment in instruction, and (10) demonstrates flexibility and responsiveness. Specific evidence of what the observer sees and hears in the classroom will be recorded by the observer.

Once the evidence has been collected through the observation process, the evidence will be interpreted as against the Framework for Teaching rubric for the purpose of determining whether the teacher's performance is ineffective, minimally effective, effective, or highly effective within a particular component.

The Feedback Process

Within 30 days of the classroom observation, the person who conducted the observation will provide feedback on the observation. The feedback process is intended to support learning and improved practice by the teacher. The feedback process will include sharing by the observer of specific evidence collected during the observation and how the evidence supports a specific effectiveness rating. The feedback process is intended to engage discussion between the observer and teacher about how the teacher could improve and strengthen his/her teaching practice.

Developing Performance Ratings

The Onsted Community Schools performance evaluation system will assign all teachers one of the following effectiveness ratings: (1) highly effective, (2) effective, (3) minimally effective, or (4) ineffective. The effectiveness rating will be based on the teacher's score on the annual year-end evaluation.

Each teacher's performance rating will be arrived at through use of the Onsted Community Schools performance evaluation system which includes: (1) Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching evaluation tool, (2) student growth and assessment data as required by Section 1249 of Michigan's Revised School Code, and (3) to the extent that they are not included in the evaluation tool, the teacher's demonstrated pedagogical skills, the teacher's classroom management, the teacher's attendance and disciplinary records, the teacher's significant, relevant accomplishments, and the teacher's relevant special training. Classroom observations, teacher provided information, and other relevant information and records will be used to inform the evaluation system and arrive at a final effectiveness rating for the teacher.

Developing Performance Goals and Improvement Plans

Through the performance evaluation process, the evaluator will, in consultation with the teacher, develop specific performance goals for the teacher which will assist in improving the teacher's effectiveness for the next school year. The performance goals will be incorporated into the teacher's annual year-end evaluation and may include recommended training that would assist the teacher in meeting the goals.

If the teacher is in his/her first year as a probationary teacher or received a rating of minimally effective or ineffective on his/her most recent annual year-end evaluation, the teacher will be provided a midyear progress report, which will be used as a supplemental tool to gauge a teacher's improvement from the preceding school year and to assist the teacher to improve. The midyear progress report will be based at least in part on student achievement and will be aligned with the teacher's individualized development plan. The midyear progress report will include performance goals for the remainder of the school year. The performance goals will be developed in consultation with the teacher and may include recommended training that would assist the teacher in meeting the goals.

If a teacher's performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory for any reason during the school year, the teacher's supervisor may conduct a meeting with the teacher to discuss the teacher's performance and strategies through which the teacher can improve his/her performance. The unsatisfactory performance will be documented and will be used to inform the performance evaluation system. If, after provided ample time to improve his/her performance, the teacher's performance remains unsatisfactory, the teacher will be moved to a plan of assistance, which will be developed by the supervisor and teacher. If, after provided ample time to improve his/her performance, the teacher's performance remains unsatisfactory, the teacher will be moved to an Intensive Assistance Plan.

If a teacher is rated as ineffective on three consecutive year-end evaluations, the Onsted Community Schools will dismiss the teacher from his/her employment, however, this does not prohibit the Onsted Community Schools from dismissing the teacher from his/her employment at any time.

(f) *The Onsted Community Schools will provide evaluators and observers with training on the use of the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching tool as follows:*

The Onsted Community Schools will provide training to all Onsted Community Schools employees responsible for evaluating and observing teachers. All training will be provided by an individual or individuals who have expertise in Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching evaluation tool and observation protocol. A typical training will include a review of the Framework, including, but not limited to defining effective teaching practice, identifying common themes of the Framework, identifying varying levels of teaching performance, identifying varying levels of student engagement, identifying and collecting evidence of effective teaching beyond the classroom, identifying and collecting evidence of classroom practices through observation, generating a summative report, and strategies for providing feedback and goal development/monitoring with teachers.

Training will be scheduled to ensure that all Onsted Community Schools employees responsible for evaluation and observation are able to attend a training session.

Technical support on use of the Framework for Teaching evaluation tool will be available from the Onsted Community Schools Staff Resources Department on an ongoing basis, and additional training may be made available to those individuals determined as requiring such.

School ADvance

(a) *The research base for the School ADvance evaluation framework, instrument, and process is:*

The School ADvance school administrator evaluation tool is based on four assumptions, which are grounded in the work of researchers in the field of educator performance evaluation. Those assumptions, as taken from the School ADvance website, are as follows:

1. The ultimate goal of educator evaluation is to achieve better results for students by fostering improved effectiveness of teachers and leaders.
2. New accountability requirements have enormous implications for administrators' expertise – and for the way they do business and spend their time.
3. High-stakes accountability must be balanced with ongoing feedback and support for continuous improvement.
4. Evaluation should not be something we do to people; rather, it should empower employees to take responsibility for their own learning, growth, and performance.

The School ADvance assumptions led to the identification of 10 core value and six research-aligned principles which guided development of the School ADvance administrator evaluation tools. The core values and research-aligned principles are as follows:

Core Values

1. Growing capacity for better student results
2. Two-way dialogue and interaction
3. A grounding in research supported practice
4. Self-Assessment and reflective practice
5. Authentic feedback
6. Growth targets that really matter
7. Personal ownership
8. Context, conditions, and student characteristics
9. Multiple sources of data/evidence
10. Student results

Research-Aligned Principles

1. **Authentic**, using evidence-based practices to achieve better student outcomes
2. **Professional**, building personal commitment and efficacy for growth and improvement
3. **Purpose Driven**, focused on measurable improvement targets for student success
4. **Adaptive**, fostering self-assessment, reflective practice, action research, and innovative methods of improving student results
5. **Evidence Based,** data informed, using multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative data tied to student achievement and evidence-based practice including achievement and observation data
6. **Inclusive**, serving all, with alignment between student, teacher, administrator, and district improvement goals

In arriving at the above-referenced standards and research-aligned principles the School ADvance authors relied heavily on work conducted by the Council of Chief State and School Officers (CCSSO) including their *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015*

developed by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. Development of those standards "involved a thorough review of empirical research and sough the input of researchers and more than 1,000 school and district leaders through surveys and focus groups." National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015). *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015*. Reston, VA. A select bibliography of cited research is available on pages 19-23 of that report.

Additional research, which supports the School ADvance evaluation tool includes the following:

> "Our school leaders need to acquire and demonstrate effective instructional expertise and human capital management strategies to ensure the selection, support, evaluation, and retention of the most highly skilled teachers and staff that can support and effect the necessary changes in student learning and achievement." Council of Chief State School Officers. *Enhancing Capacity for Standards-Based Leadership Evaluation: State and District Roles*. Washington DC.
>
> "No longer can we conceive of leaders as herculean individuals who flourish devoid of growth opportunities that we have recognized as vital to classroom teachers and other educational professionals." *Id.*
>
> "An intentional and mindful approach to supporting the development of educational leaders throughout their professional careers is critical to those who aspire to educational leadership and those who comprise the ranks of current administrative positions. How the phases of the pipeline are enacted, and the quality of these experiences, serve as a message to candidates and practitioners alike. How we recruit, prepare, induct, and develop educational leaders may influence the expectations of and commitment levels to the profession of candidates and practitioners alike, and ultimately may affect our ability to recruit and retain those who are most capable." *Id*. quoting Hitt, D.H., Tucker, P.D., Young, M.D. *The professional pipeline for educational leadership: A white paper to inform the work of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration*. Charlottesville, VA. 2012.
>
> "Ultimately, leadership standards serve as the through-line to student learning and achievement and the effective management of human capital across the career continuum. When leadership standards are in place, school leaders are clear about what's expected of them. Arguably, this clarity provides the most important condition for a school leader to thrive." *Id*.
>
> "Given the increasingly complex and important roles and responsibilities of educational leaders, it is critical that school leaders receive ongoing, individualized support for professional growth and leadership development." *Id*.

"Each school leader has specific and personalized leadership development needs, which are dependent on the context of the school community and the individual leader's experiential base, knowledge, and skills. *Id*.

"Much of the success of district and school leaders in building high-performance organizations (organizations which make significantly greater than-expected contributions to student learning) depends on how well these leaders interact with the larger social and organizational context in which they find themselves." Anderson, S., Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Wahlstrom, K. *How leadership influences student learning*. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement at the University of Minnesota, Ontario Institute for Student in Education at the University of Toronto, The Wallace Foundation. 2004.

"A critical aspect of leadership is helping a group to develop shared understandings about the organization and its activities and goals that can undergird a sense of purpose or vision." *Id*. referencing Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. *Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. 1980-1995.

"Often cited as helping set directions are such specific practices as identifying and articulating a vision, fostering the acceptance of group goals and creating high performance expectations. Visioning and establishing purpose are also enhanced by monitoring organizational performance and promoting effective communication and collaboration." Anderson, S., Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Wahlstrom, K. *How leadership influences student learning*. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement at the University of Minnesota, Ontario Institute for Student in Education at the University of Toronto, The Wallace Foundation. 2004.

"The ability to engage in practices that help develop people depends, in part, on leaders' knowledge of the "technical core" of schooling – what is required to improve the quality of teaching and learning – often invoked by the term 'instructional leadership.' But this ability is part of what is now being referred to as leaders' emotional intelligence. Recent evidence suggests that emotional intelligence displayed, for example, through a leader's personal attention to an employee and through the utilization of the employee's capacities, increases the employee's enthusiasm and optimism, reduces frustration, transmits a sense of mission and indirectly increases performance." *Id*. referencing Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & and McKee, A. *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press. and McColl-Kennedy, J.R. & and Anderson, R.D. *Impact of leadership style and emotions on subordinate performance*. The Leadership Quarterly.

"Successful educational leaders develop their districts and schools as effective organizations that support and sustain the performance of administrators and teachers as well as students." Anderson, S., Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Wahlstrom, K. *How leadership influences student learning*. Center for Applied Research and

Educational Improvement at the University of Minnesota, Ontario Institute for Student in Education at the University of Toronto, The Wallace Foundation. 2004.

"To be successful in highly accountable policy contexts, school leaders need to: create and sustain a competitive school, empower others to make decisions, provide instructional guidance, develop and implement strategic school [and district] improvement plans." *Id.*

"Distributed leadership overlaps substantially with shared, collaborative, democratic and participative leadership concepts. Distributed leadership assumes a set of practices that 'are enacted by people at all levels rather than a set of personal characteristics and attributes located in people at the top." *Id.* referencing Fletcher, J.K. & and Kaufer, K. *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

"New research has established that high-quality leadership is essential to the success of any school improvement strategy." The Wallace Foundation. *The Making of the Principal: Five Lessons in Leadership Training*. New York. 2012.

"The principal is the single biggest determinant of whether or not teachers want to stay in their schools, which suggests that better leadership may be a highly cost-effective way to improve teaching and learning throughout schools." *Id.*

"[R]esearchers who have examined education leadership agree that effective principals are responsible for establishing a schoolwide vision of commitment to high standards and the success of all students." The Wallace Foundation. *The School Principal as Leader: Guiding Schools to Better Teaching and Learning*. New York. 2012.

"An effective principal also makes sure that notion of academic success for all gets picked up by the faculty and underpins what researchers at the University of Washington describe as a schoolwide learning improvement agenda that focuses on goals for student progress." *Id.* referencing Knapp, M., Copland, M., Honig, M., Plecki, M., & Portin, B. *Learning-focused Leadership and Leadership Support: Meaning and Practice in Urban Systems*, University of Washington, 2002.

"Effective principals ensures that their schools allow both adults and children to put learning at the center of their daily activities." The Wallace Foundation. *The School Principal as Leader: Guiding Schools to Better Teaching and Learning*. New York. 2012.

" … the study suggests that principals play a major role in developing a 'professional community' of teachers who guide one another in improving instruction. This is important because the research found a link between professional community and higher student scores on standardized math tests. In short, the researchers say, 'When principals and teachers share leadership, teachers' working relationships with one another are stronger and student achievement is higher." Anderson, S., Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Wahlstrom, K. *How leadership influences student learning*. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement at the University of Minnesota, Ontario Institute for Student in Education at the University of Toronto, The Wallace Foundation. 2004.

"Effective principals work relentlessly to improve achievement by focusing on the quality of instruction. They help define and promote high expectations; they attack teacher isolation and fragmented effort; and they connect directly with teachers and the classroom. Knapp, M., Copland, M., Honig, M., Plecki, M., & Portin, B. *Learning-focused Leadership and Leadership Support: Meaning and Practice in Urban Systems*, University of Washington, 2002.

"Effective principals also encourage continual professional learning. They emphasize research-based strategies to improve teaching and learning and initiate discussions about instructional approaches, both in teams and with individual teachers. They pursue these strategies despite the preference of many teachers to be left alone." Anderson, S., Leithwood, K., Seashore Louis, K., Wahlstrom, K. *How leadership influences student learning*. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement at the University of Minnesota, Ontario Institute for Student in Education at the University of Toronto, The Wallace Foundation. 2004.

(b) *The identity and qualifications of the School ADvance author is:*

School ADvance was designed, developed, and authored by Dr. Patricia Reeves and Patricia McNeill who collaborated with members of the Michigan Association of School Administrators (MASA), the Michigan affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), practicing school leaders, higher education faculty, and numerous experts in educator evaluation.

Dr. Patricia Reeves (biography is courtesy of the School ADvance website – www.goschooladvance.org and used with permission)

Dr. Patricia Reeves is an Associate Professor of educational leadership, research, and evaluation in the College of Education and Human Development at Western Michigan University – Department of Educational Leadership, Research, and Technology. She also serves a contracted MASA Associate Executive Director for Administrator Certification and Development. Dr. Reeves joined the MASA team and the WMU faculty

in 2005 with 19 years experience as a K-12 assistant superintendent and superintendent. Prior to that, she was a Director of Instruction, a Gifted and Talented Program Specialist, a Reading Specialist, and a classroom teacher.

Dr. Reeves played a key role in researching state administrator credentialing systems, developing policy recommendations, drafting legislation, and working with the Michigan Department of Education to establish policies and rules for Michigan's Administrator credentialing system. Dr. Reeves' major contribution to this work was the conceptualization and design of Michigan's three-tiered administrator credentialing options and, specifically, the introduction of specialty and enhanced endorsements. In conjunction with her work at the policy and legislative level, Dr. Reeves also codeveloped the Courageous Journey programs for superintendent specialty and enhanced endorsements and the MASA DISC system of developing, inducting, supporting, and credentialing K-12 district leaders.

Other policy level work contributed by Dr. Reeves include chairing the MASA Legislation Committee, co-chairing the MASA/MAISA insurance sub-committee, coordinating the MASA/MAISA Adequacy and Equity study, and most recently, facilitating and writing the MASA Lead Forward policy paper on comprehensive redesign of Michigan's K-12 public education system.

Dr. Reeves is also co-principal investigator and co-author of the School ADvance Educator Evaluation System, developed through collaboration between MASA, MIASCD, and the WMU Educational Leadership and Research Department.

Dr. Reeves' teaching and research focus includes principal and superintendent practice, data informed school improvement, performance based educator evaluation and credentialing models, measurement of educator effectiveness, and qualitative research methods. Dr. Reeves scholarship includes articles in peer reviewed and nationally recognized publications, book chapters, research and policy reports, contributions to legislation and administrative rule, both peer reviewed and invited national and state presentations, and co-creation of research based tools for educator evaluation, data informed decision making, and systemic change processes.

Patricia McNeill (biography is courtesy of the School ADvance website – www.goschooladvance.org and used with permission)

Patricia McNeill is the Executive Director of the Michigan affiliate of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Prior to her appointment to that position, Ms. McNeill served as Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development of Holt Public Schools for 12 years. She also served as a curriculum director and staff developer for Waverly Public Schools, and an elementary education, adult education, and career center teacher. She has served as a college instructor in the Education Departments of both Michigan State University and Western Michigan University.

Ms. McNeill has extensive experience as a consultant and trainer in the areas of effective instruction, clinical supervision, cognitive coaching, cooperative learning, school improvement, and classroom management. Additionally, she has instructed professional development workshops on Response to Intervention, Failure is not an Option, Differentiated Instruction, Dimensions of Learning, Understanding by Design,

Assessment + Grading, Brain + Learning, Effective Teaching + Learning, cooperative learning, cognitive coaching, clinical supervision, classroom management, and school improvement.

(c) *Evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy of School ADvance is, or a plan for developing that evidence:*

The Onsted Community Schools is working with Dr. Patricia Reeves from SchoolADvance, which is actively working to develop evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy of the School ADvance evaluation tool based upon its use for the evaluation of school administrators in Michigan and beyond.

(d) *The School ADvance evaluation frameworks and rubrics with detailed descriptors for each performance level on key summative indicators are presented under the following link(s): (please report any broken or inoperable links to Blissfield Community School District)*

http://www.goschooladvance.org/tools

(e) *The Onsted Community Schools will collect evidence, conduct evaluation conferences, develop performance ratings, and develop performance improvement plans as follows:*

The Evidence Collection Process

The School ADvance evaluation tool employs both a formative and summative evaluation process. The formative and summative processes while distinct are complementary and overlapping. The formative assessment process is intended to gather evidence that can be used to guide improvement in the school administrator throughout the school year, while also informing the summative assessment process, which is intended to measure the overall level of proficiency of the school administrator at the end of the school or fiscal year, with the intent of using that information to guide improvement in future years.

Evidence collection associated with school administrator performance will be ongoing and will consist of various forms. Evidence may be collected and documented by the evaluator, the school administrator being evaluated, and/or through other evidence collection means. Evidence collection strategies and areas of focus may include, but are not limited to, observation of school administrator job performance; survey results; demonstrated achievement of district and/or school improvement goals; improved teacher and/or subordinate performance; district and/or school culture, including staff morale; community, including district, school, and the community-at-large, input and feedback; compliance with applicable law, policy, and procedures; improved self-practice; professional development; and district/school operations.

Evidence collected will be interpreted as against the School ADvance framework for building-level administrators and district-level administrators, as applicable, rubric for the purpose of determining whether the school administrator's performance is ineffective, minimally effective, effective, or highly effective within a particular component.

The Feedback Process

School administrator performance feedback will be ongoing throughout the school/fiscal year. The feedback process is intended to support learning and improved practice by the school administrator with the overall goal of improving school and/or district performance. The feedback process will include sharing by the evaluator of evidence collected and how the evidence supports a specific effectiveness rating. The feedback process is intended to engage discussion between the evaluator and school administrator about how the school administrator could improve and strengthen his/her performance.

Developing Performance Ratings

The Onsted Community Schools performance evaluation system will assign all school administrators one of the following effectiveness ratings: (1) highly effective, (2) effective, (3) minimally effective, or (4) ineffective. The effectiveness rating will be based on the school administrator's score on the annual year-end evaluation.

Each school administrator's performance rating will be arrived at through use of the Onsted Community Schools performance evaluation system which includes: (1) School ADvance evaluation tool and (2) student growth and assessment data as required by Section 1249b of Michigan's Revised School Code. The evidence collection process, school administrator provided information, and other relevant information and records will be used to inform the evaluation system and arrive at a final effectiveness rating for the school administrator.

Developing Performance Goals and Improvement Plans

Through the performance evaluation process, the evaluator will, in consultation with the school administrator, develop specific performance goals for the school administrator which will assist in improving the school administrator's effectiveness for the next school/fiscal year. The performance goals will be incorporated into the school administrator's annual year-end evaluation and may include recommended training that would assist the school administrator in meeting the goals.

If the school administrator received a rating of minimally effective or ineffective on his/her most recent annual year-end evaluation, the school administrator will be provided an improvement plan, which shall be intended to correct the identified deficiencies in the school

administrator's performance and shall be implemented by the school administrator. The improvement plan will recommend professional development opportunities and other actions designed to improve the rating of the school administrator on his/her next annual evaluation.

If a school administrator's performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory for any reason during the school/fiscal year, the school administrator's supervisor may conduct a meeting with the school administrator to discuss the school administrator's performance and strategies through which the school administrator can improve his/her performance. The unsatisfactory performance will be documented and will be used to inform the performance evaluation system. If, after provided ample time to improve his/her performance, the school administrator's performance remains unsatisfactory, the school administrator will be moved to a plan of assistance, which will be developed by the supervisor and school administrator. If, after provided ample time to improve his/her performance, the school administrator's performance remains unsatisfactory, the school administrator will be moved to an Intensive Assistance Plan.

If a school administrator is rated as ineffective on three consecutive year-end evaluations, the Onsted Community Schools will dismiss the school administrator from his/her employment, however, this does not prohibit the Onsted Community Schools from dismissing the school administrator from his/her employment at any time.

(f) *The Onsted Community Schools will provide evaluators and observers with training on the use of the School ADvance tool as follows:*

The Onsted Community Schools will provide training to all Onsted Community Schools employees responsible for evaluating and observing school administrators. All training will be provided by an individual or individuals who have expertise in the School ADvance evaluation tool and observation protocol. A typical training will include: updates on current law and policy; a review of how district, school, and program goals can drive educator evaluation; development of district implementation plans and timelines; orientation to the School ADvance rubrics, processes, and protocols; alignment and adaption of School ADvance rubrics to specific job responsibilities; guidance on weighting according to goals and priorities; how to identify, collect, and verify evidence of performance; summative and formative evaluation process and growth plans; local growth models; and system digital management and development. Training will be scheduled to ensure that all Onsted Community Schools employees responsible for evaluation and observation are able to attend a training session.

Technical support on use of the School ADvance evaluation tool will be available from the Onsted Community Schools Staff Resources Department on an ongoing basis, and additional training may be made available to those individuals determined as requiring such.

Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB) Superintendent Evaluation Tool

Information contained in this report was provided by and is used with the permission of the Michigan Association of School Boards.

(a) *The research base for the MASB Superintendent evaluation framework, instrument, and process is:*

The MASB Superintendent Evaluation framework, instrument, and process were developed, at least in part, through the consideration of research conducted by the Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB), which relied heavily on the following two extensive studies related to the leadership of educational institutions: (1) Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015, and (2) School District Leadership that Works: The Effect of Superintendent Leadership on Student Achievement.

The 2015 Standards are the result of an extensive process that took an in-depth look at the new education leadership landscape. It involved a thorough review of empirical research (see the Bibliography for a selection of supporting sources) and sought the input of researchers and more than 1,000 school and district leaders through surveys and focus groups to identify gaps among the 2008 Standards, the day-to-day work of education leaders and leadership demands of the future. The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and American Association of School Administrators (AASA) were instrumental to this work. The public was also invited to comment on two drafts of the Standards, which contributed to the final product. The National Policy Board for Education Administration (NPBEA), a consortium of professional organizations committed to advancing school leadership (including those named above), has assumed leadership of the 2015 Standards in recognition of their significance to the profession and will be their steward going forward. National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015). Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015. Reston, VA.

To determine the influence of district superintendents on student achievement and the characteristics of effective superintendents, Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning , a Denver-based education research organization, conducted a meta-analysis of research — a sophisticated research technique that combines data from separate studies into a single sample of research — on the influence of school district leaders on student performance. This study is the latest in a series of meta-analyses that McREL has conducted over the past several years to determine the characteristics of effective schools, leaders, and teachers. This most recent meta-analysis examines findings from 27 studies conducted since 1970 that used rigorous, quantitative methods to study the influence of school district leaders on student achievement. Altogether, these studies involved 2,817 districts and the achievement scores of 3.4 million students, resulting in what McREL researchers believe to be the largest-ever quantitative examination of research on superintendents. Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) (2006). School District Leadership that Works: The Effect of Superintendent Leadership on Student Achievement. Denver, CO.

(b) *The identity and qualifications of the MASB Superintendent evaluation tool author are:*

The Michigan Association of School Boards has served boards of education since its inception in 1949. In the decades since, MASB has worked hands-on with tens of thousands of school board members and superintendents throughout the state. Evaluation of the superintendent has been a key aspect of that work – MASB developed superintendent evaluation instruments and trained board members in their use nearly half a century before the requirements.

MASB Staff and Faculty involved in creating the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument Include:

- Rodney Green, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools (retired), East China
- Olga Holden, Ph.D., Director of Leadership Services (retired), MASB
- Donna Oser, CAE, Director of Executive Search and Leadership Development, MASB

- Debbie Stair, MNML, former school board member, Board Development Manager, MASB

New York Council of School Superintendents Staff and Leadership involved in creating the Council's Superintendent Model Evaluation (which significantly influenced MASB's instrument):

- Jacinda H. Conboy, Esq., New York State Council of School Superintendents
- Sharon L. Contreras, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools, Syracuse City SD
- Chad C. Groff, Superintendent of Schools
- Robert J. Reidy, Executive Director, New York State Council of School Superintendents
- Maria C. Rice, Superintendent of Schools, New Paltz CSD
- Dawn A. Santiago-Marullo, Ed.D., Superintendent of Schools, Victor CSD
- Randall W. Squier, CAS, Superintendent of Schools, Coxsackie-Athens CSD
- Kathryn Wegman, Superintendent of Schools (retired), Marion CSD

(c) *Evidence of reliability, validity, and efficacy of the MASB Superintendent evaluation tool is, or a plan for developing that evidence:*

Validity

Validity refers to how well an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure. Construct validity was established for the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument. Construct validity ensures the assessment is actually measuring superintendent performance. Validity was established using of a panel of experts familiar with the research base and work of the effective school superintendent. The experts examined the research, identified performance indicators for measure and refined the scale for measurement.

Panel Members included:

- Rodney Green, Ph.D., Superintendent of Schools (retired), Consultant, MASB
- Olga Holden, Ph.D., Director of Leadership Services (retired), MASB
- Mary Kerwin, BA, former school board member, Senior Consultant, MASB
- Debbie Stair, MNML, former school board member, Board Development Manager, MASB

Efficacy

Efficacy refers to the capacity of the evaluation instrument to produce the desired or intended results. The MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument has three intended outcomes:

1) To accurately assesses the level of a superintendent's job performance
2) To improve the superintendent's professional practice and impact on student learning
3) To advance the goals of the school district

MASB will seek to establish efficacy of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument by surveying school board members and superintendents from a representative sample of school districts (see details below). An electronic survey instrument will be used to ascertain the extent to which:

a. The district followed the prescribed process for conducting the evaluation, and
b. The evaluation instrument and prescribed process supported the stated outcomes

Reliability

Reliability is the degree to which an evaluation instrument produces stable and consistent results. While there are several types of reliability, MASB will seek to establish the test-retest reliability of the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument. Test-retest reliability is a measure of reliability obtained by administering the same instrument twice over a period of time to a group of individuals. To accomplish this, a representative sample of school districts using the MASB 2016 Superintendent Evaluation instrument will participate in a reliability study. A minimum of 15 school districts (with low board member turnover and no transition in the superintendency) will conduct an evaluation at the midpoint of their evaluation cycle and again at the end of their evaluation. Scores from the two assessments will then be correlated in order to evaluate the test for reliability. A coefficient of 7.0 or higher will indicate acceptable stability.

(d) *The MASB evaluation frameworks and rubrics with detailed descriptors for each performance level on key summative indicators are presented under the following link(s): (please report any broken or inoperable links to Onsted Community Schools):*

http://www.masb.org/Portals/0/Education_Community/Superintendents/MASBSuptEvaluation2016.pdf

(e) *The Onsted Community Schools will collect evidence, conduct evaluation conferences, develop performance ratings, and develop performance improvement plans as follows:*

The Evidence Collection Process

The MASB Superintendent evaluation process identifies a number of possible items which may be used as evidence to help inform the Board's evaluation of the Superintendent. The provided evidence, while not exclusive, is intended to provide some degree of objectivity to the evaluation process.

Evidence collection associated with the performance of the Superintendent will be ongoing and will consist of various forms. Evidence may be collected and documented by Members of the School Board, the Superintendent, and/or through other evidence collection means. Evidence collection strategies and areas of focus may include, but are not limited to, observation of Superintendent job performance; survey results; demonstrated achievement of district and/or school improvement goals; district and/or school culture, including staff morale; community,

including district, school, and the community-at-large, input and feedback; compliance with applicable law, policy, and procedures; improved self-practice; professional development; and district/school operations.

Evidence collected will be interpreted as against the MASB Superintendent evaluation framework rubric for the purpose of determining whether the Superintendent's performance is ineffective, minimally effective, effective, or highly effective.

The Feedback Process

Superintendent performance feedback will be ongoing throughout the school/fiscal year. The feedback process is intended to support learning and improved practice by the Superintendent with the overall goal of improving district performance. The feedback process will include sharing by the School Board of evidence collected and how the evidence supports a specific effectiveness rating. The feedback process is intended to engage discussion between the School Board and Superintendent about how the Superintendent could improve and strengthen his/her performance.

Developing Performance Ratings

The Onsted Community Schools performance evaluation system will assign the Superintendent one of the following effectiveness ratings: (1) highly effective, (2) effective, (3) minimally effective, or (4) ineffective. The effectiveness rating will be based on the Superintendent's score on the annual year-end evaluation.

The Superintendent's performance rating will be arrived at through use of the Onsted Community Schools performance evaluation system which includes: (1) MASB superintendent evaluation tool and (2) student growth and assessment data as required by Section 1249b of Michigan's Revised School Code. The evidence collection process, Superintendent provided information, and other relevant information and records will be used to inform the evaluation system and arrive at a final effectiveness rating for the Superintendent.

Developing Performance Goals and Improvement Plans

Through the performance evaluation process, the School Board will, in consultation with the Superintendent, develop specific performance goals for the Superintendent which will assist in improving the Superintendent's effectiveness for the next school/fiscal year. The performance goals will be incorporated into the Superintendent's annual year-end evaluation and may include recommended training that would assist the Superintendent in meeting the goals.

If the Superintendent received a rating of minimally effective or ineffective on his/her most recent annual year-end evaluation, the Superintendent will be provided an improvement plan, which shall be intended to correct the identified deficiencies in the Superintendent's performance and shall be implemented by the Superintendent. The improvement plan will recommend professional development opportunities and other actions designed to improve the rating of the Superintendent on his/her next annual evaluation.

If the Superintendent's performance is deemed to be unsatisfactory for any reason during the school/fiscal year, the School Board, and/or a subcommittee of the School Board, may conduct a meeting with the Superintendent to discuss the Superintendent's performance and strategies through which the Superintendent can improve his/her performance. The unsatisfactory performance will be documented and will be used to inform the performance evaluation system. If, after provided ample time to improve his/her performance, the Superintendent's performance remains unsatisfactory, the Superintendent will be moved to a plan of assistance, which will be developed by the School Board and Superintendent. If, after provided ample time to improve his/her performance, the Superintendent's performance remains unsatisfactory, the Superintendent will be moved to an Intensive Assistance Plan.

If the Superintendent is rated as ineffective on three consecutive year-end evaluations, the Onsted Community Schools will dismiss the Superintendent from his/her employment, however, this does not prohibit the Onsted Community Schools from dismissing the Superintendent from his/her employment at any time.

(f) *The Onsted Community Schools will provide evaluators and observers with training on the use of the MASB Superintendent evaluation tool as follows:*

The Onsted Community Schools will provide training to the members of the Onsted Community Schools Board of Education who are collectively responsible for evaluating and observing the Superintendent. All training will be provided by an individual or individuals who have expertise in the MASB superintendent evaluation tool and observation protocol. A typical training will include the fundamentals of evaluation including legal requirements, evaluation as a developmental tool, establishing performance goals and expectations, and use of the MASB superintendent evaluation tool including the cycle of evaluation, rating performance on the rubric, compilation and presentation of the evaluation, as well as the use of evidence to demonstrate performance. Training will be scheduled to ensure that all members of the Onsted Community Schools Board of Education are able to attend a training session.

Technical support on use of the MASB superintendent evaluation tool will be available from the Onsted Community Schools Staff Resources Department on an ongoing basis, and additional training may be made available to those individuals determined as requiring such.