



**The Framework for Teaching by  
Charlotte Danielson  
District-Approved Teacher Evaluation Tool**

*Per MCL 380.1249: Beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, a school district, intermediate school district, or public school academy shall post on its public website specific information about the evaluation tool(s) used for its performance evaluation system for teachers. Complete language (including requirements) for MCL 380.1249 can be found [here](#).*

*This evaluation tool has been approved by the district, as the result of a review process implemented with fidelity. The contents of this document are compliant with the law laid forth, specifically pertaining to The 2013 Instrument, The Framework for Teaching by Charlotte Danielson*

Sylvia Brown

Printed Name of Superintendent

Signature of Superintendent

1/23/17

Date of Approval

**Research Base for the Evaluation Framework, Instrument, and Process [Section 1249(3)(a)]**

First published by ASCD in 1996, *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* was an outgrowth of the research compiled by Educational Testing Service (ETS) for the development of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments, an observation-based evaluation of first-year teachers used for the purpose of licensing. The Framework extended this work by examining current research to capture the skills of teaching required not only by novice teachers but by experienced practitioners as well. Each component of the Framework for Teaching has been validated by the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) study. The Framework for Teaching has been found to have predictive validity. Further research around the FFT can be found on The Danielson Group’s website. See the Chicago and Cincinnati studies.

**Identification and Qualifications of the Author(s) [Section 1249(3)(b)]**

The Framework for Teaching was developed by Charlotte Danielson, a recognized expert in the area of teacher effectiveness. Her work focuses on the use of a framework, a clear description of practice, to promote professional conversations and learning. She advises State Education

Departments and National Ministries and Departments of Education, both in the United States and overseas.

- Charlotte Danielson graduated from Cornell with a degree in history, and earned her master's in philosophy, politics and economics at Oxford University. In 1978, she earned another master's from Rutgers in educational administration and supervision. After college, she worked as a junior economist in think tanks and policy organizations. While working in Washington, D.C., she got to know some of the children living on her inner-city block – and that's what motivated her to choose teaching over economics. She obtained her teaching credentials and worked her way up the spectrum from teacher to curriculum director, then on to staff developer and program designer in several different locations, including ETS in Princeton. She has developed and trained extensively in the areas of teacher observation and assessments.

---

### **Evidence of Reliability, Validity, and Efficacy [Section 1249(3)(c)]**

This plan will be in place for the 2016-17 school year. By the start of the 2017-18 school year, GWCA will demonstrate that our teacher evaluation/observation tool meets the standards considered valid and reliable by:

1. Conducting a professional development training for all teachers on using the Frontline teacher rubric forevaluations/observations. This training will calibrate evaluators on the use of GWCA'sevaluation/observation tool. This training will take place by January 30, 2017.
2. During the training, teachers will:
  - Review the evaluation rubric in depth.
  - Write down their ratings during observation of a video watching a teacher in his/her classroom
  - Have conversations with one another (in collaborative PLC Teams) to calibrate their ratings and discuss the reasoning behindwhy they provided those specific ratings to the teacher.
3. To demonstrate reliability among teachers, after the training, teacherswill engage in a peer assessment of another teacher and receive administrative feedback on their use of the evaluation/observation tool. Teacherswill also watch the video andanswer a set of questions about their observation. Each of the teachers that participate will receive an evaluationscore.



**George Washington  
Carver Academy**

4. An independent auditing agency will analyze the data from the evaluation professional development for reliability. The independent auditor/agency will analyze the ratings assigned by different evaluators observing the same lesson to ensure there is at least 75% mastery.
5. GWCA will provide similar training to new teachers on the evaluation rubric.
6. To guarantee our evaluation rubrics are valid and we are measuring the right thing, we will annually review the correlation of our teachers' evaluation ratings with student growth scores. An independent auditor, contracted as a third party data and reliability consultant, will review GWCA's Plan to determine the reliability and validity of GWCA's teacher evaluation/observation tool.

**Evaluation Framework and Rubric [Section 1249(3)(d)]**

All teachers use the following performance ratings:

The Teacher Evaluation Rubric has criterion-referenced progressions of performance expectations. Leaders, when evaluating teachers, will individually consider each teacher and review the rubric below:

<b>Highly Effective</b> Exemplary Model to other staff and shares knowledge	<b>Effective</b> Meets expected performance level	<b>Minimally Effective</b> Approaching expected performance level	<b>Ineffective</b> Below expected performance level
90% or more of students met targeted student growth expectations from fall to spring  Teacher is 'Distinguished' and/or 'Proficient' in observable Domains 2 and 3  Teacher is 'Distinguished' and/or 'Proficient' in non-observable Domains 1 and 4	75%-89% of students met targeted student growth expectations from fall to spring  Teacher is 'Proficient' in observable Domains 2 and 3  Teacher is 'Proficient' in non-observable Domains 1 and 4	50-88% of students met targeted student growth expectations from fall to spring  Teacher is 'Proficient' and/or 'Basic' in observable Domains 2 and 3  Teacher is 'Proficient' and/or 'Basic' in non-observable Domains 1 and 4	Less than 50% of students met targeted student growth expectations from fall to spring  Teacher is 'Basic' and/or 'Not Proficient' in observable Domains 2 and 3  Teacher is 'Basic' and/or 'Not Proficient' in non-observable Domains 1 and 4



The rubric uses a four-level evaluation scale for the ratings as follows:

**3.5-4 – Highly Effective** – Master teacher performance that meets very demanding criteria

**2.50-3.49 – Effective** – Expected professional performance for an effective teacher

**1.90-2.49 – Minimally Effective** – Performance is mediocre; no teacher should be content to remain at this level

**1.00-1.89 – Ineffective** – Does Not Meet Standards, unacceptable performance resulting in an Individual Development Plan, intensive support, and, where applicable, dismissal

**Description of Process for Conducting Classroom Observations, Collecting Evidence, Conducting Evaluation Conferences, Developing Performance Ratings, and Developing Performance Improvement Plans [Section 1249(3)(e)]**

### The Framework for Classroom Observations

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Pre-observation conference</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Walk through the lesson plan. Confirm the learning outcome(s) for lesson being observed (Instructional Plan).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Discuss alignment between the student learning outcome(s), lesson activities (readings, discussions, problem solving, group work, handouts, independent work, centers, etc.), and assessment (How will students demonstrate mastery?)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Identify any specific areas the teacher would like the observer to focus on. These will most likely be selected from Domain 2 (Classroom Environment) or Domain 3 (Instruction).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Using the rubrics, review the levels of performance for any components chosen.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Observation</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Observer collects and records evidence, noting any questions regarding aspects of the lesson.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Post Observation</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Provide to teacher: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ copy of observer’s notes</li> <li>✓ reflection form</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



**George Washington  
Carver Academy**

▪ **Post-observation conference**

✓ Invite teacher to reflect on the lesson

✓ Seek additional information. Examine samples of student work, if appropriate. Ask questions to clarify and validate the evidence collected. (The more evidence you gather, the more reliable your judgment will be!)

✓ Align evidence with the levels of performance by highlighting words from the rubrics that best fit the evidence collected. Teacher and observer may do this individually, and then compare alignment, or this may be done collaboratively. Agree upon rubric language and supporting evidence to be used in the Observation Report.

✓ Discuss teaching areas of strength and areas for future growth.

✓ Prepare Observation Report, including specific language from levels of performance, citing evidence from observer's notes. Optional: Attach observer's notes and any documentation or artifacts submitted by the teacher.

✓ Submit report to teacher for signature and additional comments.



**(Informal) Classroom Walkthrough-Evidence Based Rubric**

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation		Domain 2: Classroom Environment	
1a. Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy		2a. Creating an environment of respect and rapport	
1b. Demonstrating knowledge of students		2b. Establishing a culture for learning	
1c. Setting instructional outcomes		2c. Managing classroom procedures	
1d. Demonstrating knowledge of resources			2d. Managing student behavior
1e. Designing coherent instruction		2e. Organizing physical space	
1f. Designing student assessments			
Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities		Domain 3: Instruction	
4a. Reflecting on teaching		3a. Communicating with students	
4b. Maintaining accurate records		3b. Using questioning and discussion techniques	
4c. Communicating with families		3c. Engaging students in learning	
4d. Participating in a professional community		3d. Using assessment in instruction	
4e. Growing and developing professionally		3e. Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness	
4f. Demonstrating professionalism			





4. Describe any modifications you will make to accommodate individuals or groups of students in this class.
- 5a. During the lesson, how will you monitor student progress?
- 5b. How and when will you know whether the students have learned what you intend?
6. Is there anything else, either about your students or your classroom, which you would like an observer to know?
7. Which components of teaching would like the observer to specifically observe during the lesson?





**George Washington  
Carver Academy**

**Post-Observation Conference – Reflection Form  
Classroom Teacher**

Teacher \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Grade Level(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Subject \_\_\_\_\_

1. In general, how successful was the lesson? Did the students learn what you intended for them to learn?
2. To what extent were your goals and objectives appropriate for your students?
3. Please comment on your classroom procedures, student conduct, and your use of physical space. To what extent did they contribute to student learning?
4. Did you depart from your plan? If so, how, and why?
5. Please comment on different aspects of your instructional delivery. To what extent were they effective? What would you do differently to improve the lesson?

5a - Activities

5b- Grouping of students

**Description of Plan for Providing Evaluators and Observers with Training [Section 1249(3)(f)]**

An evaluation process is determined by local guidelines and decisions. The Danielson Group trains observers to collect non-biased, quality evidence that is aligned to FFT components. Observers, working jointly with teachers, examine the evidence against critical attributes that distinguish levels of performance. This collaborative process supports the determination of a rating based on the preponderance of evidence. The Danielson Group promotes the use of evidence in collaborative pre- and post-observation conferences focused on growth.

The Danielson Group offers training in facilitating evidence-based conversations to support the development of reflective practice and professional development plans, encouraging focused action and peer-to-peer learning. Our process is based on research that points to the importance of evaluator training.

In addition, an Individualized Development Plan (IDP) is crafted for teachers who score in the Minimally Effective or Ineffective categories.

In alignment with this IDP, The Minimally Effective or Ineffective teacher must fulfill each of the following requirements:

- Engage in assigned professional development activities to enhance knowledge or skill in areas of weakness (15-20 hours).
- Engage in 10-20 hours of Peer Mentorship feedback on teaching performance from either administrator/curriculum supervisors and/or more experienced colleagues.
- The teacher makes prioritized, individual effort to glean knowledge from others or to assume greater accountability of professional responsibilities.
- The teacher must seek regular opportunities for continued professional development.
- The teacher agrees to welcome colleagues and supervisors into the classroom for the purposes of gaining insight from their feedback.
- The teacher agrees to actively participate in organizations designed to contribute to the profession and to foster their professional growth in areas of weakness.

The Danielson Group specializes in full-day, on-site training. We will also lead distance or remote consultation and follow-up webinars with large or small groups. All offerings can be customized to address gaps and needs. We also organize regional conferences and encourage school districts to pool resources and work together to arrange ongoing professional learning. We are available for keynote talks and large group overviews as well. Via email and phone, we remain available to Framework adopters. To respond to scheduling and budget considerations,



## **George Washington Carver Academy**

The Danielson Group offers a number of training sequences. Clients contact The Danielson Group; we assess needs and discuss possible plans; clients propose training dates; and then we draft an agreement for review. A member of our national team of experienced consultants will contact the client to enhance their understanding of district needs and to individualize the training design as appropriate.

Free resources can be found on The Danielson Group website: <http://www.danielsongroup.org>.

---