

SOUTH DAKOTA TEACHER EVALUATION HANDBOOK



JANUARY 2013

Table of Contents

Preface.....	3
Workgroup Members.....	5
Purpose of the Teacher Evaluation Workgroup.....	6
Glossary of Terms.....	7
Levels of Performance.....	8
Recommended Teacher Evaluation Process.....	9
Sample Artifacts.....	11
Summary of the Framework for Teaching.....	13
Teacher Evaluation Training Programs.....	14
South Dakota Professional Teaching Standards Training Opportunities. ...	15
Recommended Next Steps.....	16
Statutory Authority.....	17
Rules.....	19
Appendix	
Appendix A – 2011-12 Pilot Districts.....	20
Appendix B – Danielson Rubric and Observation Tools.....	20
Appendix C - Forms	
Pre-Observation Forms.....	21
Observation Forms.....	21
Post-Observation Forms.....	21
Sample Feedback Forms.....	22
Follow-Up.....	22
Other Forms.....	22
Appendix D – Pre-Observation Form Samples.....	23
Appendix E – Post-Observation Form Samples.....	25
Appendix F – Sample Evaluation Schedule.....	28

Preface

Research clearly indicates that effective teachers have a profound impact on student learning. Key to having effective teachers is using a set of consistent standards to guide professional development and continually improve instruction. Teacher preparation programs currently base their programs on INTASC standards, which describe knowledge and skills deemed necessary for teachers new to the profession. The missing link was standards and an evaluation system to carry the teaching professional forward.

A district must meet the minimum standards in SDCL 13-42-34 of:

- a. teachers must be evaluated annually for those in year 1 to 3
- b. teachers in their fourth contract or more must be evaluated every other year
- c. Districts must adopt the performance standards adopted by the state Board of Education which establish minimum performance standards, requires multiple measure, serves as a basis for growth, and includes a plan of assistance for teachers not meeting the performance standards

The 2010 Legislature passed Senate Bill 24, now codified law SDCL 13-42-35, inclusive, to establish the basis for South Dakota to engage in this important work. The bill, developed in collaboration with the South Dakota Education Association and other educational organizations, mandates the following:

- Required teacher evaluation
- Adoption of teaching standards
- Creation of a model evaluation tool

A work group met five times from June through November 2010, to review widely accepted teaching standards. The work group recommended the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching for statewide adoption. The framework provides a succinct and common language along with a deep research base of what “good teaching” looks like across the career continuum.

The Danielson Framework was presented to the South Dakota Board of Education in November 2010. The adoption process moved forward with the South Dakota Board of Education approving ARSD 24:08:06, Teacher performance standards, at their July 2011 meeting.

In May, 2012 a Teacher Evaluation Work Group was created with the purpose of providing input in developing a four-tier rating system and evaluation instrument. This document will outline the recommendations of this work group and provide guidance on the implementation of a teacher evaluation system for the state of South Dakota.

The process and procedures outlined in this document are recommendations of the Teacher Evaluation Workgroup. School districts have the option to augment these processes and procedures to better meet the needs of their district.

DRAFT

Workgroup Members

This document would not be possible without the tremendous efforts of the following educators and experts:

MEMBERS

TEACHERS

Sharla Steever, Hill City
Kristin Skogstad, Sioux Falls
Pat Moller, Mitchell
Nicole Keegan, Rapid City
Paul Kuhlman, Avon
Candy Ballard, Lead Deadwood

PRINCIPALS

Kym Johnston, Lennox
Kyley Cumbow, Pierre
Kevin Lein, Harrisburg

SUPERINTENDENTS

Don Kirkegaard, Meade
Shayne McIntosh, Parkston

SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

Pam Haukaas, Colome
Rebecca Reimer, Chamberlain

PARENTS

Amy Blum, Chamberlain
Stacy Bauer Jones, Brandon Valley
Shauna Hoglund, Dell Rapids

EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS

Steve O'Brien, SDEA
Wade Pogany, ASBSD
Rob Monson, SASD

Special thanks should be given to Dr. Rick Melmer, Dean of Education at the University of South Dakota and Dr. Fred Aderhold, Lecturer in the Division of Educational Administration at the University of South Dakota for leading this workgroup. Their support and guidance during this process has been instrumental to the success of this project.

Purpose of the Teacher Evaluation Work Group

An effective teacher in the classroom is perhaps the most influential, controllable school factor for impacting student learning. Therefore, the primary purpose of the teacher evaluation process is to help teachers excel in their task of improving student achievement.

The teacher evaluation process is designed to provide evidenced-based feedback to teachers on an annual basis, thus providing data for professional development and employment decisions. The entire evaluation process recognizes the value of the teacher/administrator professional relationship as the basis for meaningful, in depth dialogue focused on the teaching/learning process.

This evaluation tool provides the mechanism for holding these professional conversations centered around a framework for research-based teaching.

Objectives of the Teacher Evaluation Work Group

- Review a set of teacher performance standards that will be used as a foundation for the teacher evaluation instrument. (Danielson Framework for Teaching)
http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/documents/TS_RefCard.pdf
- Develop a teacher evaluation instrument available to districts beginning with the 2014 – 15 academic year. (Pilot implementation – 2013 – 14)
- Develop the procedures to guide the teacher evaluation process. This includes information that addresses issues such as observation length and frequency
- Determine strategies to incorporate levels of performance and student performance into the teacher evaluation process
- Develop the teacher evaluation training program for administrators and teachers
- Develop multiple measures of performance

Glossary of Terms

Component – a category of measures within the evaluation system. In South Dakota’s recommended Professional Teaching Standards, the teacher evaluation system consists of the following components: Classroom Observation, Qualitative Data through multiple sources, and Quantitative Data through multiple sources.

Drop-in visit - same as informal observation

Formal Observation - the formal observation begins with a pre-conference, followed by a classroom observation of a minimum of 15 minutes in length, followed by a post-observation conference including written feedback to the teacher.

Informal Observation - the informal classroom observation must be at least 5 minutes in length, and result in feedback to the teacher.

Observation - an observer gathers data in a teacher’s classroom to document evidence of practice relative to the South Dakota Professional Teaching Standards based on the Danielson Framework for Teaching.

Plan of Assistance - a formal written document outlining specific improvements needed to remediate any instructional weaknesses identified through the evaluation process.

Pre-conference - the observer meets with the teacher prior to the formal observation to discuss lesson standards, assessment tools, instructional strategies, differentiation needed.

Post-observation conference - following the classroom observation, the observer and the teacher meet face-to-face to discuss the evidence observed during the classroom observation. The conference is meant to be dialogue about effective teaching/learning strategies based on reflection and analysis relative to the South Dakota Professional Teaching Standards.

Summative Evaluation - the use of qualitative and quantitative data to determine a teacher’s rating prior to making employment decisions.

Surveys – are questionnaires about the teacher’s performance given to various stakeholder groups. In this case, questions on how well a teacher meets standards or other expectations can be asked of their principals, students and/or community members. Stakeholder feedback is designed to give teachers informal feedback on how they are perceived by different stakeholder groups. A “360” survey is given to all stakeholders who surround the teacher.

Levels of Performance

Distinguished - a teacher rating where evidence shows, both qualitatively and quantitatively, that student learning is occurring at an accelerated rate in the teacher's classroom.

Proficient - a teacher rating where evidence shows, both qualitatively and quantitatively, that an acceptable level of student learning is occurring in the teacher's classroom.

Basic - a teacher rating where there is some evidence to show, either qualitatively or quantitatively, that student learning is occurring in the teacher's classroom.

Unsatisfactory - a teacher rating where there is no evidence to show, either qualitatively or quantitatively, that student learning is occurring in the teacher's classroom.

Recommended Teacher Evaluation Process

The South Dakota Teacher Evaluation Process focuses the evaluation on two areas of performance:

- 1) The attainment of student learning outcomes or results; and
- 2) The demonstration of behaviors that represent excellence in teaching and in the profession.

This is an evaluation tool that considers both quantitative and qualitative data to determine a teacher's level of competency.

Components of the Annual Evaluation Process

- **Classroom observation**
 - For teachers in years one through three of continuous employment:
 - Two (2) formal observations
 - The first should be prior to October 31st
 - The second should be prior to January 31st
 - Four (4) informal observations (the first one prior to the first formal, then interspersed throughout the year)
 - For teachers in their 4th contract and beyond:
 - One (1) formal observation
 - Four (4) informal observations
 - Peer to peer observation and feedback (is not included in evaluation documentation)
- **Qualitative data from multiple sources that show evidence of effective teaching such as:**
 - classroom observations
 - lesson plans
 - survey results (both self-assessment and 360 feedback)
 - professional growth development
 - teaching artifacts
- **Quantitative data from multiple sources that show evidence of student learning such as:**
 - statewide assessments
 - pre and post test results
 - ACT
 - DIBELS/STAR
 - portfolio of student growth
 - end of course exams
 - other state-approved assessment tools

Peer Observation Process

- Teachers are encouraged to observe and be observed by another teacher once per year at a minimum using the South Dakota Professional Teaching Standards.
- Following the collection of evidence, the observer and teacher will engage in dialogue where they will compare the evidence observed with the Danielson rubric. The process is designed to develop a deeper understanding of the South Dakota Professional Teaching Standards and to engage colleagues in discussion about the use of research-based strategies to enhance student learning. Any data from the observation **may not** be included in the summative evaluation.

Rating Process

This model of teacher evaluation is based on two criteria:

- the teacher has professional (qualitative data); and
- student learning results (quantitative data).

Evidence of Learning

1. Focus on Domains 3b, 3c, 3d, 4a
2. Look at artifacts
3. Determine collectively between principal & teacher

Evidence of Teaching

- Domains 1-4

Score

The overall score will place the teacher in one of four categories:

- Unsatisfactory
- Basic
- Proficient
- Distinguished

*** see Levels of Performance for descriptions of the four categories*

The rating process has a recommended completion date of April 1 of each year.

Sample Artifacts Aligned to South Dakota Professional Teaching Standards

Artifacts	Domain 1 Planning and Preparation	Domain 2 The Classroom Environment	Domain 3 Instruction	Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities
Stakeholder surveys (parents, students and community)	X	X	X	X
Student Achievement data – formative and summative			X	X
Teacher lesson plans	X			
Discipline referrals		X		
Parent newsletters				X
Class website			X	X
School improvement goals	X			
Professional development plan	X	X	X	X
Demonstration of student achievement growth			X	
Student enrollment (electives)		X		
Community partnerships				X
Teacher journal	X	X	X	X
Safety report		X		
Positive feedback portfolio	X	X	X	X
Parental contact log				X
Transcript	X			X
Demonstration of professional behavior (dress, punctuality, attendance)				X

Artifacts	Domain 1 Planning and Preparation	Domain 2 The Classroom Environment	Domain 3 Instruction	Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities
Community involvement				X
Demonstration of high expectations		X		
Discipline plans or contracts		X		
Substitute teacher folder	X			X
Leadership opportunities				X
Curriculum maps/common core	X		X	
Committee Assignments				X
Grade book				X
Video lesson	X	X	X	X
Professional organizations				X
Individual Education Plans (students)	X	X	X	
Differentiated lesson plans	X		X	
Peer observation	X	X	X	X
Mentoring	X	X	X	X
Action research	X	X	X	X

Summary of the Framework for Teaching

The Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching encompasses the foundational ideas on which the observation process is based, and it guides how the South Dakota Department of Education defines effective teaching. Many schools and districts across the nation and around the world use this framework to help define effective teaching. The framework offers a description of practices that, based on research and empirical evidence, have been shown to promote student learning.

The Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching serves as the guide for rating classroom observations in South Dakota.

A Framework for Teaching Charlotte Danielson 2011	
<p style="text-align: center;">Domain 1 Planning and Preparation</p> <p>a. Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy Knowledge of Content and the Structure of the Discipline Knowledge of Prerequisite Relationships Knowledge of Content-Related Pedagogy</p> <p>b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students 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</p> <p>c. Selecting Instructional Outcomes Value, Sequence, and Alignment Clarity Balance Suitability for Diverse Students</p> <p>d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources Resources for Classroom Use Resources to Extend Content Knowledge and Pedagogy Resources for Students</p> <p>e. Designing Coherent Instruction Learning Activities Instructional Materials and Resources Instructional Groups Lesson and Unit Structure</p> <p>f. Designing Student Assessments Congruence with Instructional Outcomes Criteria and Standards Design of Formative Assessments Use for Planning</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Domain 2 The Classroom Environment</p> <p>a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport Teacher Interactions with Students Including Both Words and Actions Student Interactions with Other Students, Including Both Words and Actions</p> <p>b. Establishing a Culture for Learning Importance of the Content and of Learning Expectations for Learning and Achievement Student Pride in Work</p> <p>c. Managing Classroom Procedures Management of Instructional Groups Management of Transitions Management of Materials and Supplies Performance of Non-Instructional Duties</p> <p>d. Managing Student Behavior Expectations Monitoring of Student Behavior Response to Student Misbehavior</p> <p>e. Organizing Physical Space Safety and Accessibility Arrangement of Furniture and Use of Physical Resources</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Domain 4 Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>a. Reflecting on Teaching Accuracy Use in Future Teaching</p> <p>b. Maintaining Accurate Records Student Completion of Assignments Student Progress in Learning Non-instructional Records</p> <p>c. Communicating with Families Information about the Instructional Program Information about Individual Students Engagement of Families in the Instructional Program</p> <p>d. Participating in a Professional Community Relationships with Colleagues Involvement in a Culture of Professional Inquiry Service to the School Participation in School and District Projects</p> <p>e. Growing and Developing Professionally Enhancement of Content Knowledge and Pedagogical Skill Receptivity to Feedback from Colleagues Service to the Profession</p> <p>f. Showing Professionalism Integrity and Ethical Conduct Service to Students Advocacy Decision Making Compliance with School and District Regulations</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Domain 3 Instruction</p> <p>a. Communicating with Students Expectations for Learning Directions for Activities Explanations of Content Use of Oral and Written Language</p> <p>b. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques Quality of Questions/Prompts Discussion Techniques Student Participation</p> <p>c. Engaging Students in Learning Activities and Assignments Grouping of Students Instructional Materials and Resources Structure and Pacing</p> <p>d. Using Assessment in Instruction Assessment Criteria Monitoring of Student Learning Feedback to Students Student Self-Assessment and Monitoring of Progress</p> <p>e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness Lesson Adjustment Response to Students Persistence</p>

Teacher Evaluation Training Programs

Training is critical to ensure a successful teacher evaluation program based on the South Dakota Professional Teaching Standards. The Teacher Evaluation Workgroup makes the following recommendations:

I. Training

It is recommended all certified teachers who are being evaluated and all administrators who are conducting the evaluations complete the Danielson 101 course. The workgroup recommends the Danielson 101 be broadened to include information regarding the rating system.

It is recommended that all administrators who will be conducting evaluations complete an online certification course. It is also recommended for teachers to become familiar with the evaluation process and also to aid with the implementation of peer observations should the district so elect.

The Teacher Evaluation Workgroup recommends that all teachers and all administrators be required to attend training on the South Dakota Teacher Performance Standards with all costs related to the training paid for with state funding. There will be no additional compensation for participants, nor will there be any cost incurred by the local districts. Teachers and administrators that can show evidence of already being trained in the South Dakota Professional Teaching Standards may be granted a waiver from any training requirements.

II. Pilot

The pilot project would be open to any school district. Resources and training will be provided by the Department of Education according to the following timeline:

- a. During 2013-2014 the training will be delivered to the pilot sites. It is also recommended to extend the training to all interested personnel in higher education.
- b. During 2014-2015 the evaluation model will be implemented

The pilot project should include schools of all size enrollments. Lastly, the Department of Education should establish a valid and reliable research study to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the pilot schools implementation of the South Dakota Professional Teaching Standards.

III. Communications Plan

It is recommended the Department of Education establish a strategic communications plan to guide the roll out of the implementation of the South Dakota Professional Teaching Standards. The plan should be designed to have multiple stages related to targeted audiences. Teachers and administrators must be the first to receive communications.

South Dakota Professional Teaching Standards Training Opportunities

The University of South Dakota will be offering a 16-week, one-credit online course called “EDAD 792: Introduction to SD Professional Teaching Standards: The Danielson Framework.” The course explores the South Dakota Teaching Standards (i.e., Danielson Framework). Participants will gain knowledge of the domains, components and elements within the framework, discuss the levels of performance and language of the framework, and will practice first steps of collecting and sorting evidence from within the framework. [Click here](#) to access; scroll down the page. \$125 stipends will be provided to administrators who successfully complete the course, courtesy of the Bush Foundation.

The Department of Education plans to offer training opportunities specific to the Danielson Framework/Teachscape software during summer 2013, assuming the Governor’s budget proposal to provide public school districts with Teachscape license/software passes. Teachscape is the Danielson-endorsed software product. As part of the package, the training opportunity would provide in-depth video-rich training, including video-based scoring practice and a rigorous assessment to test observer accuracy in scoring evidence of teaching practice and increase the reliability of observations. This training is expected to be a combination of face-to-face and online training and involve an estimated 30 hours. Stipends will be available to administrators. More information to come following the legislative session.

Recommended Next Steps

- Develop a training program for evaluators. This program would be a follow up to the introductory on-line course that will be offered in the spring of 2013 by USD.
- Develop a research based pilot program to implement the Framework for Teaching. This program should be research-based with a clear set of deliverables.
- A communications plan will need to be developed to inform districts about the progress of the teacher evaluation instrument and the implementation plan for interested school districts.
- A discussion should be held about the development of a set of recommendations to guide the Post-secondary institutions as they integrate the South Dakota Professional Teaching Standards in their teacher education programs.
- There was a suggestion for South Dakota to review the Iowa Teacher initiative that has been proposed for the 2013 Iowa legislative session. There are a number of components of the Iowa plan that could have implications in South Dakota.
- A number of corresponding tools should be developed to accompany the Teacher Evaluation instrument. Those tools include but would not be limited to a 360 degree assessment, self-assessment, peer-assessment and forms that assist with the implementation of the evaluation instrument such as a pre-conference and post-conference form.
- A study of the relationship between the work of the Teacher Evaluation work group and the state's accountability plan and related School Performance Index needs to be conducted.

Statutory Authority

SDCL 13-42-33. **Promulgation of rules on performance standards.** The Board of Education shall, no later than July 1, 2011, promulgate rules pursuant to chapter 1-26 to establish minimum professional performance standards for certified teachers in South Dakota public schools, and to establish best practices for the evaluation of the performance of certified teachers that may be used by individual school districts.

Source: SL 2010, ch 94, § 1.

SDCL 13-42-34. **Teacher evaluations.** Any public school district seeking state accreditation shall evaluate the performance of each certified teacher in years one through three not less than annually, and each certified teacher in the fourth contract year or beyond, not less than every other year.

Each school district shall adopt procedures for evaluating the performance of certified teachers employed by the school district that:

- (1) Are based on the minimum professional performance standards established by the Board of Education pursuant to § 13-42-33;
- (2) Require multiple measures;
- (3) Serve as the basis for programs to increase professional growth and development of certified teachers; and
- (4) Include a plan of assistance for any certified teacher, who is in the fourth or subsequent year of teaching, and whose performance does not meet the school district's performance standards.

Source: SL 2010, ch 94, § 2.

SDCL 13-42-35. **Work group to develop model evaluation instrument.** A work group appointed by the secretary of education shall provide input in developing the standards and shall develop a model evaluation instrument that may be used by school districts. The work group shall consist of the following:

- (1) Six teachers: two from an elementary school, two from a middle school, and two from a high school;
- (2) Three principals: one from an elementary school, one from a middle school, and one from high school;
- (3) Two superintendents;
- (4) Two school board members;
- (5) Four parents who have students in various levels of the K-12 system;
- (6) One representative of the South Dakota Education Association;
- (7) One representative of the School Administrators of South Dakota; and
- (8) One representative of the Associated School Boards of South Dakota.

Source: SL 2010, ch 94, § 3.

Statutory Authority

SDCL 13-3-62. **State accountability system established.** A single, statewide state accountability system is established. The system shall hold public schools accountable for the academic achievement of their students and shall ensure that all public schools make yearly progress in continuously and substantially improving the academic achievement of their students.

Source: SL 2003, ch 90, § 1; SL 2012, ch 89, § 1.

SDCL 13-3-69. **Promulgation of rules to establish state accountability system.** The South Dakota Board of Education may promulgate administrative rules pursuant to chapter 1-26 to establish the state accountability system based on achievement and other indicators including:

- (1) A definition of academic progress;
- (3) The method of calculating yearly progress in mathematics and reading for all public schools, including methods for determining both the status and growth;
- (3) A definition of four levels of student achievement, including a proficient level;
- (4) Determination of cut scores in mathematics and reading for each level of student achievement;
- (5) Establishment of the measurable objectives for academic progress;
- (6) Establishment of a system of sanctions, rewards, and recognition;
- (7) Establishment of the process for teacher and principal evaluation;
- (8) Determination of the criteria to demonstrate student preparedness for college and career for each public high school;
- (9) Determination of the method for calculating the attendance rate for each public elementary and middle school;
- (10) Establishment of an appeal process for public schools; and
- (11) Establishment of a process whereby the state accountability system will be periodically reviewed.

Source: SL 2003, ch 90, § 8; SL 2012, ch 89, § 6.

Rules

24:08:06:01. Teacher performance standards. Beginning in the 2014-2015 school year, the minimum professional performance standards to be used as a basis for evaluating teacher performance shall be aligned with the twenty-two components, clustered into domains one through four, inclusive, in The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument (2011 edition) by Charlotte Danielson.

Source: 38 SDR 58, effective October 17, 2011; 39 SDR 32, effective September 3, 2012.

General Authority: SDCL 13-3-69(7), 13-42-33, 13-42-34.

Law Implemented: SDCL 13-3-69(7), 13-42-33, 13-42-34.

Reference: Charlotte Danielson, **The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument**, published by the Danielson Group, 2011 edition. The materials are available for viewing at the South Dakota Department of Education, 800 Governors Drive, Pierre, South Dakota. Copies may be obtained from www.danielsongroup.org.

24:55:01:04. Public school accountability system defined. For purposes of this article, the term, accountability system, means a system established by the state to ensure that all public schools make yearly progress in continuously and substantially improving the performance of their students and make yearly progress in increasing the quality of instruction and leadership. The accountability system shall:

- (1) Be implemented and administered for all public schools through department policies and procedures consistent with SDCL [13-3-62](#) to [13-3-69](#), inclusive, and the requirements of this article;
- (2) Be based upon the content standards in reading and mathematics approved by the state board of education;
- (3) Include measurements of student achievement in reading and mathematics based on the state academic assessment;
- (4) Include four levels of student achievement for reading and mathematics: advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic, as referenced in SDCL [13-3-66](#), that are based on mastery of the content standards as measured by academic achievement tests, with cut scores for each level established by the department;
- (5) Include multiple indicators of public school performance;
- (6) Include a process for evaluating and supporting teachers and principals that is designed to improve their effectiveness in maximizing student learning, with the process being based on professional performance standards and multiple measures, and that informs professional growth and development of teachers and principals;
- (7) Include a six-year cycle that is coordinated with the school accreditation requirements of article 24:43;
- (8) Include annual measurements and public reporting based on the data collected pursuant to SDCL [13-3-51](#);
- (9) Include a system of classification, sanctions, rewards, and recognition;

Source: 39 SDR 51, effective October 3, 2012.

General Authority: SDCL [13-3-69](#).

Law Implemented: SDCL [13-3-62](#), 13-3-69.

Appendix

Appendix A. List of 2011-12 pilot districts for the Danielson Framework

Aberdeen
Brookings
Custer
Deuel (middle school only)
Harrisburg
Kimball
McCook Central
Stanley County
Todd County
Wagner
White River

Appendix B. Danielson Rubric and Observation Tools

Framework for Teaching

http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/documents/TS_RefCard.pdf

Framework for Teaching Proficiency Test Instrument

Evaluative Language for Writing Teacher Observations

Complete Framework used during the South Dakota Pilots

<http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/documents/FramwkIns.docx>

Appendix C. Forms

Pre-Observation Forms (completed by the teacher)

- Pre-Observation Form – Portland Maine (page 33)
http://www.nctq.org/docs/Portland_Evaluation_Guidebook_V6.pdf
- Pre-Observation Conference Guide – Hillsborough Florida
- Pre-Observation Conference Questions – Hillsborough Florida

Observation Form

- Observation Form I – Portland Maine (pages 36-44)
http://www.nctq.org/docs/Portland_Evaluation_Guidebook_V6.pdf
- Classroom Teacher Evaluation Instrument – Hillsborough Florida
- Summative Feedback Form Version II – Delaware
<http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/files/teachforms/DPASTeachSumFdbkForm1doc.doc>
- Sample Format Summative Evaluation for Professional Staff – South Dakota
- South Dakota Summative Evaluation Form – South Dakota
<http://doe.sd.gov/secretary/documents/SumEvProS.pdf>

Post-Observation Form

- Post-Observation Conference Reflection Questions – Portland Maine (page 94)
http://www.nctq.org/docs/Portland_Evaluation_Guidebook_V6.pdf
- Post-Observation Conference Tool – Hillsborough Florida
- Lesson Reflection Sheet – Delaware
<http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/files/teachforms/DPASTeachLesRefISht.doc>
- Conference Discussion Guide (Completed by Evaluators) – Hillsborough Florida

Sample Feedback Form

- Satisfactory Documentation Example – Delaware
<http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/new/SatDocofSatlesson.pdf>
- Unsatisfactory Documentation Example - Delaware
<http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/files/InSuffDocofSatlesson.pdf>

Follow-up Forms

- Expectations Follow-Up Form– Delaware
<http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/files/teachforms/DPASTeachExtFollUpFrm.doc>
- Improvement Plan for Teachers – Delaware
<http://www.doe.k12.de.us/csa/dpasii/files/teachforms/DPASTeachImpPlanFrm.doc>
- Comprehensive Assessment Future Growth Plan – Tennessee
<http://tennessee.gov/education/frameval/doc/fgp.pdf>

Other

- Teacher Self Reflection Form – Portland Maine (pages 27-29)
http://www.nctq.org/docs/Portland_Evaluation_Guidebook_V6.pdf
- Professional Growth Form – Portland Maine (pages 30-32)
http://www.nctq.org/docs/Portland_Evaluation_Guidebook_V6.pdf
- Peer Evaluation Protocols – Hillsborough Florida
- Peer to Peer Classroom Observation Form – New Hanover County North Carolina
<http://www.nhcs.k12.nc.us/snipes/Forms/PeertoPeerClassroomObservationForm.pdf>
- 360 Survey Documents – Jackson Public School District Mississippi (pages 31-42)
<http://www.nctq.org/docs/81-07.pdf>

Appendix D. Pre-Observation Forms - Samples

Pre-Observation Form

It is required that the educator completes the form and arrives prepared to discuss these questions at the pre-observation conference. Refer to the *Portland Framework for Teaching in preparation for the conference.*

Name of Educator:	
School:	
Grade Level/Subject(s):	
Name of Observer:	
Date of Pre-Observation Conference:	
Date of Scheduled Classroom Observation:	
Type of Lesson:	
Learning Outcomes: (1c)	

Evidence will be gathered in all components in Domains 2 and 3. However, there might be specific components where additional feedback is requested. Which specific components within Domains 2 and 3 would you like the evaluator to pay special attention to during the lesson?

Component Focus:	Domain 2: _____
	Domain 3: _____

Interview Protocol for a Pre-observation Conference

Questions for discussion:

1. To which part of your curriculum does this lesson relate? (1e)
2. How does this learning "fit" in the sequence of learning for this class? (1b,1e,1a)
3. Briefly describe the students in this class, including those with special needs. (1b)
4. What do you want the students to understand? (1c, 1f)
5. How will you engage the students in the learning? What will you do? What will the students do? Will the students work in groups, or individually, or as a large group? Provide any worksheets or other materials the students will be using. (1d,1e,1a)
6. How will you differentiate instruction for different individuals or groups of students in the class? (1d,1c)
7. How and when will you know whether the students have learned what you intend? (1f)



Pre-Observation Conference Questions

(To be completed by teacher prior to pre-observation conference)

Teacher name: _____ Date: _____

School name: _____ Observer Name: _____

School code: _____

Please provide brief answers (bullet points or narrative) to each question.

Learning Goals and Objectives

1. What is/are your lesson objective(s)? (Components 1A, 1C)

2. How is/are the lesson objective(s) aligned with state curriculum standards? (Components 1A, 1C)

3. What information/data did you use to design this lesson? How did the information/data influence the planning of this lesson? (Components 1B, 1C, 1F)

Assessment

4. How will you know if your lesson objective(s) was/were achieved? (Component 1F)

Appendix E. Post-Observation Forms - Samples



Post-Observation Conference Tool

(Optional – May be used to reflect on the lesson prior to the post observation conference.)

Teacher name: _____ Observation Date: _____
School name: _____ Subject area: _____
Grade: _____ Observed: _____
Lesson topic: _____

Please provide brief answers (bullet points or narrative) to each question.

1. Do you feel you successfully achieved the lesson objective(s)? Why/why not? What data support your answer to the previous question?
2. What do you feel worked well and what would you refine if you were to teach this lesson again to the same class?
3. Based on student learning of your objectives, what are your next steps?
4. As you reflect over this observation cycle, what ideas or insights are you discovering about your teaching? <i>(Think specifically about your Professional Development Plan.)</i>

**DELAWARE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM II
LESSON REFLECTION SHEET (FOR TEACHERS)**

Teacher _____ Evaluator _____

School _____ Date of Conference _____

Grade(s) _____ Subject Area(s) _____

This form is optional

*The teacher may choose to complete this form, in whole or in part, and bring it to the Post-observation Conference. **The teacher has full discretion as to whether this form is completed and/or shared with the evaluator.***

Reflect and comment on the different aspects of your instructional delivery for this particular lesson. To what extent was the lesson effective? What would you do differently to improve the lesson?

	Were the following aspects of your instructional delivery effective? Why or why not?	What would you do differently to improve the lesson?
Instructional Strategies		
Student Grouping(s)		
Student Activities		
Materials, Resources, and Technology		
Assessment Methods		
Classroom Management/Student Behavior		
Student Engagement/Interest		

Post-observation conference steps
<p><u>Introduction and Greeting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set the tone. • Establish the length of the conference. • Review the summary conference process.
<p><u>Discussion: Guiding questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you feel you successfully achieved the lesson objective(s)? Why/why not? • What data support your answer to the previous question? • What do you feel worked well and what would you refine if you were to teach this lesson again to the same class? • Based on student learning of your objectives, what are your next steps? • As you reflect over this observation cycle, what ideas or insights are you discovering about your teaching?
<p><u>Strengths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share strengths of the lesson and provide examples. • Prompt the teacher to talk about one strength you want to reinforce. Elicit feedback to explain why the skill is critical to student learning.
<p><u>Areas for Focus</u></p> <p>Share three areas for focus and provide examples from the observation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. <p>Recommend actions to improve practice (e.g. training courses, peer observation, lesson modeling).</p>
<p><u>Closing</u></p> <p>Discuss next steps including professional development</p>

Appendix F. Sample Evaluation Schedule

