



Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot

Teacher Criteria, Criteria Definitions, and Instructional Framework Alignment

Washington State Teacher Criteria (RCW 28A.405.100 2(b))	Washington State Teacher Criteria Definitions
1. Centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement.	EXPECTATIONS The teacher communicates high expectations for student learning.
2. Demonstrating effective teaching practices.	INSTRUCTION The teacher uses research-based instructional practices to meet the needs of all students.
3. Recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs.	DIFFERENTIATION The teacher acquires and uses specific knowledge about students' cultural, individual intellectual and social development and uses that knowledge to adjust their practice by employing strategies that advance student learning.
4. Providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum.	CONTENT KNOWLEDGE The teacher uses content area knowledge, learning standards, appropriate pedagogy and resources to design and deliver curricula and instruction to impact student learning.
5. Fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment.	LEARNING ENVIRONMENT The teacher fosters and manages a safe and inclusive learning environment that takes into account: physical, emotional and intellectual well-being.
6. Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning.	ASSESSMENT The teacher uses multiple data elements (both formative and summative) to plan, inform and adjust instruction and evaluate student learning.
7. Communicating and collaborating with parents and school community.	FAMILIES AND COMMUNITY The teacher communicates and collaborates with students, families and all educational stakeholders in an ethical and professional manner to promote student learning.
8. Exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving instructional practice and student learning.	PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE The teacher participates collaboratively in the educational community to improve instruction, advance the knowledge and practice of teaching as a profession, and ultimately impact student learning.



Architecture of the Three Research-Based Instructional Frameworks

	Framework		
	Danielson Framework for Teaching	CEL 5D+™ Teacher Evaluation Rubric 2.0	Marzano Art and Science of Teaching Framework
Domain or Dimension	<p>Domains</p> <p>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</p> <p>Domain 2: The Classroom Environment</p> <p>Domain 3: Instruction</p> <p>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities</p>	<p>Dimensions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose • Student Engagement • Curriculum and Pedagogy • Assessment for Student Learning • Classroom Environment and Culture • Professional Collaboration and Communication 	<p>Domains</p> <p>Domain 1: Classroom Strategies and Behaviors</p> <p>Domain 2: Planning and Preparing</p> <p>Domain 3: Reflecting on Teaching</p> <p>Domain 4: Collegiality and Professionalism</p>
Components	Components – 22	Subdimensions – 13	Components– 31
Evaluation Level Rubric (4 level)	<i>(Example – Component 1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students)</i>	<i>(Example – Student Engagement: Intellectual Work)</i>	<i>(Example – 3.1: The teacher knows individual student learning needs to design instruction)</i>
Support for observation	Indicators	Indicators	Possible Teacher Evidence Possible Student Evidence
	Critical Attributes/Possible Examples – teacher and student	Possible Teacher Observables Possible Student Observables	Possible Artifacts Possible Impacts

Note: The component numbers for both Danielson and CEL are reflective of the component numbers in their original frameworks, thus they may not be in numerical order.



Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot

Criterion 1: Centering instruction on high expectations for student achievement

Key Word: EXPECTATIONS

Definition: *The teacher develops and communicates high expectations for student learning.*

Danielson	CEL 5D+	Marzano
<p>Domain 2: The Classroom Environment</p> <p>2b: Establishing a Culture for Learning</p> <p>Domain 3: Instruction</p> <p>3a: Communicating with Students</p> <p>3c: Engaging Students in Learning</p>	<p>Purpose</p> <p>P1: Connection to standards, broader purpose and transferable skill</p> <p>P4: Communication of learning target(s)</p> <p>P5: Success criteria and performance task(s)</p> <p>Student Engagement</p> <p>SE3: Work of high cognitive demand</p> <p>Classroom Environment & Culture</p> <p>CEC3: Discussion, collaboration and accountability</p>	<p>Component 1.1: Providing Clear Learning Goals and Scales (Rubrics)</p> <p>Component 1.2: Celebrating Success</p> <p>Component 1.3: Understanding Students' Interests and Backgrounds</p> <p>Component 1.4: Demonstrating Value and Respect for Low Expectancy Students</p>



Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot

Criterion 2: Demonstrating effective teaching practices.

Key word: INSTRUCTION

Definition: *The teacher uses research-based instructional practices to meet the needs of all students.*

Danielson	CEL 5D+	Marzano
<p>Domain 3: Instruction</p> <p>3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques</p> <p>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>4a: Reflecting on Teaching</p>	<p>Student Engagement</p> <p>SE1: Quality of questioning</p> <p>SE5: Expectation, support and opportunity for participation and meaning making</p> <p>SE6: Substance of student talk</p> <p>Curriculum & Pedagogy</p> <p>CP6: Scaffolds the task</p> <p>CP7: Gradual release of responsibility</p>	<p>Component 2.1: Interacting with New Knowledge</p> <p>Component 2.2: Organizing Students to Practice and Deepen Knowledge</p> <p>Component 2.3: Organizing Students for Cognitively Complex Tasks</p> <p>Component 2.4: Asking Questions of Low Expectancy Students</p> <p>Component 2.5: Probing Incorrect Answers with Low Expectancy Students</p> <p>Component 2.6: Noticing when Students are Not Engaged</p> <p>Component 2.7: Using and Applying Academic Vocabulary</p> <p>Component 2.8: Evaluating Effectiveness of Individual Lessons and Units</p>



Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot

Criterion 3: Recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs.

Key word: DIFFERENTIATION

Definition: *The teacher acquires and uses specific knowledge about students' cultural, individual intellectual and social development and uses that knowledge to adjust their practice by employing strategies that advance student learning.*

Danielson	CEL 5D+	Marzano
<p>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</p> <p>1b: Demonstrating Knowledge of Students</p> <p>Domain 3: Instruction</p> <p>3e: Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness</p>	<p>Purpose</p> <p>P3: Teaching point(s) are based on students' learning needs</p> <p>Student Engagement</p> <p>SE2: Ownership of learning</p> <p>SE4: Strategies that capitalize on learning needs of students</p> <p>Curriculum & Pedagogy</p> <p>CP5: Differentiated instruction</p> <p>Assessment for Student Learning</p> <p>A6: Teacher use of formative assessment data</p>	<p>Component 3.1: Effective Scaffolding of Information Within Lessons</p> <p>Component 3.2: Planning and Preparing for the Needs of All Students</p>
<p>Student Growth 3.1: Establish Student Growth Goal(s) - Individual Student(s)</p>		
<p>Student Growth 3.2: Achievement of Student Growth Goal(s) - Individual Student(s)</p>		



Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot

Criterion 4: Providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum.

Key Word: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Definition: *The teacher uses content area knowledge, learning standards, appropriate pedagogy and resources to design and deliver curricula, instruction to impact student learning.*

Danielson	CEL 5D+	Marzano
<p>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</p> <p>1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy</p> <p>1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes</p> <p>1d: Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources</p> <p>1e: Designing Coherent Instruction</p>	<p>Purpose</p> <p>P2: Connection to previous and future lessons</p> <p>Curriculum & Pedagogy</p> <p>CP1: Alignment of instructional materials and tasks</p> <p>CP2: Discipline-specific conceptual understanding</p> <p>CP3: Pedagogical content knowledge</p> <p>CP4: Teacher knowledge of content</p>	<p>Component 4.1: Attention to Established Content Standards</p> <p>Component 4.2: Use of Available Resources and Technology</p>



Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot

Criterion 5: Fostering and managing a safe, positive learning environment.

Key word: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Definition: *The teacher fosters and manages a safe and inclusive learning environment that takes into account: physical, emotional and intellectual well-being.*

Danielson	CEL 5D+	Marzano
<p>Domain 2: The Classroom Environment</p> <p>2a: Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport</p> <p>2c: Managing Classroom Procedures</p> <p>2d: Managing Student Behavior</p> <p>2e: Organizing Physical Space</p>	<p>Classroom Environment & Culture</p> <p>CEC1: Arrangement of classroom</p> <p>CEC2: Accessibility and use of materials</p> <p>CEC4: Use of learning time</p> <p>CEC5: Managing student behavior</p> <p>CEC6: Student status</p> <p>CEC7: Norms for learning</p>	<p>Component 5.1: Organizing the Physical Layout of the Classroom</p> <p>Component 5.2: Reviewing Expectations to Rules and Procedures</p> <p>Component 5.3: Demonstrating “Withitness”</p> <p>Component 5.4: Applying Consequences for Lack of Adherence to Rules and Procedures</p> <p>Component 5.5: Acknowledging Adherence to Rules and Procedures</p> <p>Component 5.6: Displaying Objectivity and Control</p>



Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot

Criterion 6: Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning.

Key word: ASSESSMENT

Definition: *The teacher uses multiple data elements (both formative and summative) to plan, inform and adjust instruction and evaluate student learning.*

Danielson	CEL 5D+	Marzano
<p>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</p> <p>1f: Designing Student Assessments</p> <p>Domain 3: Instruction</p> <p>3d: Using Assessment in Instruction</p> <p>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>4b: Maintaining Accurate Records</p>	<p>Assessment for Student Learning</p> <p>A1: Self-assessment of learning connected to the success criteria</p> <p>A2: Demonstration of learning</p> <p>A3: Formative assessment opportunities</p> <p>A4: Collection systems for formative assessment data</p> <p>A5: Student use of assessment data</p>	<p>Component 6.1: Designing Instruction Aligned to Assessment</p> <p>Component 6.2: Using Multiple Data Elements</p> <p>Component 6.3: Tracking Student Progress</p>
<p>Student Growth 6.1: Establish Student Growth Goal(s) - Whole Class(es)</p>		
<p>Student Growth 6.2: Achievement of Student Growth Goal(s) - Whole Class(es)</p>		



Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot

Criterion 7: Communicating and collaborating with parents and school community.

Key word: FAMILIES AND COMMUNITY

Definition: *The teacher communicates and collaborates with students, families and all educational stakeholders in an ethical and professional manner to promote student learning.*

Danielson	CEL 5D+	Marzano
<p>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>4c: Communicating with Families</p>	<p>Professional Collaboration & Communication</p> <p>PCC3: Parents and guardians</p> <p>PCC4: Communication within the school community about student progress</p>	<p>Component 7.1: Promoting Positive Interactions about Students and Parents – Courses, Programs and School Events</p> <p>Component 7.2: Promoting Positive Interactions about Students and Parents – Timeliness and Professionalism</p>



Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot

Criterion 8: Exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving instructional practice and student learning

Key word: PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE

Definition: *The teacher participates collaboratively in the educational community to improve instruction, advance the knowledge and practice of teaching as a profession, and ultimately impact student learning.*

Danielson	CEL 5D+	Marzano
<p>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities</p> <p>4d: Participating in a Professional Community</p> <p>4e: Growing and Developing Professionally</p> <p>4f: Showing Professionalism</p>	<p>Professional Collaboration & Communication</p> <p>PCC1: Collaboration with peers and administrators to improve student learning</p> <p>PCC2: Professional and collegial relationships</p> <p>PCC5: Supports school, district, and state curriculum, policy and initiatives</p> <p>PCC6: Ethics and advocacy</p>	<p>Component 8.1: Seeking Mentorship for Areas of Need or Interest</p> <p>Component 8.2: Promoting Positive Interactions with Colleagues</p> <p>Component 8.3: Participating in District and School Initiatives</p> <p>Component 8.4: Monitoring Progress Relative to the Professional Growth and Development Plan</p>
<p>Student Growth 8.1: Establish Student Growth Goal(s), Implement, and Monitor Growth Grade-level, Subject matter, or other Instructional Team</p>		



Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot

Document Background

September 2010-July 2011

Operationalizing the 8 Washington State Teacher Criteria

Between August 2010 and June 2011, the TPEP districts defined the new teacher evaluation criteria (RCW 28A.405.100 2(b)). This work was published in the July 2011 TPEP legislative report (http://tpep.files.wordpress.com/2011/07/tpep_leg_report-july_2011_full.pdf).

The TPEP districts continued to build their models by mapping their chosen instructional framework back to the 8 Washington State Teacher Criteria. This alignment of each framework back to the “State 8” was done with the input of the instructional framework authors and TPEP districts’ involvement.

July 2011-September 2011

Three Frameworks

Under the direction of the TPEP steering committee, another round of grants were awarded to 65 districts (Regional Implementation Grants) to begin the process of determining the components and implementation plan for their teacher and principal evaluation systems. These districts were not selected to replicate the work of the TPEP pilots, but to begin the same important decision making process around the components of a new comprehensive evaluation model based on both accountability and professional growth. Within the RIG process, districts are given 3 options (Danielson, Marzano and CEL 5D+) for the instructional framework component of their new evaluation model.

October-November 2011

Alignment of Frameworks to the Washington State Teacher Criteria (“State 8”)

While the work of aligning **each individual** framework back to the “State 8” was complete, the alignment across the frameworks and final draft of the definitions accompanying each criterion was still work to finalize. This work is important for two specific reasons:

1. In order for the state to be assured there is consistency and commonality across the individual district systems, an alignment across the three instructional frameworks back to a common understanding of the state criteria was established.
2. In order for RIG districts to be deliberate in their selection of an instructional framework having the alignment and clear definitions of the criterion is critical to their collaborative district process in analyzing and ultimately selecting an instructional framework that will serve as the foundation of their system.

A committee convened and completed this alignment work on November 1st, 2011. This committee was comprised of practitioners representing each of the three instructional frameworks.

September 2011-July 2012

Student Growth

In September 2011, OSPI and the TPEP steering committee initiated a student growth committee to analyze the incorporation of student growth in the evaluation model underway. In the spring, ESSB 5895 outlined more specifically the requirements of student growth and the committee responded by creating rubrics specifically aligned to “three of the evaluation criteria.”

- **Criterion 3 - Individual Student(s)**
- **Criterion 6 - Whole Class(es)**
- **Criterion 8 - Grade -level, Subject matter, or other Instructional Team**



Teacher/Principal Evaluation Pilot

FAQ

1. Can districts pick and choose elements to construct their own framework using the three models listed below (Danielson, CEL 5D+and Marzano)?

No. The intent is to choose one of the three frameworks and adhere to its alignment to the eight Washington State teacher criteria. This document was carefully constructed with input by TPEP practitioners and the authors of the three instructional frameworks. Reconstructing a new framework out of the three instructional frameworks compromise the integrity of the “research base” that each of the framework authors identify in their work.

2. How should I use this document and will it ever change?

This document will contain a date stamp (lower left-hand corner) and every time the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction makes any changes, we will date stamp accordingly. Please note that future changes will be subtle and this document can and should be used to begin discussions around instructional frameworks. This document does not replace studying the framework rubrics, but serves as state instructional framework overview.