Development of CEL's Teacher Evaluation Rubric

Based on CEL's Instructional Framework: The 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning

The research on teacher quality as the primary correlate for student achievement is unequivocal – teaching matters above all else, including family income and education (Haycock, 1998; Peske & Haycock, 2006). A close examination of variance in student achievement across the country yields once again that differences among students, as well as schools, are but a small factor compared to differences in the quality of teaching from classroom to classroom (Rowan, Correnti, & Miller, 2002). There is also a growing body of research evidence that suggests leadership is only second to teaching as the highest correlate to student achievement (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson & Wahlstrom, 2004) and that clarifies the important relationship school district central office leaders can play in supporting student learning across a system (Copland & Knapp, 2006; Honig, 2008; Wahlstrom, Seashore, Leithwood & Anderson, 2010). These realities drive CEL's mission and focused its work on an instructional framework to help educators identify and strengthen effective instruction.

Instructional Framework

An instructional framework is a set of descriptions of teaching behaviors, based on research and the work of practitioners, linked to improved student learning. Its purpose is to support teachers and principals in enhancing their instructional expertise and emphasize continuous improvement. The instructional framework creates a common language and vision for high quality instruction that is shared by everyone in a school district.

A common language of instruction is foundational to powerful discourse about effective teaching, instructional feedback, and the collection and use of formative and summative assessment data across a system. An instructional framework is key to improving teaching practice and thus learning for all students.

The 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning Framework

CEL's instructional framework was derived from an extensive four- to five-year effort to mine research on what constitutes quality instruction, informed by the experiences of practitioners identified as possessing demonstrated expertise with observing in classrooms and providing feedback to teachers. CEL's instructional framework was created as part of a research study that asked the following questions: What do expert observers of instruction pay attention to in classrooms? How do experts make sense of what they observe? How do experts use what they see in classrooms to craft feedback to teachers?

Three types of sources were investigated which included (1) empirically based studies of teaching and coaching practice, (2) practitioner-oriented prescriptions and frameworks for instructional and coaching practice, and (3) descriptions of practice from an identified panel of expert observers who included instructional coaches and school administrators working daily with teachers on improving practice. A panel of experts was convened to engage in a multi-stage process of watching videos and visiting classrooms, compiling what they were noticing and wondering about instructional practice.

Five dimensions of teaching and learning emerged from these studies and descriptions, leading to the term ***5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning***. The five dimensions encompass a total of thirteen sub-dimensions as follows:

5 Dimensions and 13 Sub-Dimensions of Teaching and Learning	
Purpose	1. Standards
	2. Teaching Point
Student Engagement	3. Intellectual Work
	4. Engagement Strategies
	5. Talk
Curriculum & Pedagogy	6. Curriculum
	7. Teaching Approaches and/or Strategies
	8. Scaffolds for Learning
Assessment for Student Learning	9. Assessment
	10. Adjustments
Classroom Environment & Culture	11. Use of Physical Environment
	12. Classroom Routines and Rituals
	13. Classroom Culture

A sample of the research supporting each of the dimensions includes:

Purpose

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (Eds.). (2000) *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Saphier, J. & Gower, R. (1997). *The skillful teacher: Building your teaching skills (5th ed.).* Acton, MA: Research for Better Teaching.

Schmoker, M. (2001). *The results fieldbook: Practical strategies from dramatically improved schools.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stronge, J. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Student Engagement

Boaler, J. (2008). Promoting 'relational equity' and high mathematics achievement through an innovative mixed ability approach. *British Educational Research Journal*, 34 (2), 167-194.

Boaler, J. & Staples, M. (20008). Creating mathematical futures through an equitable teaching approach: the case of Railside school. *Teachers College Record*, 110 (3), 608-645.

Cohen, E., & Latan, R. (Eds.) (1997). Working for equity in heterogeneous classrooms: sociological theory in practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cohen, E., Latan, R. A., Scarloss, B. A., & Arellano, A.R. (1999). Complex instruction: Equity in cooperative learning classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 38(2), 80-86.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Saphier, J. & Gower, R. (1997). *The skillful teacher: Building your teaching skills (5th ed.).* Acton, MA: Research for Better Teaching.

Wiske, M. (Ed.). (1998). *Teaching for understanding: Linking research with practice.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Yatvin, J. (2004). *A room with a differentiated view: How to serve all children as individual learners.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Curriculum & Pedagogy

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (Eds.). (2000) *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mooney, M. (1990). *Reading to, with, and by children*. Katonah, NY: Richard C. Owen Publishers.

Saphier, J. & Gower, R. (1997). *The skillful teacher: Building your teaching skills (5th ed.).* Acton, MA: Research for Better Teaching.

Stein, M.K., & Nelson, B.S. (2003). Leadership content knowledge. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 25(4), 423-448.

Stigler, J., & and Hiebert, J. (1999). *The teaching gap: Best ideas from the world's teachers for improving education in the classroom.* New York: The Free Press.

Stronge, J. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Assessment for Student Learning

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (Eds.). (2000) *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R., Pickering, D. & Pollock. J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Saphier, J. & Gower, R. (1997). *The skillful teacher: Building your teaching skills (5th ed.).* Acton, MA: Research for Better Teaching.

Schmoker, M. (2001). *The results fieldbook: Practical strategies from dramatically improved schools.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stigler, J., & and Hiebert, J. (1999). *The teaching gap: Best ideas from the world's teachers for improving education in the classroom.* New York: The Free Press.

Wiske, M. (Ed.). (1998). *Teaching for understanding: Linking research with practice.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Classroom Environment & Culture

Boaler, J. (2008). Promoting 'relational equity' and high mathematics achievement through an innovative mixed ability approach. *British Educational Research Journal,* 34 (2), 167-194.

Boaler, J. & Staples, M. (20008). Creating mathematical futures through an equitable teaching approach: the case of Railside school. *Teachers College Record,* 110 (3), 608-645.

Cohen, E., & Latan, R. (Eds.) (1997). Working for equity in heterogeneous classrooms: sociological theory in practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cohen, E., Latan, R. A., Scarloss, B. A., & Arellano, A.R. (1999). Complex instruction: Equity in cooperative learning classrooms. *Theory into Practice,* 38(2), 80-86.

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R., Pickering, D. & Pollock. J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Saphier, J. & Gower, R. (1997). *The skillful teacher: Building your teaching skills (5th ed.).* Acton, MA: Research for Better Teaching.

Stein, M.K., & Nelson, B.S. (2003). Leadership content knowledge. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 25(4), 423-448.

Stronge, J. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wiske, M. (Ed.). (1998). *Teaching for understanding: Linking research with practice.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Yatvin, J. (2004). *A room with a differentiated view: How to serve all children as individual learners.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Over years of work with practitioners in the field, the exact wording and format of the 5D has been updated for version 2.0 and now 3.0. Researchers at the University of Washington have continued to review research on effective learning and the original dimensions have been consistently affirmed. Meanwhile, practitioners have provided feedback and input about the language and its meaning. The biggest shift from 1.0 to 2.0 was the layout of the card, adding colors and specific names for the sub-dimensions so it was more user-friendly for educators. Version 3.0 incorporated clarifying language

around “status.” CEL’s commitment to continuous improvement drives both ongoing research review and responses to practitioners as they indicate the need to further explain the concepts and ideas.

CEL’s instructional framework is the only comprehensive instructional framework in the country accompanied by an on-line assessment tool that measures leaders’ ability to observe and analyze instruction, provide useful and timely feedback to teachers, and guide teachers’ learning. More than 2,000 district leaders, school leaders, and coaches nationwide have participated in the 5D assessment process since its development.

For additional research that explores the links between student achievement and work with the Center for Educational Leadership, please see Research Brief III (March 2007) *Improving Instruction: Developing the Knowledge and Skills of School Leaders*, Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District and Marysville School District: http://www.k-12leadership.org/research/case-studies

The Teacher Evaluation Rubric

Passage of E2SSB 6696 in Washington state prompted CEL to examine the 5D framework as the basis for a teacher evaluation rubric. The Five Dimensions of Teaching and Learning are a close match to the state criteria that focus specifically on instruction – the interaction at the classroom level with students and content. The state criteria expand to include professional roles of teachers outside the classroom, including communication and collaboration. Using its ten-year knowledge base working with teachers and leaders, and in partnership with the Anacortes School District pilot, CEL developed a four-tier rubric for the existing five dimensions and the professional dimensions required in the law. A University of Washington assessment expert was then hired to review the rubric and ensure language consistency, validity, and measurability.