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Current State
Teacher Evaluation at Chicago Public Schools

- Observation tool is a 35-year-old compliance-focused checklist
- Tenured teachers in good standing evaluated every two years; pre-tenured teachers evaluated annually
- System does not include teaching standards or guidance to principals regarding application
  - More than 90% of teachers are rated Excellent or Superior (top 2 ratings)
  - Ratings cannot be compared across schools or used for district-level personnel decisions
The Vision
Teacher Evaluation at Chicago Public Schools

1) Detailed feedback for teachers during formative evaluations
2) Summative evaluation that draws upon student achievement and teacher practice data
3) Evaluation tied to targeted support, tenure attainment, and career ladders

The Performance Evaluation Reform Act of 2010, signed into Illinois law on January 15, 2010, requires:

• Use of student growth data for all teachers
• Standards-based teacher observation practices
• Aggressive timeline for implementation (2012)
• 90-day window of collaboration with union; CPS implements last best offer if parties cannot reach agreement

Excellence in Teaching Project
A Brief Timeline
The Excellence in Teaching Project

2006-2008: CPS-CTU Joint Committee on Teacher Evaluation
- Selection of Charlotte Danielson’s *Framework for Teaching* as the definition of effective teaching practice
- Principals and teachers at 9 volunteer schools test the Framework

SY 2008-2009: Year 1, the Excellence in Teaching Project
- 44 CPS elementary schools randomly selected for the pilot
- 43 schools successfully implemented the Framework

SY 2009-2010: Expansion of the pilot
- 100 CPS elementary schools implementing the Framework
- Working groups with 8 high schools and instructional coaches

SY 2010-2011: High school pilot and district-wide refinement
- 232 CPS elementary schools in 14 Areas will be implementing the Framework
- 28 CPS high schools in 7 Areas will help navigate high school-specific issues
Overview
The CPS Framework for Teaching

- Modified slightly, with permission, from Charlotte Danielson’s Framework
- Describes effective teaching practices for all classroom teachers across all grades and subjects
- Rubric for each component has four performance levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 1: Planning and Preparation</th>
<th>Domain 2: The Classroom Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy</td>
<td>2a Creating an environment of respect and rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b Demonstrating knowledge of students</td>
<td>2b Establishing a culture for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c Setting instructional outcomes</td>
<td>2c Managing classroom procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d Demonstrating knowledge of resources</td>
<td>2d Managing student behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e Designing coherent instruction</td>
<td>2e Organizing physical space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f Designing student assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities</th>
<th>Domain 5: Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a Reflecting on teaching</td>
<td>3a Communicating with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b Maintaining accurate records</td>
<td>3b Using questioning and discussion techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c Communicating with families</td>
<td>3c Engaging students in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d Participating in a professional community</td>
<td>3d Using assessment in instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e Growing and developing professionally</td>
<td>3e Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f Demonstrating professionalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CPS Framework for Teaching has been modified slightly, with permission, from Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching.
Levels of Performance
The CPS Framework for Teaching

**Unsatisfactory:** Practice that is doing harm

**Basic:** Inconsistent, inexperienced practice

**Proficient:** Experienced, effective practice

**Distinguished:** Student-led community of learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Distinguished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2c: Managing classroom</td>
<td>Much instructional time is lost due to inefficient classroom routines and</td>
<td>Some instructional time is lost due to only partially effective classroom routines and procedures, for transitions, handling of</td>
<td>Little instructional time is lost due to classroom routines and procedures, for transitions,</td>
<td>Students contribute to the seamless operation of classroom routines and procedures, for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedures</td>
<td>procedures, for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-</td>
<td>procedures, for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties.</td>
<td>transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties, which occur</td>
<td>transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instructional duties</td>
<td></td>
<td>smoothly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proficient**

Little instructional time is lost due to classroom routines and procedures, for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties, which occur smoothly.

**Distinguished**

Students contribute to the seamless operation of classroom routines and procedures, for transitions, handling of supplies, and performance of non-instructional duties.
Studying the CPS Excellence in Teaching Project

Presented by Lauren Sartain, CCSR
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CCSR Study: Research Questions & Methods

1. What are principal and teacher perceptions of the Framework?
   - Interviews with principals and teachers

2. Is the Framework a reliable tool? *Is it valid*?
   - Joint classroom observations by school administrators and external observers

3. How does the Framework and teacher evaluation relate to bigger school change?
   - Case studies in elementary schools
1. Principal and Teacher Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mostly Positive</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Mostly Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Attitudes</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Attitudes</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Overall, more than half of principals highly engaged in Year 1*
2. Reliability of the Framework

- High level of agreement about low-level teaching
- Principals more likely to label practice as “distinguished”
- There are some differences in how individual principals rate
  - 30% severe
  - 16% lenient
Questions Raised: Summative Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>% of Ts who meet the benchmark (N=130)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No unsatisfactory</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only 4 basic</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only 2 basic</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only proficient and distinguished</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions about . . .

The Excellence in Teaching Project
Sheri Frost Leo
Visit our website: www.ChicagoTeacherExcellence.org
E-mail: TeacherExcellence@cps.k12.il.us

The Consortium on Chicago School Research
Lauren Sartain
Visit our website: ccsr.uchicago.edu
E-mail: lsartain@ccsr.uchicago.edu