



University of Idaho

EDAD 504 Charlotte Danielson Framework For Administrative Certification

Fall 2017

Course Syllabus

3 Credits

College of Education
Leadership and Counseling

Instructors

Barbara Leeds, Ed.S.

barbaral@uidaho.edu

Trina C. Caudle, Ed.D.

tcaudle@uidaho.edu

Instructor Availability

Email is the simplest and most effective ways to reach the instructor if you have questions regarding the course or need assistance with course content.

Course Connection to CARE Conceptual Framework

University of Idaho educators CARE. Together we develop as scholar practitioners who value and professionally apply and advance:

Cultural Proficiency;

Assessment, Teaching, and Learning;

Reflective Practice; and,

Engaging in Community Building & Partnerships

Course Description

This course is designed for Idaho Administrators who are seeking certification in Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching, Second Edition. Not only will participants acquire in depth knowledge of Danielson's model, they will be able to implement the model to improve both formative and summative evaluations of staff. Additionally, they will acquire skills necessary to provide staff development so teachers fully understand the implications the evaluation model has for their professional practice and potential earnings.

Goals for the Course

Administrators will learn to reset their thinking regarding teacher observations and the relationship of observation to teacher improvement and student achievement by providing balanced feedback to teachers about their professional practice. They will learn to gather unbiased evidence during drop-in visits, formal observations, observations of PLCs, and other venues in which staff can be observed. They will consider the importance of inter-rater reliability and learn through practice by successfully reviewing videos calibrated to the Danielson model. They will learn to recognize the importance of artifacts as evidence. Administrators will collaborate and network with peers while developing practical resources.

Required Texts/Reading

- Archer, J., Cantrell, S., Holtzman, S.L., Joe, J.N., Tocci, C.M., & Wood, J. (2016). *Better feedback for better teaching: A practical guide to improving classroom observations*. San Francisco, CA.
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A Framework for Teaching*, (2nd Ed.). Alexandria, VA; ASCD.
- Danielson, C. (2013). *The framework for teaching evaluation instrument*. The Danielson Group.

Learning Objectives

- Participants will analyze Idaho Administrative Rule, IDAPA 08.02.02.120 and determine if the evaluation policy and evaluation tool employed by their current district complies with said rule.
 - Is the evaluation aligned with Charlotte Danielson, “Framework for Teaching?”
 - Does the evaluation contain all 22 components within the four (4) Domains?
 - Does the policy require no less than two formal observations/evaluations each year one prior to January 30?
 - Does the evaluation include student achievement data?
 - Does the evaluation tool clearly distinguish how an overall rating is determined?
 - Is the evaluation system differentiated between teachers based on their effectiveness and provide professional development supports aligned to instructional goals?
- Participants will demonstrate understanding of the ethical issues related to teacher supervision (formative) and summative evaluations.
 - Participants will analyze Idaho Code 33-513 through 33-515 to understand the contractual obligations related to evaluation of professional staff; specifically, how the evidence gathered supports continued employment or dismissal.
 - Participants will review Idaho Code 33-1210 to understand how the evidence underpinning the evaluation is transferred to other Idaho districts if a teacher changes employment.
 - Participants will review the Code of Ethics for Idaho Educators and its implications regarding the evaluation and supervision of teachers.
- Participants will practice gathering evidence for each of the four Domains in the “Framework for Teaching” that include: Domain 1 - Planning and Preparation, Domain 2 - Classroom Environment, Domain 3 - Instruction and Domain 4 - Professional Responsibilities.
 - Participants will be able to collect reliable evidence from observations and gather appropriate artifacts of teacher practice and performance for each Domain.
 - Participants will be able to check for opinion, bias and interpretations when gathering evidence.
 - Participants will be able to align evidence to the appropriate Domain and component.
 - Participants will write rationale for levels of performance for all four (4) Domains based on evidence.
- Participants will watch videos related to Domains 2 and 3, take appropriate evidence

related to the observed instruction, complete the assigned document illustrating their ratings and successfully match what they observe to calibrated results from experts.

- Participants will be able to identify the variations in teacher effectiveness documented in the videos.
- Participants will maximize the instructional value of feedback by uploading redacted teacher observations notes that exemplify best practice.
- Participants will understand how to help good teachers get better through effective observation.
 - Participants will understand how to support teacher growth by providing actionable feedback about instruction and other professional practice.
 - Participants will understand the role of reflection in promoting teacher growth.
- Participants will be able to help teachers formulate the required IPLP and gather artifacts to help teachers meet the requirements of Idaho Code 33-1004L. **Master Teacher Premiums (Effective July 1, 2019)**
 - Participants will understand how to use assessment appropriately as part of the teacher evaluation process to monitor student growth and achievement as required by the IPLP.
 - Participants will be able to assist teacher in setting appropriate goals to be reflected on the required Individualized Professional Learning Plan (IPLP) that support academic achievement for all students.
 - Participants will be able to analyze growth data from a variety of measures and provide guidance to teachers to improve classroom instruction based on their analysis.
- Participants will design relevant staff development opportunities for teachers to enhance the understanding of the “Framework for Teaching” and laws governing evaluation. This should include conversations regarding the Career Ladder.
- Participants will increase their assessment literacy using “Assessment Literacy Standards (Michigan Assessment Consortium) and their own district’s comprehensive assessment plan.”
 - Assuming the role of a building principal, participants will create a comprehensive assessment plan, aligned with their district’s plan, and incorporate information found in the document provided by the Michigan Assessment Consortium.

Course Website

<https://bblearn.uiaho.edu>

Assignments and Course Timeline

This is a graduate level course. Only scholarly work will be accepted. Assignments should be written in APA format, 12-point font, double spaced, and posted by midnight of the day they are due. Citations need to be included in each assignment with a separate reference page using APA format. Here is a helpful website for APA formatting:

<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

If you find you cannot make a certain due date, please contact the both instructors in the same email. Prior approval is required to submit a late assignment. Points may be deducted for late assignments.

All statements shared with the class and posted in online discussions and assignments must be considered confidential and within the context of academic freedom. Participants are expected to respect the opinions of others on controversial issues.

Assignment	Resources	Timeline
<p>1 Compliance Analysis Paper Analyze Idaho Code, IDAPA Rule and your own district's policies, procedures and forms regarding teacher evaluation. Write a 5 to 7 page paper addressing the following questions. Be sure to provide evidence to support your claims.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does IDAPA rule align with state statute? ● In what ways do your district's policies, procedures and forms align with Idaho Code and IDAPA rules? ● What gaps in alignment did you find in your analysis? ● What suggestions do you have to address those gaps? 	<p>Idaho Code 33-1001 Idaho Code 33-1201A Idaho Code 33-1004A Idaho Code 33-1004B IDAPA Rule 08.02.02.120 https://boardofed.idaho.gov/ Danielson (2007)</p>	<p>Read and annotate chapters 1 and 2 of Danielson (2007) Due August 31st</p>
<p>2 Career Ladder & Master Teacher Premium Project Participants will interview district office personnel with in-depth knowledge of the career ladder and its implementation in one's district. The assigned document/video must include information derived from the interview and an in-depth study of the assigned readings. The content of the presentation must delineate the portions of the career ladder related to administrative responsibilities/influence regarding evaluations, IPLPs, and student achievement that might affect a teacher's advancement. Use information from your interview and personal analysis to develop an informational brochure, PowerPoint, or video that one could to use as professional development for teachers in your building or district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Brochure's should be tri-fold; 	<p>Idaho Code 33-1001 Idaho Code 33-1201A Idaho Code 33-1004A Idaho Code 33-1004B IDAPA Rule 08.02.02.120</p>	<p>Read and annotate chapters 10, 11, 12 and 13 of <i>Better Feedback for Better Teaching</i>. Due September 10th</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PowerPoint no less than 10-15 slides (with notes to be used when presenting); <p>Video should be no less than 10 minutes in length.</p>		
<p>3 Activity - Explore the Influence of Biases Participants will consider the concepts of bias, personal preferences when compiling evidence to support evaluation ratings by reading the assigned portions of the texts. Participants will submit a paper 3-5 pages in length discussing bias with specific references to the readings and include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. District’s standard for compiling evidence compared with information from the readings; OR, 2. If one’s district doesn’t have a standard, the participant will create guidelines for practitioners to follow based on their readings. 3. Practicing administrators will submit examples of evidence that they have provided to teachers as part of the evaluation cycle and indicate why or why not they include bias. <p>Participants who are not practicing administrators will provide examples of evidence from their personal evaluations that they believe are biased or reflective of the evaluator’s preference and rewrite statements in a way that eliminates bias.</p>	<p>Danielson (2013) Danielson (2007) Better Feedback for Better Teaching</p>	<p>Read and annotate Chapters 3 and 4 of Danielson (2007) Due September 21st</p>
<p>4 An Analysis of Domains 1 & 4 <u>Review your prior reading and annotations for Danielson (2007) on Domains 1 and 4. Read and study the rubrics for Domains 1 and 4 in Danielson (2013), paying particular attention to the critical attributes and examples for each component and rating.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop a list of possible artifacts for each component in Domain 1 and Domain 4. 2. If you are a practicing administrator, take three evaluations you have already completed with varying rating 	<p>Be sure to review your prior reading and annotations for Danielson (2007) on Domains 1 and 4.</p>	<p>Prior to completing assignment read and study Danielson (2013) Domains 1 and 4. Due October 1st</p>

<p>levels for Domain 1 (e.g. distinguished, proficient, basic or unsatisfactory). What differences do you find in the artifacts gathered for each that caused you to rate the teacher as you did? What, if anything, would you do differently? (If you are not a practicing administrator, please find an administrator to complete this assignment with you.)</p> <p>3. Pull three more observations with different ratings on Domain 4. Again, what differences do you find in the artifacts gathered for each that caused you to rate the teacher as you did? What if anything would you do differently? (If you are not a practicing administrator, please find an administrator to complete this assignment with you.)</p> <p>4. Use your work to complete and submit the Analysis Graphic Organizer.</p>		
<p>5 Calibration & Inter-rater Reliability PARTICIPANTS ARE EXPECTED TO READ THE LISTED TEXTS/READINGS AS ASSIGNED <u>IN THEIR ENTIRETY</u> PRIOR TO ATTEMPTING/SUBMITTING CALIBRATION EXERCISES.</p> <p>Participants will be assigned groups by the course instructors.</p> <p>Prior to individual calibration exercises, instructors will schedule facilitated video observations that will include discussion with their assigned group and the instructors. Participants are expected to be available for these group efforts.</p> <p>Participants will view fifteen (15) calibration videos with their assigned groups, and/or individually as per the assignment text for module 5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five (5) of the videos will focus solely 	<p>Be sure to review your prior reading and annotations for Danielson (2007) on Domains 2 and 3.</p> <p>Danielson (2013)</p> <p>Better Feedback for Better Teaching</p> <p>Rating Rubric provided by instructors</p>	<p>Prior to beginning this assignment, read and study the rubrics for Domains 2 and 3 in Danielson (2013), paying particular attention to the critical attributes and examples for each component and rating.</p> <p>Due December 1st</p>

<p>on Domain 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five (5) of the videos will focus solely on Domain 3. • Five (5) of the videos or observations will focus on Domains 2/3 simultaneously. <p>Videos will be 20-30 minutes in length and included a variety of subjects and grade levels K-12.</p> <p>Observers will use the assigned observation tool to gather and note unbiased evidence and highlight each/all indicator(s) that apply to what they observed in the video.</p> <p>GROUP OBSERVATIONS: If groups disagree among themselves regarding evidence and the assignment of ratings, the group will need to come to consensus prior to submitting evidence and a final group calibration form when required.</p> <p>While Domain 1 and 4 are often not observed, per se, some components underpin the lesson when observed i.e. lesson planning.</p>		
<p>6 Mini Evaluation Exercise</p> <p>Participants will complete a full observation and evaluation cycle. Participants who are not current administrators will pair with a current, practicing administrator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a pre-conference in accordance with your district's protocol. Be sure to collect and examine necessary artifacts prior to the observation, including the student achievement and assessment data. • Be sure to also include the teacher's IPLP and associated student achievement goals and assessment data (if available). • Conduct an observation for the entire length of the lesson. • Using collected evidence and artifacts, create reflection questions to ask the teacher in the post conference. 	<p>Refer to your prior readings, assignments, feedback and notes to assist you in completing this assignment.</p>	<p>Prior to completing assignment read and annotate chapter 6 of Danielson (2007).</p> <p>Due December 10th</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct the post conference and summarize the dialog between you and the teacher. • Write a final evaluation using your district's form. <p>Participants will submit a portfolio to include all artifacts, observation notes, reflection questions, post conference summary of dialog and final evaluation.</p>		
<p>7 Ethics Paper</p> <p>Participants will analyze Idaho Code and the Code of Ethics for Idaho Educators in order to understand the contractual obligations related to the evaluation of professional staff; specifically, how the evidence gathered as part of the evaluation cycle or as part of an investigation for inappropriate conduct supports continued employment or dismissal. Participants will interview district personnel to determine the district's compliance with these regulations and review the district's policy regarding the Code of Ethics and dismissal. Participants will submit 3-5 page paper indicating their personal administrative responsibilities in upholding the code, related district policies and the Code of Ethics. If one finds that their district's policy is insufficient or non-existent, the participant can include a suggested rewrite of the policy as part of the paper.</p>	<p>Idaho Code 33-513 through 33-515 Idaho Code 33-518 Idaho Code 33-1210 Code of Ethics for Idaho Educators</p>	<p>Due December 15th</p>
<p>8 Assessment Literacy Project</p> <p>Research and analyze your district's comprehensive assessment plan. Interview district office personnel with in-depth knowledge of assessment and your district's comprehensive assessment plan.</p> <p>Using this information along with the Assessment Literacy Standards (Michigan Assessment Consortium) and assessment literacy best practices create a comprehensive assessment plan for your school.</p> <p>Be sure to align your plan with the district's plan and incorporate information found in the</p>	<p>Assessment Literacy Standards (Michigan Assessment Consortium)</p>	<p>Due December 15th</p>

<p>document provided by the Michigan Assessment Consortium.</p> <p>Develop a PowerPoint you could share with your teaching staff or fellow colleagues describing your comprehensive assessment plan. Be sure to include rationale on why you chose specific assessment elements to be included in the plan.</p> <p>The PowerPoint should be no less than 5 - 10 slides with notes to be used when presenting.</p>		
<p>Online Course Participation</p> <p>Online classes at the University of Idaho emphasize group interaction through the use of Discussion Boards. Active participation is essential to learning, and classroom discussions are intended to provide formative opportunities for reflection and deeper understanding. The purpose of Discussion Board questions is to generate formative, practical, and interesting discussion relevant to the topics we are studying.</p> <p>Participants who are absent or not engaged in class discussions, will not experience the benefit of class involvement and will not be able to contribute to the learning of other students in the class. In order to achieve maximum points for class discussions, participants are expected to complete responses and post them in a timely manner.</p>		

Evaluation of Student Performance

Assignment	Percent of Grade
Compliance Analysis Paper	5%
Career Ladder & Master Teacher Premium Project	5%
Activity - Explore the Influence of Bias	5%
Analysis of Domains 1 and 4	10%
Calibration & Inter-rater Reliability	50%
Mini Evaluation Exercise	10%
Ethics Paper	5%
Assessment Literacy Project	5%
Online Course Participation	5%
Total	100%

Grading Scale

- A (90-100%)
- B (80-89%)
- C (70-79%)
- D (60-69%)
- F (0-68%)

Expectations and Policies

Please ensure you are familiar with the University's Student Code of conduct and Academic Integrity Policy. <http://www.uidaho.edu/student-affairs/dean-of-students/student-conduct>

Additional Information

College Mission

The College of Education enriches lives by advancing excellence in research and practice in education, leadership, and applied human arts and sciences. The College of Education envisions being a leading, diverse, nationally recognized educational community. Our caring faculty members and innovative curriculum are:

- Preparing professional through integrated programs grounded in research
- Generating and evaluating knowledge through disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship
- Informing professional practice and community life through the exchange and utilization of knowledge

Together, our college community is achieving this vision through a culture of openness, innovation, and collaboration.

Currently, UI program curriculum is aligned to the *former* Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium ([ISLLC], 2008) Standards - National Standards for School Administrators:

http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2008/Educational_Leadership_Policy_Standards_2008.pdf
<http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/Analysis%20of%20Leadership%20Standards-Final-070913-RGB.pdf>

Standard 1: Setting a widely shared vision for learning. An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.

Standard 2: Developing a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth. An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Standard 3: Ensuring effective management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment. An education leader promotes the success of every student by ensuring management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

Standard 4: Collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. An education leader promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

Standard 5: Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

Standard 6: Understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, legal, and cultural contexts. An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

UI Educational Leadership program curriculum is aligned with the following 14 Idaho Foundation Standards for School Administrators (IFSSA) approved November, 2013 by the State Board of Education:

DOMAIN I: SCHOOL CLIMATE

Standard 1: School Culture

Standard 2: Communication

Standard 3: Advocacy

DOMAIN II: COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP

Standard 4: Shared Leadership

Standard 5: Priority Management

Standard 6: Transparency

Standard 7: Leadership Renewal

Standard 8: Accountability

DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Standard 9: Innovation

Standard 10: Instructional Vision

Standard 11: High Expectations

Standard 12: Continuous Improvement of Instruction

Standard 13: Evaluation

Standard 14: Recruitment and Retention

Please be aware of recent changes in professional standards for school leaders at the national level: *The NEW national PSEL standards have replaced the 2008 ISLLC standards.* The Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) were adopted October 2015 by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. Re-alignment to these standards is forthcoming at the state and local levels. Access the link below to learn more:
<http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2015/ProfessionalStandardsforEducationalLeaders2015forNPBEAFINAL.pdf>