

(AutoFill School District Name from the setup screen)

Teacher Evaluation based on the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning and 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric

Developed at the Center for Educational Leadership
– University of Washington

TEACHER	Pre-load
EVALUATOR	Pre-load
POSITION/TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	Text Box
OBSERVATION DATES	Pre-load based on walkthroughs and observations
TEACHING STATUS	Pre-load based on employee status in set-up (Probationary/Tenured)

We know that building the capacity of teachers will lead to better instruction and greater learning for all students. Evaluation should be an on-going process to improve the quality of performance as well as identify areas of strength and required improvement. It should promote growth in teacher effectiveness through the interaction between the teacher and administrator. Helping educators understand what good teaching looks like is at the heart of the Center for Educational Leadership's 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric – a growth-oriented tool for improving instruction.

The 5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric is based on the 5 Dimensions of Teaching and Learning (5D) instructional framework, which is derived from an extensive study of research on the core elements that constitute quality instruction. These core elements have been incorporated into the 5D framework and 5D+ rubric as five dimensions -- Purpose, Student Engagement, Curriculum & Pedagogy, Assessment for Student Learning, and Classroom Environment and Culture – which are divided into 13 subdimensions. The 5D+ Rubric also includes Professional Collaboration and Communication which is based on activities and relationships that teachers engage in outside of classroom instruction.

The summative rating for each indicator below is based on an analysis of evidence. In general, formative evidence is gathered through multiple observations, responses to wonderings, and student work. This evidence is then analyzed to determine trends and frame formative conversations.

The summative rating for each dimension is based on the preponderance of evidence for each indicator rating within the dimension and it's probable truth/accuracy, not the amount of evidence. If the dimension score is not clear, the guiding questions below are used to reflect on the evidence in order to determine an informed professional judgment about what the dimension level score and final summative rating should be for the year.

- What else do I need to see or consider to make a final decision – what is available to me?
- What is the distribution of evidence over time?
- Has there been demonstrated and consistent improvement? If there was growth, was the growth sustained?
- What would be the tipping point? If I consistently saw “X”, I would feel confident that the performance is Basic. If I consistently saw “Y”, I would feel confident that performance is Proficient.
- What is the essence of the indicator? The dimension? Go back and find the key words in the framework/rubric. What does the evidence tell you about the evaluatee's performance and growth with regards to this essential aspect of the indicators/dimension?
- Is this evaluatee more Basic than s/he is Proficient, or more Proficient than s/he is Basic in this indicator? What is the evidence based in the framework/rubric to support your decision?

Indicator Rating	Dimension	Subdimension	Indicator
Purpose			
Rating	P1	Standards	Connection to Standards, broader purpose and transferable skill
Rating	P2	Standards	Connection to previous and future lessons
Rating	P3	Teaching Point	Teaching point(s) are based on students' learning needs
Rating	P4	Learning Target	Communication of learning target(s)
Rating	P5	Learning Target	Success criteria and performance task(s)
Dimension Rating			
Student Engagement			
Rating	SE1	Intellectual Work	Quality of Questioning
Rating	SE2	Intellectual Work	Teaching point(s) are based on students' learning needs
Rating	SE3	Engagement Strategies	High Cognitive Demand
Rating	SE4	Engagement Strategies	Strategies that Capitalize on Learning Needs of Students
Rating	SE5	Engagement Strategies	Expectation, Support and Opportunity for Participation and Meaning Making
Rating	SE6	Talk	Substance of Student Talk
Dimension Rating			
Curriculum & Pedagogy			
Rating	CP1	Curriculum	Alignment of Instructional Materials and Tasks
Rating	CP2	Teaching Approaches &/or Strategies	Discipline-specific Conceptual Understanding
Rating	CP3	Teaching Approaches &/or Strategies	Pedagogical Content Knowledge
Rating	CP4	Teaching Approaches &/or Strategies	Teacher Knowledge of Content
Rating	CP5	Teaching Approaches &/or Strategies	Differentiated Instruction
Rating	CP6	Scaffolds for Learning	Scaffolds for Tasks
Rating	CP7	Scaffolds for Learning	Gradual Release of Responsibility
Dimension Rating			
Assessment for Learning			
Rating	A1	Assessment	Self-assessment of Learning Connected to the Success Criteria
Rating	A2	Assessment	Demonstration of Learning
Rating	A3	Assessment	Formative Assessment Opportunities
Rating	A4	Assessment	Collection Systems for Formative Data
Rating	A5	Assessment	Student Use of Assessment Data
Rating	A6	Adjustments	Teacher Use of Formative Assessment Data
Dimension Rating			
Classroom Environment & Culture			
Rating	CEC1	Use of Physical Space	Arrangement of Classroom
Rating	CEC2	Use of Physical Space	Accessibility and Use of Materials
Rating	CEC3	Classroom Routines & Rituals	Discussion, Collaboration and Accountability
Rating	CEC4	Classroom Routines & Rituals	Use of Learning Time
Rating	CEC5	Classroom Routines & Rituals	Managing Student Behavior
Rating	CEC6	Classroom Culture	Student Status
Rating	CEC7	Classroom Culture	Norms for Learning
Dimension Rating			
Professional Collaboration & Communication			
Rating	PCC1	Professional Learning & Collaboration	Collaboration with Peers and Administrators to Improve Student Learning
Rating	PCC2	Professional Learning & Collaboration	Professional and Collegial Relationships
Rating	PCC3	Communication & Collaboration	Parents and Guardians
Rating	PCC4	Communication & Collaboration	Communication within the School Community About Student Progress
Rating	PCC5	Professional Responsibilities	Supports School District, and State Curriculum, Policy and Initiatives
Rating	PCC6	Professional Responsibilities	Ethics and Advocacy
Dimension Rating			

SUMMATIVE COMMENTS (TEXT BOX THAT ONLY APPEARS IF TEXT INCLUDED)

SCORE SUMMARY BY DIMENSION

Dimension	Score
Purpose	Auto-fill based on rating with above ((Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, Distinguished)
Student Engagement	Auto-fill based on rating with above ((Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, Distinguished)
Curriculum & Pedagogy	Auto-fill based on rating with above ((Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, Distinguished)
Assessment for Learning	Auto-fill based on rating with above ((Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, Distinguished)
Classroom Environment & Culture	Auto-fill based on rating with above ((Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, Distinguished)
Professional Collaboration & Communication	Auto-fill based on rating with above ((Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, Distinguished)

5D+ TEACHER EVALUATION SUMMATIVE RATING:

Pull-down menu of

Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, Distinguished

RECOMMENDED AREAS OF FOCUS/GOALS FOR THE NEXT SCHOOL YEAR

(TEXT BOX ONLY APPEARS IF TEXT INCLUDED)

The signatures below indicate the teacher and evaluator have discussed the report together. It does not necessarily mean the teacher and evaluator agree with all ratings or remarks contained herein.

The signatures below indicate the teacher and evaluator have discussed the report together. It does not necessarily mean the teacher and evaluator agree with all ratings or remarks contained herein.

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

(AutoFill School District Name from the setup screen) (AutoFill School Year) End of Year Summative Evaluation

TEACHER	Pre-load
EVALUATOR	Pre-load
POSITION/TEACHING ASSIGNMENT	Text Box
TEACHING STATUS	Pre-load based on employee status in set-up (Probationary/Tenured)

A final Summative Rating is given to represent the aggregate of all components of the teacher evaluation system. Component scores are calculated by multiplying the raw score for each component of the evaluation system by the designated percent each component represents. Once a total raw score is calculated look to the score ranges below to determine a summative rating of Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective or Highly Effective.

Component (Adjustable by State/ District)	Rating	Raw Score	% of Whole (Adjustable by State/District)	Component Score
5D+ Teacher Evaluation Rubric	Pull-down menu of Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective, and Highly Effective	Auto-fill based on rating with 1 (Ineffective), 2 (Minimally Effective), 3 (Effective), and 4 (Highly Effective)	40%-50%	
Student Growth (Standardized Test)	Pull-down menu of Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective, and Highly Effective	Auto-fill based on rating with 1 (Ineffective), 2 (Minimally Effective), 3 (Effective), and 4 (Highly Effective)	25% (Tested Areas) 0% (Non-tested Areas)	
Student Learning Objective	Pull-down menu of Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective, and Highly Effective	Auto-fill based on rating with 1 (Ineffective), 2 (Minimally Effective), 3 (Effective), and 4 (Highly Effective)	25% (Tested Areas) 50% (Non-tested Areas)	
Other	Pull-down menu of Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective, and Highly Effective	Auto-fill based on rating with 1 (Ineffective), 2 (Minimally Effective), 3 (Effective), and 4 (Highly Effective)	0-10%	
			Raw Score	

Ineffective	Minimally Effective	Effective	Highly Effective
0.0 - 1.49	1.5 - 2.49	2.5 - 3.49	3.5 - 4.0

FINAL SUMMATIVE RATING: **Pull-down menu of Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective, Highly Effective**

The signatures below indicate the teacher and evaluator have discussed the report together. It does not necessarily mean the teacher and evaluator agree with all ratings or remarks contained herein.

Teacher Signature: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____