

## **Framework for Assessing Teacher Collaboration**

	Key Principles	Evidence of <u>Strong</u> Implementation	Evidence of <u>Weak</u> Implementation	Assessment
Time	Sufficient time is provided for teachers to discuss student learning needs and share, review, and provide feedback on instructional practices that address these needs	<ul> <li>Master schedule thoughtfully designed to provide targeted opportunities for collaboration amongst teachers</li> <li>Collaboration meetings are at least 45 minutes long</li> <li>Collaboration meetings are sacred, uninterrupted, and start on time</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Teacher schedules are not aligned to allow for regular meetings</li> <li>Meetings are sporadic and less than 45 minutes long</li> <li>Collaboration meetings are often skipped, interrupted or otherwise not taken seriously</li> </ul>	Weak Strong Notes:
Content	Collaboration meetings are a mechanism for teachers to improve instruction and build expertise	<ul> <li>Team members strategize and discuss effective instructional practices and brainstorm ways to refine practice</li> <li>Student-level data is used to drive collaboration and action</li> <li>Team members routinely analyze student work and teacher assignments to gauge instructional effectiveness</li> <li>Team members observe and learn from model lessons</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>No common instructional practices are identified to drive collaboration</li> <li>Student-level data is rarely reviewed</li> <li>Discussion of student behavior management, logistics, or school "housekeeping" issues take center stage</li> </ul>	Weak Strong Notes:



## **Framework for Assessing Teacher Collaboration**

	Key Principles	Evidence of <u>Strong</u> Implementation	Evidence of <u>Weak</u> Implementation	Assessment
Leadership and Support	District and school leadership see collaboration as primary vehicle for improving instruction and student performance	<ul> <li>Administrators and coaches actively participate in and support collaboration meetings, providing guidance and feedback as necessary</li> <li>Principal, other school leaders and teachers share common understanding of what collaboration means and entails</li> <li>Teams are provided with the necessary material support, training, and assistance to help collaborative meetings succeed</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Principals and other school leaders have little involvement in meetings or follow-up</li> <li>Members do not exhibit common understanding of purpose of collaborative teams</li> <li>Teams do not have access to reference materials, consultants, etc. needed to build expertise or collaborative skills</li> </ul>	Weak Strong Notes:
Structure	Collaboration meetings are part of a coherent school improvement plan and are structured with clearly mapped goals and objectives	<ul> <li>Thought is given to who should comprise each team, offering opportunities for vertical and horizontal teaming when possible</li> <li>All teams exhibit coherence in their focus on the same issues and content connected to instructional improvement</li> <li>Teams have established structured operating principles with well-defined roles and responsibilities</li> <li>Effective meeting management strategies (e.g. agendas, minutes, action items, etc.) are routinely used</li> <li>Teams report progress publicly by distributing minutes/agendas</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Teams are hastily or haphazardly formed with insufficient thought given to whom should participate</li> <li>There is no coherent plan for what teachers are trying to accomplish</li> <li>Meetings are unstructured, with ill- or undefined roles for participants and lacking established norms for participation</li> </ul>	Weak Strong Notes: