

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	 Master schedule thoughtfully designed to provide targeted opportunities for collaboration amongst teachers Collaboration meetings are at least 45 minutes long Collaboration meetings are sacred, uninterrupted, and start on time 	 Teacher schedules are not aligned to allow for regular meetings Meetings are sporadic and less than 45 minutes long Collaboration meetings are often skipped, interrupted or otherwise not taken seriously 	Weak Strong Notes:
Content	Collaboration meetings are a mechanism for teachers to improve instruction and build expertise	 Team members strategize and discuss effective instructional practices and brainstorm ways to refine practice Student-level data is used to drive collaboration and action Team members routinely analyze student work and teacher assignments to gauge instructional effectiveness Team members observe and learn from model lessons 	 No common instructional practices are identified to drive collaboration Student-level data is rarely reviewed Discussion of student behavior management, logistics, or school "housekeeping" issues take center stage 	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	 Administrators and coaches actively participate in and support collaboration meetings, providing guidance and feedback as necessary Principal, other school leaders and teachers share common understanding of what collaboration means and entails Teams are provided with the necessary material support, training, and assistance to help collaborative meetings succeed 	 Principals and other school leaders have little involvement in meetings or follow-up Members do not exhibit common understanding of purpose of collaborative teams Teams do not have access to reference materials, consultants, etc. needed to build expertise or collaborative skills 	Weak Strong Notes:
Structure	Collaboration meetings are part of a coherent school improvement plan and are structured with clearly mapped goals and objectives	 Thought is given to who should comprise each team, offering opportunities for vertical and horizontal teaming when possible All teams exhibit coherence in their focus on the same issues and content connected to instructional improvement Teams have established structured operating principles with well-defined roles and responsibilities Effective meeting management strategies (e.g. agendas, minutes, action items, etc.) are routinely used Teams report progress publicly by distributing minutes/agendas 	 Teams are hastily or haphazardly formed with insufficient thought given to whom should participate There is no coherent plan for what teachers are trying to accomplish Meetings are unstructured, with ill- or undefined roles for participants and lacking established norms for participation 	Weak Strong Notes: