



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Model Educator Evaluation System: Practical Ideas for Evaluating Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education Specialists

Developed by:

Higher Educators in Linguistically Diverse Education (HELDE)

December 2014

Version 1: To provide feedback please email: Educator_Effectiveness@cde.state.co.us

Foreword

****PLEASE NOTE: The purpose of this document is to highlight possible approaches for districts and BOCES to consider when constructing their approach to evaluating culturally and linguistically diverse education specialists. CDE will be collecting on-going feedback to improve this guidance. To submit your feedback, email Educator_Effectiveness@cde.state.co.us.***

Following the passage of Senate Bill 10-191, the principal/assistant principal and teacher evaluation act, the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) began creating the state's evaluation system and requirements for all educators whose positions require them to hold a state license. During the first two years of development of the new system (2010 to 2012), CDE staff members focused on the processes and materials for evaluating teachers and principals. Those processes and materials were pilot tested during the 2012-13 school year, and a validation study was conducted during the 2013-14 school year.

Throughout the development, pilot testing, and validation study activities, CDE heard from groups of teachers and their evaluators whose positions require them to fulfill unique roles and responsibilities who expressed concerns that the teacher materials do not provide adequate guidance evaluating staff members in such positions. They have requested additional guidance regarding evidence/artifacts that may be used by such specialized teachers. In addition, they have asked about specific practices to "look-for" to guide their classroom observations and help ensure that all licensed teachers receive fair, valid, and reliable evaluations.

In response to such requests, CDE initiated the development of a set of implementation briefs written by practitioners for practitioners. They are intended to provide informal advice to teachers and their evaluators to help them understand the evaluation process within their specific context. Unless otherwise noted, the contents of this brief are not policy requirements but merely ideas to help educators make the best use of the state model system for all teachers. Implementation briefs are currently under development for the following groups:

- Early Childhood Education Teachers
- Special Education Teachers
- Teacher Librarians
- Teachers of English Language Learners/Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education Specialists
- Teachers of the Arts (Dance, Music, Theatre and Visual Arts)

It is CDE's hope that these briefs will help everyone involved have a better understanding of how the teachers' rubric and evaluation process may be fairly used to ensure that all teachers, including those in the groups listed above, are evaluated in a manner that is fair, rigorous, transparent and valid.

Acknowledgements

The many contributions of the Higher Educators in Linguistically Diverse Education (HELDE) group are gratefully acknowledged. HELDE members generously gave their time and expertise to write this brief as a service to their colleagues. It is their hope that the brief will be used as an informal set of suggestions and ideas to help teachers of English language learners/Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education Specialists (CLDEs) and their evaluators better understand the Colorado State Model Educator Evaluation System and how it applies to them. HELDE members who contributed to the development of this brief include:

Dr. Kara Mitchell Viesca, University of Colorado Denver

Deborah Agar, Regis University

Dr. Margaret Berg, University of Northern Colorado

Dr. Loretta Chavez, Metropolitan State University of Denver

Ashley Chrzanowsky, University of Colorado Boulder

Dr. Leslie Grant, University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

Dr. Jingzi Huang, University of Northern Colorado

Dr. Elizabeth Mahon, University of Colorado Denver

Shannon Svaldi, University of Colorado Denver

Dr. Dana Walker, University of Northern Colorado

CDE Staff Support

Dr. Katy Anthes, Executive Director, Educator Effectiveness

Joanna Bruno, Science Content Specialist, Standards and Instructional Support

Courtney Cabrera, Evaluation and Support, Educator Effectiveness

Toby King, Director, Educator Effectiveness

Katie Lams, Communications and Social Media Manager, Communications Division

Dr. Mary Pittman, Math Content Specialist, Standards and Instructional Support

Dr. Jacqueline Medina, Colorado Department of Education

Dr. Jean Williams, Evaluation Design Specialist, Educator Effectiveness

Colorado State Model Educator Evaluation System: Practitioner Ideas for Evaluating Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education Specialists

Introduction

Colorado's Senate Bill 10-191 (S.B. 10-191) requires schools, school districts and the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) to evaluate all licensed educators with state approved quality and performance standards at least annually. This requirement applies to evaluating the performance of principals, assistant principals, teachers and specialized service professionals. S. B. 10-191 requires teachers of English language learners, bilingual education teachers, and others who hold the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education (CLDE) specialists endorsement to their teaching license to be evaluated annually. To help districts address this requirement, CDE recommends using the processes and materials for classroom teachers that were developed as a part of the Colorado State Model Educator Evaluation System (state model system). Because all of the teachers for whom this guide is intended hold the CLDE endorsement, for the purpose of this guide, they are referred to as CLDE Specialists. Throughout the development and pilot testing of the new system, CLDE Specialists have expressed questions about the applicability of the new evaluation system for educators such as themselves. The roles and responsibilities of CLDE Specialists often differ from those of classroom teachers, therefore the teacher evaluation materials do not necessarily provide opportunities to review and rate all facets of the CLDE Specialist's work. This implementation brief is intended to help CLDE Specialists and their evaluators maximize the flexibility options built into the new system to ensure a fair, valid and reliable evaluation of educators serving in this unique role.

The Colorado State Model Educator Evaluation System

The new evaluation system is being planned, developed and implemented with a focus on continuously improving educator performance and student achievement. S.B. 10-191 guides the state and school districts in the transformation of current evaluation processes from a focus primarily on compliance to more rigorous and supportive processes that provide for continuous professional learning and improvement. To support school districts in implementing the new evaluation requirements, CDE developed the state model system to provide consistent, fair and rigorous educator evaluations, save district resources and enable them to focus on improving teaching, learning and leading. Districts are not required to use the state model system, but if they choose not to, then they are required to create their own system that meets all state laws and regulations.

The basic purposes of this system are to ensure that all licensed educators:

- Are evaluated using multiple, fair, transparent, timely, rigorous and valid methods.
- Are assessed through two main avenues: measuring student learning (50 percent) and evaluating teacher professional practices (50 percent).
- Receive adequate feedback and professional development support to provide them a meaningful opportunity to improve their effectiveness.
- Are provided the means to share effective practices with other educators throughout the state.
- Receive meaningful feedback to inform their professional growth and continuous improvement.

Successful implementation of the Colorado State Model Educator Evaluation System is dependent upon attending to the following priorities, or guiding principles for the evaluation system:

1. Data should inform decisions, but human judgment is critical.
2. The implementation of the system must embody continuous improvement.
3. The purpose of the system is to provide meaningful and credible feedback that improves performance.
4. The development and implementation of educator evaluation systems must continue to involve all stakeholders in a collaborative process.
5. Educator evaluations must take place within a larger system that is aligned and supportive.

The Colorado State Model Evaluation System uses a meaningful process for educator evaluation. The year-long cycle includes regular conversations between the evaluator and the person being evaluated; it is not a one-time event or observation, but rather a process that focuses on continuous improvement of the skills, knowledge and student outcomes of the person being evaluated. S. B. 10-191 requires that at least one observation be conducted annually for non-probationary teachers and at least two for probationary teachers. Districts may choose to conduct additional observations in order to provide high quality feedback and/or to confirm the accuracy of final professional practices ratings prior to finalizing them. The state model system evaluation cycle includes, but is not limited to:

- Training
- Annual orientation to the system/tools
- Educator self-assessment
- Review of annual goals and performance plan
- A mid-year review
- An evaluator assessment based on observation(s) and review of artifacts
- An end-of-year review
- A final rating
- Goal-setting and performance planning for the next school year

Who Should Use This Brief

This brief is intended for:

- English as a Second Language and bilingual teachers who hold;
 - the Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education endorsement,
 - the CLDE Bilingual Education Specialists Endorsement (or similar), or
 - a Master's degree in CLDE (or a similar area).
- Evaluators who are responsible for evaluating these language specialists (termed CLDE Specialists herein to also signify both ESL and bilingual education specialists).

This brief is intended to support CLDE Specialists and their evaluators as they explore CLDE Specialists' effectiveness from a perspective that recognizes the intricacies of second language acquisition and bicultural identities in teaching and learning processes. The complexities of making academic language and the language used in school accessible to culturally and linguistically diverse students must be made transparent in order to effectively evaluate specialists in this role.

This brief is not intended for teachers and evaluators working in general content area classrooms (often termed “mainstream” classrooms) with students who are multilingual. This guide is intended for teachers holding specialist positions who are being evaluated for their work with students who are learning English as an additional language.

How to Interpret the State Model Teacher Rubric Components for CLDE Specialists

Supporting language development requires safe spaces for students to learn and take risks with language. Teachers who value and embrace the linguistic, cultural and other forms of student diversity can help to create safe, productive learning environments. Teachers holding high expectations for student learning while also scaffolding student’s academic language acquisition and grade level content knowledge development create such environments. Members of the education community should recognize that bilingualism is a strength, not a limitation, and should value it accordingly.

While students with disabilities may also be bilingual learners, not all bilingual learners are members of the “special needs population.” Further, a great deal of care and expertise are needed to accurately identify and support bilingual students with disabilities. CLDE Specialists who work with bilingual students having unique learning needs may need to draw substantially on community resources and do extensive research to understand their students’ academic, linguistic, cultural and social backgrounds. Further, such specialists must have a strong sense of the strengths and weaknesses of a particular assessment tool in terms of what it can and cannot capture regarding their students’ strengths and needs as bilingual learners. Having such deep knowledge and understanding of their students’ strengths and needs will enable the CLDE specialist to effectively support students and families through and beyond the disability identification process.

CLDE Specialists and their evaluators should keep the following guiding principles in mind as they determine professional practices ratings for CLDE Specialists:

- It takes five-seven years to develop academic language in English so it is expected that students will need sufficient time and support. It may also take more than one year to progress through language development levels as measured by the ACCESS (Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners) assessment.
- English language learners may use their first language or a combination of their first language and English as they develop academic language skills. Such practices support English language and literacy development the development.
- A body of evidence that demonstrates student growth over time is preferable to a snapshot summative measure because language development has a direct impact on academic achievement. It is difficult to demonstrate academic achievement if the student has not achieved proficiency in the language of assessment. For this reason, multiple methods and measures must be used to provide students with adequate opportunities to demonstrate their learning and growth in both language acquisition and grade level content knowledge.
- For the entire evaluation process, we recommend that evaluators of CLDE Specialists have a CLDE or the CLDE Bilingual endorsement or similar background expertise themselves. This will enable them to understand what to expect of CLDE specialists and what they observe in CLDE classrooms. Should the evaluator not have CLDE expertise, then a person with such expertise should be asked to help with the

evaluation activities, particularly observations and interpretation of other evidence/artifacts to ensure that a fair and reliable evaluation is completed.

- Evaluators of CLDE Specialists should:
 - Be familiar with the classroom context(s) in which CLDE Specialists work.
 - Have a good understanding of the language proficiency levels of students and their cultural and academic backgrounds.
 - Understand meaningful language production and assessment practices for students at the various levels of language proficiency.
- There is a difference between developing literacy skills as a monolingual student and developing literacy skills as a bilingual student. Therefore, evaluating CLDE Specialists on Standard I, Element B, the standards related to literacy development, should take this into account.
- Instruction, evaluation and all educational interactions should support the concept that language and culture cannot be separated. Further, language and culture influence cognitive development. For this reason, worldviews that differ based on home language and culture and may or may not conform to established schooling beliefs, behaviors, values, or customs within the educational environment. Evaluating teacher effectiveness without considering the diversity of a classroom community and how that diversity may impact the way students engage with one another and the teacher has the potential to produce biased and unfair results.

An Example of the Goal-Setting Conference for a CLDE Specialist

“Maria,” a CLDE Specialist at “Anywhere Elementary,” meets with her principal for a beginning-of-the year goal-setting meeting. Before this meeting, Maria has assessed her own performance by using the Colorado State Model Educator Evaluation System’s Rubric for Evaluating Colorado Teachers and by thinking about her preparation and commitment to bilingual students. Maria should prepare for her meeting with the principal by drawing on her expertise in working with bilingual students and finding the places of alignment between the Colorado Academic Standards that guide her work and the rubric on which she is being evaluated. This alignment of the standards and her expertise will ensure that she is being evaluated from a perspective that acknowledges her specialized knowledge, background, and expertise as a CLDE Specialist.

Maria, in the conversation with her evaluator, set a goal regarding her work during the upcoming year. Many teachers, particularly teachers of students who are bilingual, are still learning how to engage in assessment practices that consider language acquisition and content knowledge development. For that reason, Maria chose to focus on Standard III, Element H: “Teachers use appropriate methods to assess what each student has learned, including formal and informal assessments, and use results to plan further instruction.” Maria also thinks this standard and element closely align with Standard IV, Element A: “Teachers demonstrate that they analyze student learning, development, and growth and apply what they learn to improve their practice.”

Maria believes that there will always be more to do in working meaningfully with the parents of her bilingual students, so she also wants to push herself by focusing on Standard V Element C: “Teachers advocate for schools and students, partnering with students, families and communities as appropriate.” Maria’s evaluator supports her choice of goals, particularly because they align well with the goals of the school.

Maria and her evaluator spend a few minutes talking about what it will look like in her classroom for her to be “proficient,” “accomplished,” or “exemplary” on these standards and elements. This is an important opportunity for Maria’s evaluator to learn about the students in Maria’s class(es) in terms of their language levels (in English and other languages they speak), their academic backgrounds, their interests, their families and communities. Maria’s evaluator will benefit greatly from knowing as much as possible about her students as well as about Maria’s perspectives on improving her work on these three standards.

Considering this conversation, Maria should set a goal for herself regarding her work on these three standards/elements and her ongoing development as a CLDE Specialist. An example of the overall goals Maria might set for herself is:

“I will use various types of informal and formal assessment practices in my classroom to ensure that I have a comprehensive understanding of the skills and abilities of my students regardless of their language proficiency levels. I will also explore ways to allow all of the linguistic skills and abilities my students bring to my classroom to be utilized in formal and informal assessments. I will use the data I collect on my students to plan for instruction and differentiate learning opportunities so students can grow in language and grade level content knowledge development. Finally, I will find innovative ways to communicate and collaborate with the families and communities of my students, particularly as a method to inform parents of assessment results.”

Now that Maria has written out her goals aligned with the standards, she and her evaluator should collaboratively decide how to measure Maria’s growth in these areas and how she will document and demonstrate her effectiveness.

For example, some measurable action steps related to some of Maria’s goals could be:

1. At least once a week, I will assess students using more than one language modality (i.e., writing and speaking) to ensure my assessments are capturing students’ knowledge and skills in the content they are learning.
2. At least once a week, I will analyze the results of the multi-modality assessments to explore if and where students may need more language development support to express their content language knowledge as expected on the assessments I use.

Maria and her evaluator should also decide how her work will be documented. For instance, Maria could be sure to let her evaluator know when she is conducting multi-modal assessments. Her evaluator may choose to observe the assessment process and Maria’s skill in implementing it. Maria could collect results of these tests and analyze the results over time, showing how her work has changed as she has learned more about students and the multi-modal assessment approach. Together, the evaluator and Maria can make a reasonable plan that both supports her in her ongoing growth as a CLDE Specialist and also provides evidence of that development.

Except for the evidence required by S.B. 10-191 and described in Exhibit 1, additional evidence/artifacts are not necessary unless the evaluator and person being evaluated have differing opinions about final ratings. In such a case, additional evidence about performance on the specific rating(s) in question may be considered. During the final evaluation conference, the evaluator and CLDE Specialist should agree on the specific evidence needed to support the rating(s) each believes is correct. Such evidence can include documents, communications, analyses, or other types of materials that are normally and customarily collected during the course of conducting their everyday activities.

Exhibits 1 and 2 may prove to be useful for evaluating CLDE Specialists like Maria. Evaluators may find them helpful as they think about the work of CLDE Specialists and how their specialized knowledge and skills can be evaluated accurately. They may also help CLDE Specialists develop their own roadmaps to success as they complete their self-

assessments, participate in the evaluation process, and develop professional goals.

Exhibit 1, in the first three rows, provides information about what is required by S.B. 10-191.

The fourth and fifth rows of the chart provides ideas for artifacts and other types of evidence that **may** be used to help confirm the accuracy of observations and ratings on non-observable items. It is important to note that these are ideas for evidence/artifacts, but they are not required to be used during the evaluation. Nor should a teacher be expected to collect all of these items. These examples are meant to serve as a catalyst for helping teachers and their evaluators generate a short and focused list of artifacts that may prove beneficial in fully understanding the quality of the teacher’s performance. It must be noted that evaluations performed using the state model system may be completed without a consideration of any artifacts.

EXHIBIT 1: Observations, Required Measures and Other Evidence/Artifacts

<p>S.B. 10-191 REQUIRES MULTIPLE MEASURES OF EDUCATOR PERFORMANCE MEASURED ON MULTIPLE OCCASIONS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR. For CLDE Specialists, this requirement is defined as observations, required measures and optional additional measures (evidence/artifacts). While the teacher rubric serves as the data collection tool for observations, districts and BOCES must determine the method for collecting data regarding required measures and additional evidence/artifacts. This chart serves as a reminder of the required measures that must be discussed annually and evidence/artifacts that may be discussed at the end of the evaluation cycle to confirm the accuracy of ratings.</p>
<p>OBSERVATIONS REQUIRED BY S.B. 10-191:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Probationary - At least two documented observations and at least one evaluation that results in a written evaluation report each year.● Non-probationary – At least one documented observation every year and one evaluation that results in a written evaluation report, including fair and reliable measures of performance against Quality Standards. every three years. <p>The frequency and duration of the evaluations shall be on a regular basis and of such frequency and duration as to ensure the collection of a sufficient amount of data from which reliable conclusions and findings may be drawn. Written evaluation reports shall be based on performance standards and provided to the teacher at least two weeks before the last class day of the school year.</p>
<p>REQUIRED MEASURES:</p> <p>Include at least one of the following measures as a part of the annual evaluation process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Student perception measures, where appropriate and feasible;● Peer feedback;● Feedback from parents or guardians;● Review of lesson plans or student work samples.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE/ARTIFACTS:

Evaluation of professional practice may include additional measures such as those listed below, which are provided as examples of evidence the evaluator and/or educator being evaluated may share with each other to provide evidence of performance in addition to observations and evaluator ratings collected on the rubric.

- **World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) “Can Do Name Chart”**
(http://www.wida.us/standards/CAN_DOs/):
 - Filled out for students with their ACCESS scores.
 - Used as a planning tool to support differentiation based on language proficiency levels.
 - Used to support formative and summative classroom assessment design and implementation.

- **Documentation of:**
 - Application of key principles of second language acquisition into teaching practice (e.g., conversational language proficiency is different from academic language proficiency, attention to comprehensible input, providing opportunities for meaningful social interactions for authentic communicative purposes, drawing on the transfer of language and skills from first language(s) to second, creating a safe space for language learning to occur).
 - Meaningful collaboration with other specialists and teachers to support student learning and experts in mathematics.
 - Conversations with colleagues to plan for next steps, seek alternative teaching methods, further understand students across contexts (e.g., P.E. vs. Language Arts)
 - Holding high and challenging expectations for all bilingual learners (e.g., lesson plans for students at WIDA/ACCESS levels 1 and 2 that utilize activities high on Boom’s taxonomy).

- **Culturally and linguistically relevant outreach and engagement efforts:**
 - Community resources used to support student learning.
 - Exploring and using community funds of knowledge (e.g., through home visits, engagement in relevant local community groups, developing relationships with respected community leaders and elders
 - Exploring and using information regarding students’ lives outside of school to support in-school learning (e.g., through student surveys, visiting important places in students’ lives outside of school, drawing connections between students lives and interest and academic learning goals).
 - Communication with families around student learning in languages the families or significant adults in the students’ lives will understand (this may be with the assistance of translators and interpreters).
 - Getting to know parents at non-school sponsored community events (e.g., church activities, sporting events)
 - Setting up meetings at locations and times most convenient for parents.
 - Thoughtful collaboration with local community and religious organizations to better work with parents and families.
 - Parent outreach and engagement with culturally and linguistically diverse families, parents, and communities.
 - Advocacy in collaboration with and for students, families and communities that are culturally and linguistically diverse (e.g., ensuring translation services are available for families during school meetings, knowing families well to be able to represent their interests in school meetings and decision making processes).

Continued on next page.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE/ARTIFACTS:

Evaluation of professional practice may include additional measures such as those listed below, which are provided as examples of evidence the evaluator and/or educator being evaluated may share with each other to provide evidence of performance in addition to observations and evaluator ratings collected on the rubric.

● Lesson plans demonstrating:

- Alignment with Colorado’s English Language Proficiency Standards and Colorado Academic Standards where appropriate
- Explicit teaching of mathematical language structures and discourse expectations.
- Explicit teaching of academic language and sheltering of content.
- Guided reading.
- Differentiation for students based on language proficiency levels.
- Learning objectives linked to evidence of student’s meeting those objectives.
- Collaboration with content teachers.

● Student work:

- Communicating and collaborating with other students on their teams.
- Linking mathematical language and knowledge to their lives outside of school.
- In multiple languages and product formats (e.g., video, essay, posters, websites).
- Writing in multiple languages.
- Audio or video of students reading, writing, speaking, and listening to have enhanced and more comprehensive data points regarding student language and literacy development.
- Materials created by students or co-constructed by teachers and students that use multiple languages, represent various cultural backgrounds and affirm the multiple identities of the students in the classroom. Also, materials from the local community and a description of how they were used in the class (e.g., signs in languages other than English, newspapers in languages other than English, etc.).
- Produced using various technology tools and potentially in multiple languages.
- Across varying levels of English proficiency showing complex thinking and strong cognitive engagement with content.

● Monitoring Student Progress:

- Student language portfolios.*
- Assessments of student work across all language modalities (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) that are both formative and summative.
- Audio and video of students’ language development linked to lesson plans or other evidence of student learning that was inspired by the assessment results.
- Number and percent of ELL students selected for National Junior Honor Society and National Honor Society.
- Student English Language Development Plan.

● Classroom environment featuring:

- Rules and routines charts in multiple languages
- Respect between and among all members of the classroom community (i.e., students do not focus on points of difference among and between each other, rather support each other in meaningful learning).
- Culturally and linguistically responsive classroom norms, routines, and procedures co-constructed by teacher and students.
- Classroom materials that embrace and affirm the diversity in the classroom (e.g., famous pictures and quotes from influential women of color, in languages other than English).
- Problem solving protocol and evidence of its use in the classroom with students.
- Roles and responsibilities of students when working in teams.

Continued on next page.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE/ARTIFACTS:

Evaluation of professional practice may include additional measures such as those listed below, which are provided as examples of evidence the evaluator and/or educator being evaluated may share with each other to provide evidence of performance in addition to observations and evaluator ratings collected on the rubric.

- **Data charts and interpretations linked to lesson plans and student work.**
- **Leadership locally, regionally and nationally:**
 - Mentoring or assisting other teachers or building professionals, particularly as it relates to working with culturally and linguistically diverse students, families and communities
 - Proposal and/or implementation of new ideas for class, school or district improvement. Sharing new learning in various forums (e.g., staff meetings, parent teacher conferences, professional learning communities).
 - Participation on Child Study Team or similar committees to problem solve and plan interventions.
 - Attend and, where possible, present at conferences such as the Colorado Association of Bilinguals Education, Colorado Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, National Association of Bilingual Education, National Council of Teachers of English, and National Council of Teachers of Math.
 - Action research projects that include independent reading and research on the topic and a detailed bibliography
- **Teacher reflection journal**
- **Student survey data regarding teaching/classroom environment collected at various times across the year linked to evidence of how the data impacted instructional practices**

* This practice is common in Europe and is accredited by the Council of Europe. The portfolio is kept with students and is routinely updated as they advance through the grades. It sections may include a language biography (something even monolingual students can write) that describes their experiences in different languages and with different cultures, a language passport with different types of rubrics and charts for students to record their varying competencies across different languages, and a language dossier with samples of student work in varying languages that provides opportunities for students to display and celebrate their linguistic accomplishments. Examples of language portfolios can be found by googling "language portfolio."

Again, evidence/artifacts listed in Exhibit 1 are examples of items that **may** be used to demonstrate proficiency on any given standard. The evaluator and/or CLDE Specialist being evaluated may use additional evidence/artifacts to address specific issues that need further explanation or illustration during the end-of-year performance discussion. The evaluator and/or CLDE Specialist may also use other evidence/artifacts to provide the rationale for specific element or standard ratings. CDE built flexibility into the use of artifacts and/or other evidence. The items listed above are provided as ideas for CLDE Specialists and their evaluators.

Exhibit 2 provides ideas for the evaluator during the observation process. The "physical evidence/demonstration (what to look for)" lists suggest behaviors and activities that may be found in classrooms where the teacher demonstrates proficiency on the Teacher Quality Standards.

Exhibit 2: Teacher Quality Standards and Physical Evidence/Demonstration: CLDE Specialists

QUALITY STANDARD I

Teachers demonstrate mastery of and pedagogical expertise in the content they teach. The elementary teacher is an expert in literacy and mathematics and is knowledgeable in all other content that he/she teaches. The secondary teacher has knowledge of literacy and mathematics and is an expert in his/her content endorsement area(s).

Elements	Practices that May be Observed During CLDE Specialist Observations*
<p>A. Teachers provide instruction that is aligned with the Colorado Academic Standards; their District’s organized plan of instruction; and the individual needs of their students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students have access to meaningful and challenging learning opportunities that are differentiated based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ English proficiency level. ➤ Biliteracy goals. ➤ ACCESS Scores. ➤ WIDA Can Do Descriptors.
<p>B. Teachers demonstrate knowledge of student literacy development in reading, writing, speaking and listening.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students using native languages. • Environmental print in more than one language. • Grouping configurations that support both first and second language development. • Oral rehearsal opportunities before, during, and after reading. • Respect for students in the silent receptive stage of language development. • Contextualized focus on vocabulary development and disciplinary literacy. • Culturally and linguistically responsive classroom materials (e.g., reading materials available in languages other than English). • Pillars of literacy (e.g., phonological awareness) taught and learned in meaningful, age appropriate contexts.
<p>C. Teachers demonstrate knowledge of mathematics and understand how to promote student development in numbers and operations, algebra, geometry and measurement, and data analysis and probability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Models and scaffolds for students regarding mathematical language development and use. • Explicit teaching of language structures and discourse expectations in mathematics. • Contextualized mathematical and language learning in students’ lives outside of school. • Collaboration with content teachers and experts in mathematics.
<p>D. Teachers demonstrate knowledge of the content, central concepts, tools of inquiry, appropriate evidence-based instructional practices and specialized character of the disciplines being taught.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit teaching of academic language, including vocabulary instruction, but also going beyond to develop academic language skills at the sentence and discourse level. • Differentiation based on language proficiency levels. • Sheltering content and making it accessible to students at varying levels of English proficiency.
<p>E. Teachers develop lessons that reflect the interconnectedness of content areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit teaching of academic language across content areas. For instance, a teacher could teach the word “table” and help students understand the different ways it is used in different content areas (a table in mathematics is different than a table in geography). • Explicit teaching of the varying cultural perspectives across and within various academic disciplines. • Use of culturally and linguistically relevant and diverse texts. • Explicit teaching of concepts that cut across content areas (e.g., cycles, structure and function).

Continued on next page.

QUALITY STANDARD I

Teachers demonstrate mastery of and pedagogical expertise in the content they teach. The elementary teacher is an expert in literacy and mathematics and is knowledgeable in all other content that he/she teaches. The secondary teacher has knowledge of literacy and mathematics and is an expert in his/her content endorsement area(s).

Elements	Practices that May be Observed During CLDE Specialist Observations*
F. Teachers make instruction and content relevant to students and take actions to connect students' background and contextual knowledge with new information being taught.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Building on prior knowledge that includes previous lessons, cultural and linguistic knowledge, as well as community funds of knowledge.• Making learning relevant to students' lives outside of school.

*The practices included in these tables are examples only and should not be considered requirements or an all-inclusive list. They are provided to help the evaluator and teacher understand how teacher quality standards may be met through CLD instruction.

QUALITY STANDARD II

Teachers establish a safe, inclusive, and respectful learning environment for a diverse population of students.

Elements	Practices that May be Observed During CLDE Specialist Observations*
<p>A. Teachers foster a predictable learning environment in the classroom in which each students has a positive, nurturing relationship with caring adults and peers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differentiated participation formats (e.g., small groups, partners, rehearsing language production with supports). • Students and teacher using native languages. • Co-constructed classroom routines, norms and behaviors that are culturally and linguistically responsive. • Various scaffolds and supports for students’ successful participation in dialogue (e.g., resources on the wall, sentence stems).
<p>B. Teachers demonstrate a commitment to and respect for diversity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students and teacher use native languages. • Environment that embraces and affirms the diversity in the classroom (e.g., pictures, quotes, materials, resources, student work, etc. that represent the various gender, racial, linguistic, cultural, religious, ability, and other potential identities students have). • Diversity affirming approaches to problem solving (i.e., co-constructed problem solving protocols, listening to students before reprimanding for behaviors, etc.). • Students and teacher use greetings, songs, transitions, labels (e.g., table names), and rules and routines charts, in the languages represented by the students in the classroom. • Explicitly teaching varied perspectives on a topic. For instance, in history learn about an event from the perspectives of all of the groups involved. In math, explore the different kinds of thinking about problem solving related to various cultural perspectives. In science, demonstrate a difference in scientific thinking and processes across various cultures.
<p>C. Teachers engage students as individuals with unique interests and strengths.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students and teacher use students’ native languages. • Differentiated learning and assessment opportunities for students based on language proficiency levels, interests, and academic background.
<p>D. Teachers adapt their teaching for the benefit of all students, including those with special needs, across a range of ability levels.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration with other teachers and specialists. • Differentiated learning and assessment opportunities for students based on language proficiency levels, interests, academic background, etc. • Language objectives tied to the instruction occurring in the class.
<p>E. Teachers provide proactive, clear and constructive feedback to families about students’ progress and work collaboratively with the families and significant adults in the lives of their students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student work displayed or made available to the observer that demonstrates collaboration with families and significant adults in the lives of students, including work in languages other than English. • Communications with parents/families, those in person or those sent how with students, are in a format that can be understood by the parent/family.
<p>F. Teachers create a learning environment characterized by acceptable student behavior, efficient use of time, and appropriate intervention strategies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-constructed classroom norms and routines that are culturally and linguistically responsive. • Explicit teaching of and holding students accountable for adhering to the culturally and linguistically responsive co-constructed classroom norms and routines. • Relationship-building among and between students and teacher. • Classrooms geared towards language development should have more student talk versus teacher talk and, therefore, may be “noisy.” Lots of talk and interaction among and between students and teachers is desirable for language acquisition.

*The practices included in these tables are examples only and should not be considered requirements or an all-inclusive list. They are provided to help the evaluator and teacher understand how teacher quality standards may be met through CLD instruction.

QUALITY STANDARD III

Teachers plan and deliver effective instruction and create an environment that facilitates learning for their students.

Elements	Practices that May be Observed During CLDE Specialist Observations*
<p>A. Teachers demonstrate knowledge of current developmental science, the ways in which learning takes place, and the appropriate levels of intellectual, social and emotional development of their students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of key principles of second language acquisition (Lucas & Villegas, 2011, p. 57): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Conversational language proficiency is fundamentally different from academic language proficiency. ➤ Students need comprehensible input that is just beyond their current level of proficiency as well as the opportunity to create meaningful output. ➤ Students learn language skills through social interaction for authentic communicative purposes. ➤ Concepts and skills learned in the first language transfer to the second language. ➤ Anxiety regarding using a second language can interfere with learning. ➤ Provides instruction that is cognitively demanding and adjusts for the language demands of learning experiences.
<p>B. Teachers plan and consistently deliver instruction that draws on results of student assessments, is aligned to academic standards, and advances students' level of content knowledge and skills.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessments meaningfully linked to student language proficiency levels. • Monitoring of student learning throughout the lesson that impacts the instructional direction of the lesson. • Multiple forms of assessment across all language modalities (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) and multiple scores on multiple assessments to make important decisions about students (e.g., using more than just DIBELS to put bilingual students in low reading groups, or using more than COG-AT scores to include or exclude students from gifted and talented programs). • Multiple opportunities for students to display their learning growth (in both content and language development) through the use of oral assessments, pictures, symbols, and various assessment products. • Standards-based instruction is delivered through an inquiry approach to learning.
<p>C. Teachers demonstrate a rich knowledge of current research on effective instructional practices to meet the developmental and academic needs of their students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students collaborating and using multiple languages. • Differentiated learning and assessment opportunities for students based on language proficiency levels. • Supports for bilingualism and bi-literacy development by allowing students to use multiple languages and providing resources and/or instruction and assessment in multiple languages. • Access to all content areas.
<p>D. Teachers thoughtfully integrate and utilize appropriate available technology in their instruction to maximize student learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students have access to materials in multiple languages that support their content and language development. • Inductive explorative experiences with technology, particularly for students with limited access to hardware and software outside of school.

Continued on next page.

QUALITY STANDARD III

Teachers plan and deliver effective instruction and create an environment that facilitates learning for their students.

Elements	Practices that May be Observed During CLDE Specialist Observations*
<p>E. Teachers establish and communicate high expectations for all students and plan instruction that helps students develop critical thinking and problem solving skills.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students engaging in age appropriate, content related complex thinking tasks, even if they are at lower levels of English proficiency. • Opportunities for students to explore content and ideas from varying perspectives and worldviews. • Students at beginning levels of English are allowed access to and instructed in grade-level Colorado academic standards in all subject areas. • Students at intermediate levels of English proficiency are pushed to express complex thinking and problem solving abilities in both English and their home language. • Opportunities for students to recognize the “gifted” side of bilingualism. • Bilingual students have access to honors, AP, gifted and talented and other accelerated curricula.
<p>F. Teachers provide students with opportunities to work in teams and develop leadership qualities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sentence stems or other linguistic scaffolds to support students in effective team work. • Cultural scaffolds for supporting effective team work and the development of leadership skills. • Clear expectations around working in teams (e.g., roles, responsibilities, purpose). • Students engage in self-assessments, which allow students to monitor their participation and leadership responsibilities in group work.
<p>G. Teachers communicate effectively, making learning objectives clear and providing appropriate models of language.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessible learning objectives for all students regardless of language proficiency level. • Print-rich environment with scaffolds to support student language development.
<p>H. Teachers use appropriate methods to assess what each student has learned, including formal and informal assessments and use results to plan further instruction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age and language proficiency level appropriate student “ownership for monitoring their own progress, setting learning goals, and applying teacher feedback to improve performance.” Teacher may ask students in the younger grades to self-monitor orally, in their first language, or through the use of pictures and/or symbols. These same approaches may also be valuable for older students at lower levels of English proficiency. • Collaborate and consult with mainstream and content area teachers to modify and adapt assessments for English proficiency levels and cultural backgrounds. • Informal, formative assessments such as: small group guided reading sessions, warm-ups, collaborative work with student groups, exit tickets, questioning, and observation of student language use and engagement in learning tasks. • Assessments that span the language modalities (speaking, listening, reading and writing) and provide multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate their knowledge regardless of language proficiency level. For instance, a written test may provide more valuable information to a teacher if it is followed with oral questions to better assess student content understanding and language development.

*The practices included in these tables are examples only and should not be considered requirements or an all-inclusive list. They are provided to help the evaluator and teacher understand how teacher quality standards may be met through CLD instruction.

Practices that “May be Observed During CLDE Specialist Observations” are not provided for Standards IV (Teachers reflect on their practice.) and V (Teachers demonstrate leadership.) because all of their professional practices are identified as being “not observable” during typical classroom observations. These two standards are evaluated through an examination of artifacts and evidence such as the items listed in Exhibit 1.

Conclusion

The evaluation of CLDE specialists presents unique challenges for both evaluators and the CLDE specialists who are being evaluated. The most common concern regarding such evaluations is that the full range of responsibilities is not reflected in the Rubric for Evaluating Colorado Teachers.

This brief addresses the first concern by explaining how CLDE specialists and their evaluators can take advantage of the flexibility built into the Rubric for Evaluating Colorado Teachers to address the unique responsibilities of CLDE specialists. The exhibits in this guide are designed to be helpful in understanding how evaluation requirements may look for CLDE specialists.

It is CDE's hope that this brief will prove helpful to CLDE specialists and their evaluators by providing them with real-life examples of evidence/artifacts, what to look for in observations, and ways in which CLDE specialists may discuss their performance with their evaluators.

Resources

Alternate ACCESS (for bilingual students with disabilities) <http://www.wida.us/assessment/alternateaccess.aspx>

Brisk, M. E. (2014). *Engaging students in academic literacies: Genre-based pedagogy for K-5 classrooms*. Routledge.

Colorado Association of Bilingual Education (COCABE)
<http://www.cocabe.org/> (affiliate of NABE: <http://www.nabe.org/>)

Colorado Affiliate of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CoTESOL)
<http://www.colorado.edu/iec/cotesol/> (affiliate of TESOL: <http://www.tesol.org/>)

Cummins, J. (2005). ELL students speak for themselves: Identity texts and literacy engagement in multilingual classrooms. *Educational Leadership Journal*.

eCALLMS: Supporting Linguistically Responsive Teaching (CU Denver) <http://ecallms.ucdsehd.net/> (Free online collaborative professional development for teachers regarding second language acquisition, academic language learning in mathematics and science)

Gibbons, P. (2009). *English learners, academic literacy, and thinking: Learning in the challenge zone*. Heinemann.

Hurley, S. R. & Tinajero, J. V. (2000). *Literacy assessment of second language learners*. Pearson.

Iddings, J. & de Oliveira, L. (2014). *Genre pedagogy across the curriculum: Theory and application in U.S. classrooms and contexts*. Equinox Publishing.

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA)
<http://www.ncela.us/>

O'Malley, J. M. & Pierce, L. V. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers*. Addison-Wesley.

Understanding Language: Language, Literacy, and Learning in the Content Areas (Stanford University)
<http://ell.stanford.edu/>.

Zwiers, J. (2007). *Building academic language: Essential practices for classrooms, Grades 5-12*. Jossey-Bass.

Zwiers, J. & Crawford, M. (2011). *Academic conversations: Classroom talk that fosters critical thinking and content understandings*. Stenhouse Publishers.