Aligning Evaluation and Curriculum

This resource describes different options for addressing the potential tension that could arise between a required evaluation tool and the content-specific and/or curriculum-specific walkthrough tool you have adopted or constructed through your vision setting process.

Guiding Questions
Before digging into the possible options below, consider the following:
1. What role does your evaluation tool currently play in your school/system?
2. What kinds of restraints do you have on making adjustments to the current evaluation tool or system?

Options	Considerations
Option 1: Use your evaluation tool only for evaluation and use the content-specific walkthrough tool for coaching purposes.	• If you're in a context where you have a required and significant framework that is tied to high-stakes decisions (i.e. compensation), this option is likely not for you because teachers could perceive the use of multiple tools as unfair. • This option requires the fewest adjustments but does require thoughtful and thorough training and communication. • School leaders and coaches need training on how to use both tools effectively and how to communicate the relationship (or non-relationship) between them. • Communication is key so that school leaders and coaches understand what tool to use for what purpose. • Teachers need to know very clearly how they will be evaluated and how they will be coached and why the approach is different. • Consider having the content-specific walkthrough tool only include "yes/no" rather than a scale to underscore that the content-specific walkthrough tool is not the evaluation tool.
Option 2: Choose to move away from your previous evaluation	• If you're in a context where you have a required and significant framework that is tied to high-stakes decisions (i.e. compensation),

tool and only use your content-specific walkthrough tool for both coaching and evaluation.	consider this option carefully. Moving away from the agreed upon evaluation tool could be cumbersome and have unintended consequences in other areas. • This option simplifies the evaluation and coaching conversation because you would just be using one tool for both. • This option ensures that feedback and evaluation are both directly tied to the vision you set for high-quality instruction. • This kind of shift requires thoughtful communication to all necessary stakeholders (teachers, school leaders, coaches, etc.) to ensure everyone knows and is trained on the new tool.
Option 3: Combine your evaluation tool with your content-specific walkthrough tool (see example below).	• This option allows you to keep your current evaluation tool while ensuring that teachers are still receiving content-specific feedback that aligns with your vision and the curriculum you are using. • This could be a good option if school leaders and teachers are deeply familiar with your current evaluation tool. • This option could potentially be confusing for teachers and leaders because it's doubling the set of shared vocabulary for how you talk about teaching. • This is a time-intensive undertaking, so if choosing this option, plan accordingly.
Option 4: Narrow your focus in your evaluation tool and combine that specific focus area with your content-specific walkthrough tool (see example below).	• This option might be an easier transition if time is a factor. • The manageability of narrowing your coaching and evaluation focus might be appealing. • Narrowing your focus could potentially limit your ability to differentiate support for stronger teachers.

Below is an example of how you could approach combining your evaluation tool and your content-specific or curriculum-specific walkthrough tool. This example takes one sub-domain from the Danielson Framework for Teaching evaluation rubric and combines with specific indicators from the ELA Instructional Practice Guide. The Danielson components are in grey and the Instructional Practice Guide components are in blue italics.

Danielson 3b- Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques
- **Quality of questions**
  - **Core Action 2A:** *Questions and tasks address the text by attending to its particular qualitative features: its meaning/purpose and/or, language, structure(s) or knowledge demands.*
  - **Core Action 2B:** *Questions and tasks require students to use evidence from the text to demonstrate understanding and to support their ideas about the text. These ideas are expressed through both written and oral responses.*
  - **Core Action 2C:** *Questions and tasks attend to the words (academic vocabulary), phrases, and sentences within the text.*
  - **Core Action 2D:** *Questions and tasks are sequenced to build knowledge by guiding students to delve deeper into the text and graphics.*
  - **Core Action 3A:** *The teacher poses questions and tasks for students to do the majority of the work: speaking/listening, reading, and/or writing. Students do the majority of the work of the lesson.*
- **Discussion techniques**
  - **Core Action 3D:** *The teacher creates the conditions for student conversations, where students are encouraged to talk about each other's thinking. Students talk and ask questions about each other's thinking, in order to obtain clarity or improve their understanding.*
- ***Student participation***
  - **Student Mastery:** *Students exhibit a strong grasp of the content of the lesson.*