**ERMA 8120: Teacher Evaluation**

**Auburn University - College of Education**

Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership, & Technology

Fall 2018

1. **Class Time:** Wednesday, 5:00-7:50PM

**Location:** Haley Center, Room 1456

**Instructor:** Carey E. Andrzejewski; (334)-844-3012; [cea0011@auburn.edu](mailto:cea0011@auburn.edu)

**Office Hours:** Tuesdays 2:30-5PM, Wednesdays 2:30-5PM, and by appointment or happenstance

**Credit Hours:** 3 semester hours

**Prerequisites:** n/a

1. **Date Syllabus Prepared:** August 2018
2. **Course Description:** I have based this course on the assumption that becoming a teacher is a career-long pursuit and that the evaluation of teachers’ practice can serve to support their efforts to become better teachers—that is teachers whose practice increasingly *works* for more students and families. We will focus on literature related to the purposes of schooling and education, the nature of high quality teaching, tools and techniques for evaluating teachers’ practice, and the supervision of teachers. In particular, we will focus on what it means to evaluate and supervise teachers in the interest of socially just education and schooling.

As we will focus on both practical and theoretical issues, ERMA 8120 will make significant demands on your time. Please think carefully about your schedule and decide early whether you are able to make this commitment. The course readings will serve as the basis for class discussions and requirements, so you will miss out on a lot and experience painful boredom unless you complete the readings before the dates for which they are assigned.

1. **Student Learning Outcomes:** By the completion of this course, you will be able to: 1) identify and apply components of clinical supervision of teachers; 2) explain research findings related to effective teaching, teacher evaluation, or supervision; 3) construct a useful system for gathering information about teaching; 4) provide useful feedback to teachers; 5) describe strengths and limitations of a wide variety of approaches to teacher evaluation; 6) apply multiple observational approaches to obtain useful information about teachers and their practice; 7) develop evidence-based plans for improving teachers’ practice.
2. **Required Materials:** [1] Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperiVision and Instructional Leadership: A Developmental Approach* (10th ed.). Boston, Pearson. [2] Web access. You must have access to a web browser, and you must check your email accounts (Tiger Mail and Canvas) several times a week. [3] Supplementary resources, which will be provided by the instructor via Canvas or in class*.* [4] Patience, time management, and a sense of humor.
3. **Suggested materials:** Pelletier, C. M. (2000). *A Handbook of Techniques and Strategies for Coaching Student Teachers* (2nd ed.). Boston, Allyn and Bacon.
4. **Course Format:** This course utilizes a seminar format. The class meetings will include small group discussions, class discussions, lectures, informal student presentations, and collaborative activities. It is important to the collective enterprise that students keep current with the assigned readings, attend class meetings, and participate in the discussions as informed members. Your participation will ensure that our time together will be productive and worthwhile.
5. **Course Policies:**
6. Professionals show up on time and prepared every day for work. Yes, professionals occasionally have to take sick or personal days, but the best professionals are always there. If you have to miss a class, you will be responsible for the notes, assignments, and other duties that have been discussed.
7. Professionals complete assignments on time. Assignments are due on Canvas before the start of class on the date given, unless otherwise noted. Assignments handed in after this time will be considered late. **Late work will not earn an A. Only in extenuating circumstances will I accept late work more than one week past the deadline.**
8. Professionals use appropriate means for discussing disagreements. If you don’t understand something, ask during class. If you still don’t understand, email, phone, or catch me in the building. If you think you deserve a different grade, please contact me within 48 hours. Please don’t be so unprofessional as to take class time to discuss grades or other points of contention.
9. Professionals take responsibility for their own learning. That said, my purpose is to help class members become the very best they can possibly become at this point in their professional development. Please allow me to assist in any way possible including, but certainly not limited to: listening, providing feedback, answering questions, sharing and addressing concerns, brainstorming, clarifying course content or expectations, and mediating or facilitating work with collaborating peers. Always feel free to contact me by phone or by email.
10. Professionals give credit where credit is due. All portions of the Auburn University student academic honesty code (Title XII) will apply to university courses (see <https://sites.auburn.edu/admin/universitypolicies/Policies/AcademicHonestyCode.pdf> as posted on the University Policies website, [www.auburn.edu/studentpolicies](https://sites.auburn.edu/admin/universitypolicies/default.aspx)). All academic honesty violations or alleged violations of the SGA Code of Laws will be reported to the Office of the Provost, which will then refer the case to the Academic Honesty Committee. Written assignments that include material that is similar to that from course reading materials or other sources should include a citation including source, author, and page number. Quotation marks should be used if the material is copied directly from the readings and in-text citations should be used (Author, year, page). If the material is paraphrased, (Author, year) should appear immediately following the paraphrased material. Failing to do so constitutes violation of the Auburn University Academic Honesty Code. In addition, written assignments that are similar or identical to those of other students in the class (past or present) is also a violation of the Code. **Finally, you may not submit the work of someone else or work that you have submitted for another class to satisfy a requirement of ERMA 8120.**
11. Professionals understand that teaching and learning are ongoing processes for everyone. There are things I haven’t thought of here. Understand that I am learning along with you and your classmates. Please help me take a collaborative approach to solving any problems that may arise.
12. Professionals make others aware of what they need to be successful. Please inform me within the first week of class if you require adaptations or modifications to any assignment because of special needs (disabilities, religious observances, and so on).
13. **Disability Accommodations:** Students who need accommodations are asked to electronically submit their approved accommodations through AU Access and to arrange a meeting during office hours the first week of classes, or as soon as possible, if accommodations are needed immediately. If you have a conflict with my office hours, an alternate time can be arranged. To set up this meeting, please contact me by e-mail. If you have not established accommodations through the Office of Accessibility, but need accommodations, make an appointment with the Office of Accessibility, 1228 Haley Center, 844-2096 (V/TT).
14. **Course Requirements and Evaluation:** See class calendar for due dates.
15. Reading Quizzes: Quizzes based on the assigned reading for the week may be given during any class, at any time, without prior notice. It is your obligation to read and to work to understand the reading. I warn you, the reading for this class is not designed for casual reading. To understand it, you will need to devote adequate time. Scores on reading quizzes will be factored into the participation grade.
16. Reflective Reports (20 points total):This semester, you will be asked to submit 10 reflective reports (approximately 2 pages; 2 points each). Most of them (numbers 3-9) will parallel the elements of the micro-supervision (see below), and they will document your emerging understanding of your role as a clinical supervisor and what you hope to accomplish during the micro-supervision experience with your supervisee. You should integrate responses to class sessions and readings as seems appropriate. Feel free to use a personal tone; after all, much of this is about you. See Appendix A for guidelines and advice. See Canvas for assignment details about each report. See the Class Calendar for deadlines.
17. Literature Review Assignment (20 points total): Over the course of the semester you will need to identify an issue related to teacher supervision/evaluation for social justice (2 points). Ideally, that issue would be inspired by and relevant to your micro-supervision project (see below). You will also gather up-to-date (i.e., not older than 2008) scholarly resources that shed light on that issue (i.e., create an annotated bibliography with no fewer than 10 resources; 8 points), and write a scholarly paper that synthesizes the literature you have reviewed and taking and arguing for a position regarding that issue (e.g., identifying a best practice or a preferred theoretical framing, etc.; approximately 10 pages; 10 points). See Canvas for assignment details. See the Class Calendar for deadlines. See Appendix B for a beginning list of resources and journals.

My aim is to provide a post-semester opportunity for groups of you who have done good work and are interested to collaborate to synthesize across these literature review papers and submit them for publication.

1. Micro-Supervision (50 points total):This class offers an opportunity to engage in evaluating and supervising a teacher on a relatively small scale. For the micro-supervision, you must:
   1. Identify an appropriate teacher to supervise (0 points, but necessary nonetheless). Teachers are individuals who take primary responsibility for instruction and assessment of student learning in any educational setting (e.g., P-12 teachers, college and university instructors, trainers and workforce developers, graduate teaching assistants, etc.). Ideally, they have a desire to engage in supervision as a means of improving their practice.
   2. Conduct an introductory interview (no fewer than 30 minutes; 7 points). The aims of the interview are to establish rapport, develop a sense of how the teacher sees their own practice, and establish a shared goal for the supervisory experience. See Canvas for complete descriptions of what you will submit.
   3. Conduct three observations and feedback cycles (at least the duration of one class meeting; 21 points total; 7 points each). The first and second observations should precede the intervention (see below). One of these two should follow a standardized format. Don’t worry; we’ll talk about and pool resources for standardized assessments in class. The third will need to come after the intervention. You’ll submit field notes about the observations and the feedback session with your supervisee.
   4. Offer an intervention (7 points). To address an identified need in your supervisee’s classroom, you’ll need to develop an intervention. That is, you’ll need to make a plan to help your supervisee improve their practice to the benefit of student learning. There are many forms the intervention could take (e.g., book or article study, model teaching, action research, etc.), but they should be focused on your supervisee’s practice as they relate to equitable student outcomes. You’ll need to submit the materials developed for the intervention as well as field notes about its implementation.
   5. Conduct a final/debriefing interview (no fewer than 30 minutes; 7 points). See Canvas for assignment details.
   6. Draft a final report of the micro-supervision (approximately 5 pages; 8 points). The report should have a professional tone as you will share it with your supervisee. It should summarize the entire micro-supervision and highlight key findings. It should include appendices with resources you want to share with your supervisee (e.g., observation guides, observation notes or summaries, or intervention materials).
2. Participation and Preparedness (10 points): Preparing for and engaging in class are essential not only to your success in class but also to the success of your classmates. This grade will be based on attendance, reading quiz grades, and the quality of your contributions to class discussions and activities.
3. **Grading Scale for the Final Grade:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Percent | Points | Letter Grade |
| 90 – 100% | ≥ 90 points | A |
| 80 – 89.99% | ≥ 80 and < 89.99 points | B |
| 70 – 79.99% | ≥ 70 and < 79.99 points | C |
| 60 - 69. 99% | ≥ 60 and < 69.99 points | D |
| Below 60% | < 60 points | F |

**Appendix A**: Hallmarks of High Quality Reflective Writing

Reflective reports should document your substantive thinking about one or more of the following questions. They should also be responsive to the prompts provided on Canvas:

* What have I learned about clinical supervision? … about myself as a clinical supervisor?
* What have I learned about my supervisee and their teaching practice?
* What is the nature of “my particular pair of spectacles”? How do I see the world in unique ways? How do my views, my lenses, my biases, and my assumptions shape what I can, and cannot, see in my supervisee’s teaching practice? How do they shape the data I generate, the assessments I make, the conclusions I reach, and the feedback I offer to my supervisee?
* What sense am I making of the class readings? … the micro-supervision experiences? … the class experiences?
* How are my readings, micro-supervision, and class experiences related?
* In what ways am I building skills as a clinical supervisor? What has gone well? What mistakes have I made? What will I do differently next time? Why?

There are also five criteria that can be used to assess the degree to which reflective writing is productive.[[1]](#footnote-1)• I will assess your reports based on the degree to which your writing completely addressed the prompts and meets these criteria. They are:

1. **Specificity and Clarity:** Does the reflective writing draw on specific language and terminology rather than broad, vague terms? Does it clearly communicate a message, epiphany, discovery, concern, or question?
2. **Accuracy:** Does the reflective writing refer to concepts in teacher evaluation in ways that demonstrate accurate, or evolving, understanding? Does the reflective writing include appropriate, if informal, citations where the thoughts, ideas, and words of others have been used?
3. **Synthesis:** Does the reflective writing provide evidence that you have drawn on more than one source of information (reading, micro-supervision, class experience, etc.) to reveal deep thinking about teacher evaluation and clinical supervision? It will be particularly important to incorporate ideas from the readings. Including citational support for your ideas is a good scholarly habit.
4. **Self- and Supervisee-Focus:** Does the reflective writing include substantive statements about your learning and experiences? Does it include substantive statements about your supervisee, their practice, their goals, or ways to achieve those goals?
5. **Future-Focus:** Does the reflective writing include specific statements about your future practice as a teacher evaluator and clinical supervisor?

**Appendix B**: Partial list of relevant journals and online resources

* *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*
* *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*
* *Journal of Teacher Education*
* *International Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education*
* *Teachers College Record*
* *Action in Teacher Education*
* *The Teacher Educator*
* *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*
* *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*
* *Journal of Effective Teaching*
* *American Education Research Journal*
* *Educational Researcher*
* *Studying Teacher Education*
* *Teacher Education Quarterly*
* *Journal of Education for Teaching*

You will likely also be able to locate peer-reviewed journals focused on teaching in specific disciplines.

* American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education: <http://aacte.org/>
* American Federation of Teachers: <http://www.aft.org/>
* Association of Teacher Educators: <http://www.ate1.org>
* National Education Association: <http://www.nea.org/>
* The Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC): <https://ccsso.org/index.php/resource-library/literature-review-intasc-model-core-teaching-standards-2011>
* Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation: <http://caepnet.org/>

Similarly, you will also likely be able to find organizations focused on teaching in specific disciplines.

**Appendix C.** Tentative Course Calendar

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Week / Topic** | **Readings** | **Assignments Due** |
| Week 1 (8/22): *Introduction* | GGG Chs 1-3 |  |
| Week 2 (8/29): *Purposes of Schooling* | Johnson & Reed (2012)  Lewis and Macedo (1995)  Giroux and Greene (1995)  Postman (1995) | Reflective Report 1 |
| Week 3 (9/5): *Purposes of Teaching* | Gitomer & Bell (2016) – This is long. Plan accordingly.  Choose one:  Postman & Weingartner (1969)  Freire (1970)  Ohanian (2012)  Milner (2012)  Nieto (2014) |  |
| Week 4 (9/12): *Teacher Development, Knowledge, & Expertise* | GGG Chs 4-6  Feldon (2006)  Koellner & Jacobs (2015)  Pantic & Florian (2015)  Locate a taxonomy/framework/model of teacher knowledge and/or teacher development in your field. We’ll show and tell in class. | Identify Supervisee |
| Week 5 (9/19): *Interpersonal Skills & Modesl of Supervision* | GGG Chs 7-11  Revisit GGG Ch 6  Choose one:  Crasborn et al. (2008)  Bullough (2005)5 | Reflective Report 2 |
| Week 6 (9/26): *Standardized Assessments, Validity, & Reliability* | Herlihy et al. (2014)  Johnson (2013)  Lavigne (2014)  Look into information about at least two of these:  EdTPA  Praxis III  Class  OPAL  TARGET  National Board Certification  AQTS – ELEOT  Identify a third to bring and share |  |
| Week 7 (10/3): *no class meeting* | Read ahead, or don’t  Catch up on projects, or don’t  You’re welcome. | Literature Review Topic |
| Week 8 (10/10): *Technical Skills: Assessment and Planning & Observation* | GGG Chs12 & 13  P Chs 1-4 (optional)  Gregoire (2003) |  |
| Week 9 (10/17): *Technical Skills: Evaluation & Feedback* | GGG Ch 14  P Chs revist 4, 8, & 9 (optional)  Kchachatryan (2015) |  |
| Week 10 (10/24): *Peer/Instructor Feedback – literature review & intervention plans* | P Chs 5-6 & 10-13 as useful (optional) | Interview 1  Observation and Feedback 1 & 2  Reflective Reports 3-5 |
| Week 11 (10/31): *Technical Tasks of Supervision* | GGG Chs 15-17  Snow-Gerono (2008)  Hoekstra & Korthagen (2011) |  |
| Week 12 (11/7): *Technical Tasks of Supervision, cont.* | GGG Chs 18-20  Tang & Chow (2007)  Soslau (2012)  Choose one:  Bleicher (2012)  Elliott (2015)  McTaggart, Nixon, & Kemmis (2017) | Annotated Bibliography |
| Week 13 (11/14): *Supervision for Social Justice* | GGG Ch 22  Zeichner (1993)  Jacobs (2006)  Lee (2011) |  |
| Thanksgiving (11/21) – no class meetings |  |  |
| Week 14 (11/28): NAME; no class meeting |  | Intervention  Observation and Feedback 3  Interview 2  Reflective Reports 6-8 |
| Week 15 (12/5): *Cultural Tasks of Supervision* | GGG Chs 21 & 23  Darling-Hammond (2006)  Levine (2011) | Micros-Supervision Final Report  Reflective Report 9 |
| Finals Week (12/12) |  | Reflective Report 10  Literature Review Paper |

1. Davis, E. A. (2006). Characterizing productive reflection among preservice elementary teachers:

   Seeing what matters. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*(3), 281-301.

   Based on guidelines developed in collaboration with Dr. Heather A. Davis [↑](#footnote-ref-1)