

# LER: Other Personnel Guidance

Released June 2024

## Alternative School Educators

### PURPOSE

Certain subgroups of educators, which are listed in the table below, operate in unique situations that may require additional attention to apply the Louisiana evaluation model with fidelity and provide educators with meaningful feedback. As such, we have conducted numerous focus groups with educators working in these areas to develop additional guidance to support evaluation. The accompanying documents are meant to serve as an instructive, although not exhaustive, list of areas to which evaluators should direct additional attention based on the unique instructional or service setting of the educator. These guides can serve as a model for applying the Louisiana Educator Rubric when observing teachers in non-traditional settings. These are meant to supplement, not replace, the Louisiana Educator Rubric. Together, the pre-observation questions, key areas for gathering evidence, examples of evidence and artifacts, and examples of excellence present an evaluator with additional resources to use to conduct high-quality evaluations.

### GUIDANCE

The accompanying documents for each educator group are broken down into two types of guidance.

1. The *Observation Guidance* document provides:
  - A quick glance at some guiding questions and overarching concerns for each educator group; and
  - Examples of pre-observation questions, key areas to focus evidence gathering, and examples of appropriate evidence/artifacts the evaluator may collect.
    - NOTE: Key areas for evidence are not intended to replace the indicators in the LER (Louisiana Educator Rubric), but rather are more detailed guidelines for evaluating indicators that educators have identified as particularly tricky to observe.
2. The *Observation Support* document provides:
  - Additional context for the evaluator when considering the responsibilities of each educator;
  - Detailed examples to illuminate some of the key indicators and areas for evidence; and
  - A platform for meaningful discussion between educators and evaluators around best practices.
    - NOTE: This can be especially useful for structuring pre-conference discussions.

### Available observation guidance documents include:

#### LOUISIANA EDUCATOR RUBRIC

- Alternative School Educators
- Special Education Educators of Students with Disabilities (SWD)
- Interventionists
- Librarian/Media Specialists (LMS)
- Master/Lead Teachers/Instructional Coaches (without classroom assignments)

# LER Observation Guidance: Alternative School Educators

## PRE-CONFERENCE COACHING QUESTIONS

1. How do you plan for effective lessons in the alternative setting?
2. How do you ensure that your instruction addresses the individualized behavior and curricular goals/objectives of students?
3. How do you actively engage students in learning?
4. What are the engagement strategies (individual, small, and whole group) that you use?
5. How do you communicate expectations for student behavior and learning?
6. What do you do to reinforce and reward student effort toward meeting the learning goals/objectives?
7. How do you reinforce respectful conditions? What techniques do you use to encourage students to treat one another with respect?
8. How do you manage student behavior so that learning is successful?
9. Are there any special circumstances in your classroom that I should know about?
10. How do you assure a safe environment in your classroom for medically fragile students? How do you follow safety plans for at-risk youth?

## KEY INDICATORS

### 1. Planning – Instructional Plans

- Alternative educators can clearly articulate how lesson plans are developed for the alternative setting (long range “unit” plans, short range clusters of plans) that provide an opportunity to positively impact students no matter the timeframe of attendance in their classroom.
- There is evidence of individual instructional goals for students and instructional lesson plans are rooted in high-quality instructional materials (as adopted by the school system) to guarantee alignment to state standards and assessments.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Motivating Students (MOT); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Lesson Structure and Pacing (LSP); Activities and Materials (ACT); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Assessment (AS); Expectations (ES)*

### 2. Instruction – Standards and Objectives

- Alternative educators can clearly and explicitly state objectives or content standard goals for students and the demands of rigor to meet the standards and the expectations/criteria for success to meet the objective(s); although, the individualized nature of student work means that whole class objectives are not consistent and generally not posted.
- There is clear evidence that most students are progressing toward mastery of objectives through the use of HQIM assessments; although the evaluator may need to speak with individual students to determine progression toward mastery.
- Students are behaviorally and cognitively engaged in the process of mastering objectives.

*\*Connection to Motivating Students (MOT); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Lesson Structure and Pacing (LSP); Activities and Materials (ACT); Questioning (QU); Academic Feedback (FEED); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Expectations (ES)*

### 3. Instruction – Lesson Structure and Pacing

- Alternative educators clearly and deliberately use individualized strategies to deliver instruction to students (NOTE: Students in alternative classrooms vary greatly in age, grade level, subject matter focus, etc. and as such, group work or partnering may be very minimal given the lack of overlap in instructional needs).
- Alternative educators pace individual learning activities to align with the needs of students and scaffold instruction to meet individual needs while maintaining focus on the demands of the standards.
- Routines are evident and can be articulated by students.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Motivating Students (MOT); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Activities and Materials (ACT); Questioning (QU); Academic Feedback (FEED); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Expectations (ES)*

#### 4. Instruction – Grouping

- The instructional grouping arrangement may vary based on student behavior plans and/or individual goals but will consistently maximize student understanding and learning efficiency.
- Instructional group composition may be varied based on the individualized needs/plans of the student instead of on factors such as race, gender, ability, and age, and are composed in the best interest of the student in order to accomplish the goals of the lesson.
- There is evidence of student individual responsibility and accountability (student work).

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Motivating Students (MOT); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Lesson Structure and Pacing (LSP); Activities and Materials (ACT); Questioning (QU); Academic Feedback (FEED); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Expectations (ES)*

#### EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE/ARTIFACTS

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• IEPs, as appropriate</li><li>• Conversations with students</li><li>• Student assessments/exit tickets, journals</li><li>• Student goal sheets and behavior tracking documentation</li><li>• Progress/data monitoring charts</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Behavior plans/contracts</li><li>• Student projects</li><li>• Safety sweep documents/checklist</li><li>• Medical assistance plan</li><li>• Contraband document</li></ul> |
|---|--|

## LER Observation Support: Scenarios for Alternative Educators

The evaluator may need to look more broadly at the alternative educator, as the alternative educator often delivers lessons in a “non-traditional” manner given individual student needs and timelines of attendance. Similarly, instructional plans are not limited to “traditional” teacher weekly plans, and as such, evaluators may find it necessary to speak or interact with students to determine if learning and thinking are taking place. Finally, student work is individualized, so standards and objectives for the whole class are not consistent and generally not posted.

### I. PLANNING

#### EXAMPLE – INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS

##### Planning – Instructional Plans:

Instructional plans (individual and whole group lessons) are based heavily on state standards, available local HQIM curriculum resources and materials, and analysis of formative and summative student assessments. Therefore, it should be evident in daily, weekly, and unit instructional plans that the following are incorporated: standards, curriculum resources, and assessments. There is evidence of communication between the Alternative Educator and teachers from the student’s home school regarding learning and behavioral needs. There is evidence of planning with the end in mind to develop lesson objectives, assessments, student work, and activities and materials that connect to the standards and lead students toward success. However, in order to determine the quality of a teacher’s plan, it is important to see the impact the planning has on the teacher’s ability to deliver the lesson and the resulting impact in the student work produced.

### II. INSTRUCTION

#### EXAMPLE – STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES

##### Instruction – Standards and Objectives:

In the classroom, standards/objectives of focus are explicitly communicated by teacher and students as well as behavioral expectations. The evaluator circulates around the room and stops to speak with individual students. The students are able to articulate which standards and objectives they are working on mastering and how their current activity helps them to meet those goals. There is also evidence of prior student work that demonstrates significant progress toward meeting their individual goals. Similarly, the alternative educator can clearly state the learning goals for individual students and differentiates instruction to meet various learning needs, styles, and strengths. Although

students may be in a variety of configurations, such as students standing, lying down, working in isolation, etc., they are actively focused on their instructional tasks. Evidence gathered from student work products (aligned to the standards) indicate student mastery or progress toward mastery of the objectives. Additionally, student behaviors reflect the explicitly communicated expectations.

## EXAMPLE — LESSON STRUCTURE AND PACING

### Instruction — Lesson Structure and Pacing:

In order to meet various learning needs, the alternative educator may divide students into several small groups and assign specific tasks, as appropriate to their learning and behavioral needs. Students transition with minimal loss of instructional time. Throughout the instructional time, the alternative educator maintains a flexible schedule that allows him/her to address learning in the moment and adjust the learning based on academic performance and behavior. This may not look like a typical classroom with blocks of time devoted to solely one subject/topic, as students have multiple learning goals in a range of different subjects. Simultaneous instruction is rare due to the level of differentiation needed by this particular group of students.

## EXAMPLE — GROUPING

### Instruction — Grouping:

The alternative educator creates groups based on what is appropriate for the individual students and what will maximize student understanding and learning efficiency to meet the standards/objectives of lessons. The grouping arrangement considers student behavior plans, individual student goals, and developmental appropriateness. Some groups may be composed of either individual students or an individual student paired with the alternative educator, will be focused on what is in the best interest of the student, and is aligned to the student's instructional plan. Throughout the instructional time, the alternative educator continuously measures the classroom climate and makes grouping adjustments as necessary. All students know their roles, responsibilities, and work expectations, and are working toward accomplishing the goals of the lesson as seen in their individual work products.

# Special Education Educators of Students with Disabilities (SWD) Louisiana Educator Rubric Observation Guidance

## PURPOSE

Certain subgroups of educators, which are listed in the table below, operate in unique situations that may require additional attention to apply the Louisiana evaluation model with fidelity and provide educators with meaningful feedback. As such, we have conducted numerous focus groups with educators working in these areas to develop additional guidance to support evaluation. The accompanying documents are meant to serve as an instructive, although not exhaustive, list of areas to which evaluators should direct additional attention based on the unique instructional or service setting of the educator. These are meant to supplement, not replace, the Louisiana Educator Rubric. Together, the pre-observation questions, key areas for gathering evidence, examples of evidence and artifacts, and examples of excellence present an evaluator with additional resources to use to conduct high-quality evaluations.

## GUIDANCE

The accompanying documents for each educator group are broken down into two types of guidance.

1. The *Observation Guidance* document provides:
  - A quick glance at some guiding questions and overarching concerns for each educator group; and
  - Examples of pre-observation questions, key areas to focus evidence gathering, and examples of appropriate evidence/artifacts the evaluator may collect.
    - NOTE: Key areas for evidence are not intended to replace the indicators in the LER (Louisiana Educator Rubric), but rather are more detailed guidelines for evaluating indicators that educators have identified as particularly tricky to observe.
2. The *Observation Support* document provides:
  - Additional context for the evaluator when considering the responsibilities of each educator;
  - Detailed examples to illuminate some of the key indicators and areas for evidence; and
  - A platform for meaningful discussion between educators and evaluators around best practices.
    - NOTE: This can be especially useful for structuring pre-conference discussions.

### Available observation guidance documents include:

#### LOUISIANA EDUCATOR RUBRIC

- Alternative Educators
- Special Education Educators of Students with Disabilities (SWD)
- Interventionists
- Librarian/Media Specialists
- Master/Lead Teachers/Instructional Coaches (without classroom assignments)

# LER Observation Guidance: Special Education Educators of Students with Disabilities

## PRE-CONFERENCE COACHING QUESTIONS

1. What are the unique circumstances in the classroom setting where you will be observed (e.g., inclusion vs. resource vs. life skills)?
2. In what ways do you plan with the regular educator(s)? How do you plan using student data?
3. How do you ensure that your instruction addresses the identified and individualized behavior and curricular goals/objectives of students?
4. What strategies and modifications do you bring to the classroom that are different from the regular classroom instructional strategies and modifications?
5. What is the direct link between what is on individual students' IEPs and what will be observed in today's lesson?
6. How do you plan lessons in a way that fulfills the goals and objectives of multiple IEPs? How did you plan for each student?
7. How do you actively engage students in learning? What are the engagement strategies (individual, small, and whole group) that you use? Differentiation strategies?
8. How will you communicate the purpose and learning expectations of the intervention lesson?
9. How do you measure student success/progress toward meeting the areas of intervention?
10. How do you communicate expectations for student behavior and learning?
11. What evidence will indicate mastery?
12. What data are you collecting? How are you collecting this data? How will you use this data to drive your instruction?
13. Are there any special circumstances in your classroom that I should know about?

## KEY INDICATORS

### 1. Planning – Instructional Plans

- Goals are measurable and explicit, aligned to state standards or student IEPs, and designed to clearly identify the gap between present level of performance and grade level performance.
- Goals and objectives, as appropriate, are selected in a manner to address deficits, accelerate progress, and close the gap.
- The Special Education Educator of SWD can clearly articulate how lesson plans and objectives are developed for the students assigned to them and how they are planning to meet the individual needs of the students identified in their IEPs.
- There is clear evidence that the plan provides regular opportunities to accommodate individual student needs (inclusion or pull-out) to build mastery; and clear purpose for the lesson should be evidenced in the lesson plan.
- Instructional plans are written in a concise, efficient manner that maximizes the amount of time spent with the student (utilizing HQIM resources).
- There is evidence of mastery/progress toward mastery of skills for students in the identified objectives.
- Plans may not integrate other disciplines, depending on the skill focus.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher knowledge of Students (TKS); Lesson Structure and Pacing (LSP); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Activities and Materials (ACT); Academic Feedback (FEED); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Student Work (SW); Assessment (AS); Expectations (ES)*

### 2. Planning – Student Work

- Engagement and conversation should be encouraged, but assignments may not lead to higher-order thinking, as repetition and focus on skill mastery are essential.
- Student work product requirements will vary based on the identified needs of the students within their IEPs.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Activities and Materials (ACT); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Academic Feedback (FEED); Instructional Plans (IP); Assessment (AS); Expectations (ES)*



### 3. Planning – Assessment

- Assessments will be aligned to short-term goals in areas of deficit, rather than state content standards, which are required for mastery at the end of the school year.
- Extended written tasks and portfolio-based assessments may not be appropriate.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Activities and Materials (ACT); Academic Feedback (FEED); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Assessment (AS); Expectations (ES)*

### 4. Instruction – Standards and Objectives

- Learning objectives (short-term) will be tied to areas of deficit that lead toward mastering state content standards by the end of the year. A clear connection between the state standard(s) or the IEP goals/objectives is evident. The IEP goals are designed in a way to accelerate progress (close the gap).
- The Special Education Educator of SWD can clearly and explicitly state objectives and the expectations/criteria for success to meet the objective(s)/sub-objectives/skills.
- Students are clear/can identify what their learning objectives are and their purpose. Students with IEPs are made aware of the goals/objectives on their particular IEP.
- There is clear evidence that most students are progressing toward mastery of objectives/sub-objectives through the use of scaffolded HQIM assessments; although the evaluator may need to speak with individual students to determine progression toward mastery. The Special Education Educator of SWD is collecting and monitoring/tracking student learning toward meeting objectives and standards.
- Students are behaviorally and cognitively engaged in the process of mastering objectives.

*\*Connection to Lesson Structure and Pacing (LSP); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Activities and Materials (ACT); Academic Feedback (FEED); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Assessment (AS); Expectations (ES)*

### 5. Instruction – Questioning

- Students are pushed to generate developmentally appropriate questions that lead to further inquiry and self-directed learning as aligned to the learning objectives identified.
- Questions are designed/scaffolded in a manner adapted to the students' particular learning styles as identified in their IEPs to meet the learning deficits.
- Questions glean information from students that could deepen their thinking toward meeting learning objectives and further identify additional needs to support learning.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Activities and Materials (ACT); Academic Feedback (FEED); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Student Work (SW); Assessment (AS); Expectations (ES)*

### 6. Instruction – Grouping

- The instructional group arrangement may vary based on student IEPs, but will maximize the impact of specific activities during the lesson and intentionally take into account diverse learning needs to consistently maximize student understanding and learning efficiency.
- Instructional group composition may be varied and is flexible in order to be the most beneficial for the individual needs of diverse learners and maximize learning.
- There is evidence of student individual responsibility and accountability (student work).
- The grouping of students is directly connected to ongoing data collection, progress monitoring, and the needs of the students.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Activities and Materials (ACT); Academic Feedback (FEED); Assessment (AS); Expectations (ES); Environment (ENV); Respectful Conditions (RC)*

### 7. Environment – Engaging Students and Managing Behavior

- Based on student IEPs (especially students with behavior plans), learning and teaching techniques and methods may seem non-traditional, but student work products from the lesson indicate progress toward mastery of the identified learning targets with the supports provided by the educator and any support staff present during the lesson observation.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Activities and Materials (ACT); Academic Feedback (FEED); Expectations (ES); Environment (ENV); Respectful Conditions (RC)*

## EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE/ARTIFACTS

- IEPs; list of accommodations & modifications
- Instructional Plans
- Behavioral Plans
- “I can” statements

- List of objectives and sub-objectives
- Logs/documentation of IEP implementation
- Progress/data monitoring charts
- Student assessments/exit tickets, journals, portfolios

## LER Observation Support: Special Education Educators of SWD (Students with Disabilities)

First, it is important to identify the specific parameters of each Special Education Educator of SWD’s role: Self-Contained teaching or Inclusion teaching. For a Special Education Educator of SWD, it is critical to first have a deep understanding of the standards that are expected to be mastered by the end of the school year for each student he/she serves. That deep understanding must include TCK that includes what “success” looks and sounds like to master the standards and then follows the identified IEP goals for each student (which should outline the skills that lead toward mastery of that standard, the learning gaps for the student, and the steps the Special Education Educator of SWD will take to lead the student toward mastery by scaffolding learning that supports the identified success criteria). The standards and objectives for Special Education Educators of SWD must be reframed and adapted within the framework of individual student IEPs. Educators of SWD may use alternate standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities. Questioning must also be reframed according to the diverse needs of the specific populations served. Student grouping strategies do not always apply, depending on the nature of the service or instruction (e.g., grouping may be different in pull-out vs. inclusion). Given this unique setting, lesson plans should be based on and aligned with IEPs and the demands of the grade level standards. When appropriate, plans should be lesson-specific as well as student specific.

### I. PLANNING

#### EXAMPLE – INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS

##### Planning – Instructional Plans:

Instructional plans (individual and whole group lessons) are based heavily on state standards, available local HQIM curriculum resources and materials, and analysis of formative and summative student assessments. Therefore, it should be evident in daily, weekly, and unit instructional plans that the following are incorporated: student IEP goals, standards, curriculum resources, and assessments. There is evidence of planning with the end in mind to develop lesson objectives, assessments, student work, and activities and materials that connect to the Standards and lead students toward success with intentional differentiation for each student to meet those standards. However, in order to determine the quality of a Special Education Educator of SWD lesson/instructional plan, it is important to see the impact the intentional student-specific planning has on the educator’s ability to deliver the lesson and the resulting impact in the student work produced.

#### EXAMPLE – STUDENT WORK

##### Planning – Student Work:

Instructional plans (individual and whole group lessons) are based heavily on state standards, available local HQIM curriculum resources and materials, and analysis of formative and summative student assessments. Therefore, it should be evident in daily, weekly, and unit instructional plans that the following are incorporated: student IEP goals, standards, curriculum resources, and assessments. There is evidence of planning with the end in mind to develop lesson objectives, assessments, student work, and activities and materials that connect to the standards and lead



students toward success with intentional differentiation for each student to meet those standards. However, in order to determine the quality of a Special Education Educator of SWD lesson/instructional plan, it is important to see the impact the intentional student-specific planning has on the educator's ability to deliver the lesson and the resulting impact in the student work produced. For example, students who were struggling with fluency in reading, were identified to have gaps in syllabating words and understanding the meaning of the root word in order to make the text meaningful. These students who struggled to read words with multiple syllables were provided a model/think aloud of how to segment a word by separating known prefixes in order to isolate the root word. Then, exploring the root word to identify meaning before adding a prefix or suffix (word train). Students were given new words with prefixes and suffixes to syllabicate and discuss. Then, when reading a piece of text, the student was expected to isolate unknown words and syllabicate them to determine meaning. Student work expectations were for the students to identify the root word, prefix, and/or suffix with a short phrase of meaning. This work was continued over time with increasing rigor and a tracking method to ensure student progress.

## EXAMPLE – ASSESSMENT

### Planning – Assessment:

Assessments will be aligned to areas of deficit (sub-objectives/skills), rather than state content standards. Extended written tasks and portfolio-based assessments may not be appropriate.

The IEPs of a group of 2<sup>nd</sup> Grade SWD indicates a deficit in meeting the following standards: 2.NBT.B.5 “Fluently add and subtract within 100 using strategies based on place value, properties of operations, and/or the relationship between addition and subtraction.” After the Special Education Educator of SWD provides scaffolded lessons on pre-requisite skills (such as the following), formative assessments of these pre-requisite skills are utilized to determine growth in the area of deficit:

- Add within 100, including adding a two-digit number and a one-digit number, and adding a two-digit number and a multiple of 10.
- Use concrete models or drawings and strategies based on place value, properties of operations, and/or the relationship between addition and subtraction; relate the strategy to a number sentence; justify the reasoning used with a written explanation.
- Understand that in adding two-digit numbers, one adds tens and tens, ones and ones; and sometimes it is necessary to compose a ten.
- Given a two-digit number, mentally find 10 more or 10 less than the number, without having to count; explain the reasoning used.
- Subtract multiples of 10 in the range 10-90 from multiples of 10 in the range 10-90 (positive or zero differences), using concrete models or drawings and strategies based on place value, properties of operations, and/or the relationship between addition and subtraction; relate the strategy to a written method and explain the reasoning used.

## II. INSTRUCTION

### EXAMPLE – STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES

#### Instruction – Standards and Objectives:

INCLUSION scenario:

After pre-planning has occurred with the regular education classroom educator, the Special Education Educator of SWD/Inclusion educator takes part in the lesson instruction along with providing support to the inclusion students and regular education students, as necessary. While supporting students classified as SWD, the SWD Educator pulls the group of SWD students aside for a “huddle” to clarify the expectations for the lesson objective. Then, he/she (considering each student's academic and behavioral challenges) provides intentional academic approval (feedback) rooted in the criteria/expectations of the learning as well as any behavioral expectations that would be critical to student success.

DIRECT INSTRUCTION scenario:

The educator of SWD instructs students based on their present IEP goals and identified deficits in the pre-requisite skills that lead to the goals. The lesson was developed from supporting guidance within HQIM. Students are clearly informed of which standards they are working on mastering and how they have been progressing toward those goals;

however, it may be difficult for them to articulate these goals without guidance. At the beginning of each lesson, the educator communicates the learning target for each student, how this target will be assessed, and the criteria for success. There is evidence of prior and current work that demonstrates that students are progressing toward meeting their IEP goals.

## EXAMPLE — QUESTIONING

### Instruction — Questioning:

#### INCLUSION scenario:

After pre-planning has occurred with the regular education classroom teacher, the Special Education Educator/Inclusion educator takes part in the lesson instruction along with providing support to the inclusion students and regular education students, as necessary. The inclusion educator follows up with individual students or small groups of students to ask additional clarifying questions and scaffold student thinking. He/she structures questions for individuals and groups to engage in appropriate levels of rigorous problem-solving. The educator of SWD knows his/her students' learning needs and the content (depth of standards) so well that there is an intuitive exchange that pushes student learning to a greater degree. Students are frequently surprised by how much they do know. Students are able to generate questions that lead to further inquiry and self-directed learning.

#### DIRECT INSTRUCTION scenario:

Questioning is within the parameters of the curriculum and all questions (forms and frequency) depend on the objective of the lessons. The educator of SWD actively works to develop higher-order thinking skills in students. In order to foster and monitor this development, he/she establishes and maintains communication with students by asking questions that are varied and high quality, providing a balanced mix of question types such as:

- What's another way you might...?
- What would it look like if...?
- What do you think would happen if...?
- How was...different from...?
- When have you done/experienced something like this before?

Students may also ask specific questions aligned to their learning such as:

- Is this problem correct?
- Could you show me the correct way to answer this?
- Could you repeat the directions?
- Should I complete the entire worksheet?
- Can I go on to the next part?
- What does this result mean?

## EXAMPLE — GROUPING

### Instruction — Grouping:

#### INCLUSION scenario:

After pre-planning has occurred with the regular education classroom teacher, the Special Education Educator of SWD/Inclusion educator takes part in the lesson instruction along with providing support to the inclusion students and regular education students, as necessary while they are working with other students in various grouping situations. The Inclusion educator may have a specific group of students with whom to work and ensure they know their roles, responsibilities, and work expectations. Additionally, the Inclusion educator may also be supporting assigned students with ensuring they have equal participation in group discussions (following identified classroom collaboration structures) and are held accountable for their own work and thinking.

#### DIRECT INSTRUCTION scenario:

The educator of SWD plans and implements instructional grouping arrangements that are focused on what is in the best interest of each student, and are aligned to the student's IEP goals (whole class, small group, pairs, individuals, learning style, etc.) to consistently maximize student understanding and learning. The students exhibit evidence of this learning in multiple ways such as: group projects, visual presentations, demonstrations, the use of technology, and verbal,

gestural, or written communication of their understanding. All students know their roles, responsibilities, and work expectations, and are working toward accomplishing the goals of the lesson as seen in their individual work products. The educator then collects data on the effectiveness of these grouping strategies through formative assessment tools. This data is used thoughtfully and effectively to drive future instruction and facilitate meaningful communication with relevant stakeholders.

### III. ENVIRONMENT

#### EXAMPLE – ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR

##### ENVIRONMENT – Engaging Students and Managing Behavior:

###### INCLUSION scenario:

After pre-planning has occurred with the regular education classroom teacher, the Special Education Educator of SWD/Inclusion educator takes part in the lesson instruction along with providing support to the inclusion students and regular education students, as necessary. While supporting students classified as SWD, the SWD educator pulls the group of SWD students aside for a “huddle” to clarify the expectations for the lesson objective. Then, he/she (considering each student’s academic and behavioral challenges) provides intentional academic approval (feedback) rooted in the criteria/expectations of the learning as well as any behavioral expectations that would be critical to student success (i.e., “Tyler is following the steps to solve the addition equation by writing a number sentence that has the addends of the problem, an equal sign, and the sum of the addends. This is great work because we need to show a number sentence with addends, an equal sign, and the correct sum of the addends.”

###### DIRECT INSTRUCTION scenario:

During classroom lessons, students and the educator of SWD provide positive feedback to one another. The educator has a reward system or incentive in place (eagle bucks, dove dots, etc.). When providing incentives, the educator connects the incentive with the appropriate behavior. Rules, norms, and behavior expectations are created and agreed on by both students and teachers, posted, and referenced if necessary during the lesson. Students support each other’s learning by reminding each other of the agreed-upon rules. Students are utilizing identified routines, procedures, and/or success criteria with the assistance of the educator and each other, if appropriate.

# Interventionist

## PURPOSE

Certain subgroups of educators, which are listed in the table below, operate in unique situations that may require additional attention to apply the Louisiana evaluation model with fidelity and provide educators with meaningful feedback. As such, we have conducted numerous focus groups, with educators working in these areas, to develop additional guidance to support evaluation. The accompanying documents are meant to serve as an instructive, although not exhaustive, list of areas to which evaluators should direct additional attention based on the unique instructional or service setting of the educator. These are meant to supplement, not replace, the Louisiana Educator Rubric. Together, the pre-observation questions, key areas for gathering evidence, examples of evidence and artifacts, and examples of excellence present an evaluator with additional resources to use to conduct high-quality evaluations.

## GUIDANCE

The accompanying documents for each educator group are broken down into two types of guidance.

1. The *Observation Guidance* document provides:
  - A quick glance at some guiding questions and overarching concerns for each educator group; and
  - Examples of pre-observation questions, key areas to focus evidence gathering, and examples of appropriate evidence/artifacts the evaluator may collect.
    - NOTE: Key areas for evidence are not intended to replace the indicators in the LER (Louisiana Educator Rubric), but rather are more detailed guidelines for evaluating indicators that educators have identified as particularly tricky to observe.
2. The *Observation Support* document provides:
  - Additional context for the evaluator when considering the responsibilities of each educator;
  - Detailed examples to illuminate some of the key indicators and areas for evidence; and
  - A platform for meaningful discussion between educators and evaluators around best practices.
    - NOTE: This can be especially useful for structuring pre-conference discussions.

### Available observation guidance documents include:

#### LOUISIANA EDUCATOR RUBRIC

- Alternative Educators
- Special Education Educators of Students with Disabilities (SWD)
- Interventionists
- Librarian/Media Specialists
- Master/Lead Teachers/Instructional Coaches (without classroom assignments)

# LER Observation Guidance: Interventionists

## PRE-CONFERENCE COACHING QUESTIONS

1. In what area are you providing intervention? How do you identify area(s) of need? What data did you use to determine area(s) of need?
2. What is the length of the intervention?
3. How do you plan for effective intervention lessons for student groups? What strategies and materials are you using to provide intervention?
4. How did you use data to make decisions about your instructional choices (e.g., meeting with teachers, data teams, reviewing data, etc.)?
5. How have you collaborated with peers (e.g., classroom teacher, data teams, other interventionists, etc.) to prepare for instruction based on student need?
6. How long have you been working with this group of students? Is this a static or fluid group?
7. Are there any students who need specific differentiated supports in your intervention class? If so, what are the supports and which student behaviors or needs are you responding to?
8. How will you communicate the purpose and learning expectations of the intervention lesson?
9. How do you measure student success/progress toward meeting the areas of intervention?

## KEY INDICATORS

### 1. Planning – Instructional Plans

- Interventionist can clearly articulate how the intervention “group” of students has been identified as aligned to areas of deficit, rather than state content standards.
- Interventionist can clearly articulate how lesson plans are developed for the identified intervention group.
- There is evidence of differentiation strategies, detailed sequencing to build mastery, and clear purpose for the lesson in the lesson plan.
- There is evidence of mastery/progress toward mastery of skills for students in the identified objectives.
- Intervention plans are rooted in high-quality instructional materials (as adopted by the school system) to guarantee alignment to state standards and assessments.
- Plans may not integrate other disciplines, depending on the skill focus.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Lesson Structure and Pacing (LSP); Activities and Materials (ACT); Grouping (GRP); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Assessment (AS); Expectations (ES)*

### 2. Planning – Student Work

- Engagement and conversation/collaboration should be encouraged, but assignments may not lead to higher-order thinking, as repetition and focus on skill mastery are essential.
- There is evidence of student learning/progress toward learning to meet end of year standards.
- Evidence of student thinking is present in student work (this includes evidence that students had clear expectations/criteria for thinking and problem solving (learning) aligned to appropriate levels of rigor to meet standards and objectives).
- There is evidence of immediate academic feedback on assessments provided to students so they can make adjustments to their work before being assessed.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Lesson Structure and Pacing (LSP); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Activities and Materials (ACT); Questioning (QU); Academic Feedback (FEED); Grouping (GRP); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Instructional Plans (IP); Assessment (AS); Expectations (ES)*

### 3. Planning – Assessment

- Assessments will be aligned to areas of deficit, rather than state content standards.
- Extended written tasks and portfolio-based assessments are used, as appropriate.
- Assessments will be rooted in high-quality, approved curriculum guidance.
- Immediate academic feedback is provided to students and to their regular classroom teachers.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Lesson Structure and Pacing (LSP); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Activities and Materials (ACT); Questioning (QU); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Assessment (AS); Expectations (ES)*

### 4. Instruction – Standards and Objectives

- Learning objectives will be tied to an area of deficit instead of a state content standard.
- Interventionist can clearly articulate the sub-skills of focus that are needed to support student learning toward meeting the objectives as well as the expectations/criteria for success to meet the objective(s).
- Sub-objectives identify the specific area of focus within a skill deficit (e.g., consonant blending).
- Students know the purpose of the intervention and are behaviorally and cognitively engaged in the process of mastering the identified skills, rather than mastery of a standard.

*\*Connection to Motivating Students (MOT); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Activities and Materials (ACT); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Assessment (AS); Expectations (ES)*

### 5. Instruction – Activities & Materials

- Student-to-student interaction may be limited, based on appropriateness.
- Adult-to-student interaction must be apparent.
- Multimedia and technology may not always be appropriate. If utilized, it should support an intervention provided by the interventionist.
- Time for reflection may not be appropriate or observed.
- Student choices may be limited due to the focused nature of the lesson.
- Additional resources utilized must maintain integrity to the demands of the standard the student is working toward mastering.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Motivating Students (MOT); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Questioning (QU); Academic Feedback (FEED); Grouping (GRP); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Expectations (ES)*

### 6. Instruction – Questioning

- Higher-order questioning may not always be appropriate, but students should be engaged in learning and responding to scaffolded questions.
- Adult-to-student interaction must be apparent.
- Opportunities for student-student interaction are provided, as appropriate.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Motivating Students (MOT); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Academic Feedback (FEED); Grouping (GRP); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Expectations (ES)*

### 7. Instruction – Grouping

- Interventionist should maximize student understanding and learning efficiency by placing students in pairs or small groups, as appropriate; however, the intervention composition or program may limit the ability of grouping.
- Students working in groups have clear and concise expectations (and criteria) for learning, roles, and responsibilities, and are all held accountable for their learning.
- Instructional groups may not set goals, reflect on, and evaluate their learning based on appropriateness. However, if possible, this is a strong practice.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Motivating Students (MOT); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Lesson Structure and Pacing (LSP); Activities and Materials (ACT); Questioning (QU); Academic Feedback (FEED); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Expectations (ES)*



## 8. Environment – Environment

- Interventionist may not have a dedicated classroom, and thus displaying student work may not be expected (from previous lessons). However, student work from a lesson observed is displayed on student desks during the lesson and potentially utilized by the teacher as a teachable moment for other students.
- The classroom is arranged to support identified skill-based activities, rather than standard-based activities.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Motivating Students (MOT); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Activities and Materials (ACT); Academic Feedback (FEED); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Thinking (TH); Problem Solving (PS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Expectations (ES)*

### EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE/ARTIFACTS

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Progress monitoring data</li><li>● Notes from classroom teachers, data team or collaborative meetings</li><li>● Intervention plans</li><li>● Other sources of data</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Instructional/Lesson plans; Lesson objectives</li><li>● Student data folders; portfolios of progressing student work</li><li>● Anecdotal documentation of monitoring/tracking student progress</li></ul> |
|--|--|

## LER Observation Support: Scenarios for Interventionists

The evaluator may need to look more broadly at the interventionist than other educators delivering instruction, as the interventionist is tasked with supporting student learning outside the core instructional setting, but still utilizing the resources within HQIM. Other resources for interventions should be approved by the school system. Interventionist routines may vary at each school, and as such, the pace and structure of instruction may differ among school sites.

### I. PLANNING

#### EXAMPLE – INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS

##### Planning – Instructional Plans:

The interventionist creates an instructional plan that is aligned to the student's area of deficit. There is a clear objective (may be sub-objectives/pre-requisite skills) stated, and the lesson is sequenced to build mastery. The interventionist has clearly outlined the essential vocabulary and skills needed to work toward mastery of the lesson (success criteria is identified). There is clear evidence of how the interventionist will differentiate support for each student.

#### EXAMPLE – STUDENT WORK

##### Planning – Student Work:

Students who were struggling with fluency in reading were identified to have gaps in syllabating words and understanding the meaning of the root word in order to make the text meaningful. These intervention students who struggled to read words with multiple syllables were provided a model/think aloud of how to segment a word by separating known prefixes in order to isolate the root word. Then, they explored the root word to identify meaning before adding a prefix or suffix (word train). Students were given new words with prefixes and suffixes to syllabicate and discuss. Then, when reading a piece of text, the student was expected to isolate unknown words and syllabicate them to determine meaning. Student work expectations were for the students to identify the root word, prefix, and/or suffix with a short phrase of meaning.

#### EXAMPLE – ASSESSMENT

### **Planning – Assessment:**

The assessment requires a student to manipulate syllables or word parts. The interventionist has a rubric/checklist to mark off as the student works through the assessment. Prior to this assessment, the interventionist uses white boards to quickly assess understanding. The interventionist has a clear method of organizing anecdotal notes based on student responses. This method helps guide instructional decisions, but it also serves as evidence of the effectiveness of the intervention.

## **II. INSTRUCTION**

### **EXAMPLE – STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES**

#### **Instruction – Standards and Objectives:**

The interventionist starts with the objective of the lesson, leading students to understand what their goal is while working through the sequence of the lesson (e.g., “Today we will be focusing on \_\_\_\_, we must have this skill to be able to \_\_\_\_.”). The interventionist then demonstrates what is expected (including success criteria). Students move into the lesson. Activities are modeled (highlighting success criteria) before moving in depth into the lesson, and visuals are available. Students are expected to produce work that can be assessed against the success criteria. There is evidence of student mastery/progress toward mastery of the skill.

### **EXAMPLE – ACTIVITIES & MATERIALS**

#### **Instruction – Activities & Materials:**

The interventionist presents the focus of the lesson, which is on word patterns, specifically words with ‘at’ (e.g., cat, bat, hat, etc.). The interventionist presents the text that will be used for the lesson. Students are asked to hold up the text and point to the words as they read “The Bat in a Hat”. The interventionist engages in the lesson with the students, focusing on the overall objective of the lesson. Students read and practice with a peer. The interventionist also has manipulatives, such as word tiles, available for students who need additional support.

### **EXAMPLE – QUESTIONING**

#### **Instruction – Questioning:**

The focus of the lesson is on decoding CVC words. The interventionist asks the students to locate the vowel in the word “dog”. He/she then follows up with questions such as, “Is this a short or long sound? Let’s look at the surrounding consonants. What is the beginning/initial sound? What is the ending/final sound?” Throughout this questioning, the interventionist provides ample wait time, and uses tiles for visuals and actual manipulation. The questions and manipulations of sounds continue based on the level of need of each student.

### **EXAMPLE – GROUPING**

#### **Instruction – Grouping:**

As appropriate: Small group with interventionist focused on any identified skill need should maximize student understanding and learning efficiency. However, the intervention composition or program may limit the ability of grouping. For example, a group of 3 students come together with the interventionist to strengthen short vowel sounds. Once the lesson model has been provided, 2 of the students could be paired in order to practice identifying the short vowels and sounds in words while the interventionist could be partnered with the remaining student who still has a greater need to scaffold learning with ensuring they know the difference between vowels and consonants as well as the sounds each vowel can make.

### III. ENVIRONMENT

#### EXAMPLE – ENVIRONMENT

**Environment – Environment:**

Since the interventionist may not have a dedicated classroom, displaying student work (from previous lessons) may not be expected. But, the classroom should be arranged to support the skill-based activities and student work products should be visible (displayed) during the lesson for review. For example, station activities might be set up in advance of the lesson for students to engage after a small group lesson. Students who need particular manipulatives and tools are aware of where they can find them to support their learning.

# Librarian/Media Specialist (LMS)

## PURPOSE

Certain subgroups of educators, which are listed in the table below, operate in unique situations that may require additional attention to apply the Louisiana evaluation model with fidelity and provide educators with meaningful feedback. As such, we have conducted numerous focus groups, with educators working in these areas, to develop additional guidance to support evaluation. The accompanying documents are meant to serve as an instructive, although not exhaustive, list of areas to which evaluators should direct additional attention based on the unique instructional or service setting of the educator. These are meant to supplement, not replace, the Louisiana Educator Rubric. Together, the pre-observation questions, key areas for gathering evidence, examples of evidence and artifacts, and examples of excellence present an evaluator with additional resources to use to conduct high-quality evaluations.

## GUIDANCE

The accompanying documents for each educator group are broken down into two types of guidance.

1. The *Observation Guidance* document provides:

- A quick glance at some guiding questions and overarching concerns for each educator group; and
- Examples of pre-observation questions, key areas to focus evidence gathering, and examples of appropriate evidence/artifacts the evaluator may collect.
  - NOTE: Key areas for evidence are not intended to replace the indicators in the LER (Louisiana Educator Rubric), but rather are more detailed guidelines for evaluating indicators that educators have identified as particularly tricky to observe.

2. The *Observation Support* document provides:

- Additional context for the evaluator when considering the responsibilities of each educator;
- Detailed examples to illuminate some of the key indicators and areas for evidence; and
- A platform for meaningful discussion between educators and evaluators around best practices.
  - NOTE: This can be especially useful for structuring pre-conference discussions.

### Available observation guidance documents include:

#### LOUISIANA EDUCATOR RUBRIC

- Alternative Educators
- Special Education Educators of Students with Disabilities (SWD)
- Interventionists
- Librarian/Media Specialists
- Master/Lead Teachers/Instructional Coaches (without classroom assignments)

# LER Observation Guidance: Librarian/Media Specialist (LMS)

## PRE-CONFERENCE COACHING QUESTIONS

### Planning:

1. In what ways do you plan with the regular educators/teachers on the campus to provide resources and services that meet student needs? What student data is utilized to determine these needs?
2. What procedures have been established and communicated to students (and teachers) about the purpose and use of library/media resources?

### Environment:

3. How do you ensure that the library/media center is organized and understandable to teachers and students?
4. How do you ensure that the library/media center is arranged to promote learning?
5. How do you ensure that your expectations in the library setting address the identified and demanding academic expectations for every student?
6. How do you ensure that students know and follow identified and communicated learning expectations in the library setting?

### Instruction:

7. How are you building/strengthening your own Teacher Content Knowledge in various content standards for student mastery and how the library/media center can support the standards?
8. When appropriate/applicable, how do you actively engage students in ensuring that the library/media center is positively impacting their learning goals? What are the engagement strategies (individual, small, and whole group) that you use?
9. How do you measure student success/progress toward meeting student learning goals by utilizing resources from the library/media center?

## KEY INDICATORS

### 1. Planning- Instructional Plans

- There is evidence of the LMS meeting regularly with classroom teachers to determine learning goals and the resources that will best support student progress and learning toward meeting content standards.
- The LMS can explicitly state the learning focus/needs of students in each grade band or classroom as well as the best library/media resources to support their learning needs.
- There is evidence observed and/or visible in the library/media center that indicates clear expectations of utilization of resources to support their learning needs.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Activities and Materials (ACT); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Expectations (ES); Environment (ENV)*

### 2. Environment- Expectations

- There is clear evidence of organization of the library/media center resources and equipment available to teachers and students. Likewise, there is evidence/documentation of use of library/media center resources and equipment to support student learning.
- If applicable, the library/media center arrangement provides space for student learning to occur individually or in any group setting.
- There is evidence of the LMS meeting regularly with classroom teachers to determine learning goals and the resources that will best support student progress and learning.
- There is evidence of established and communicated expectations for success in the library/media center setting.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Activities and Materials (ACT); Grouping (GRP); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Expectations (ES); Environment (ENV)*

### 3. Instruction – Standards and Objectives

- The LMS can explicitly communicate the ALA (American Library Association) standards and their place in the school library/media center.
- Goals and objectives are consistent with the school goals and take into account other related curriculum areas as appropriate.
- The LMS can communicate the learning focus/needs of students in each grade band or classroom as well as the best library/media resources to support their learning needs.
- There is evidence of student utilization of library/media center resources.
- If appropriate/applicable, there is evidence of active student engagement in learning in the library/media center that positively impacts student learning goals.

*\*Connection to Motivating Students (MOT); Presenting Instructional Content (PIC); Activities and Materials (ACT); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Instructional Plans (IP); Expectations (ES); Engaging Students and Managing Behavior (ESMB); Grouping (GRP)*

### 4. Instruction – Teacher Content Knowledge

- The LMS is knowledgeable of subject specific content standards for the grade levels he/she services and can articulate areas of student need in each content area.
- There is evidence of the LMS meeting regularly with classroom teachers to determine learning goals and the resources that will best support student progress and learning toward meeting content standards.
- There is evidence of specific content standard aligned resources accessible to teachers and students for use and support.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Activities and Materials (ACT); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Instructional Plans (IP); Expectations (ES)*

### 5. Instruction – Assessment

- The LMS has set goals and an action plan for the school year that are aligned to the school's overall goals and various student learning goals.
- There is evidence of regular/timely reflection and data generated that indicates impact of the LMS's action plan on their goals.
- Some evidence of impact of LMS and library/media center use on student learning may include circulation data, student and teacher surveys, and student performance data on quarterly/benchmark assessments, if appropriate, and can be linked to usage of library/media center resources and equipment.

*\*Connection to Standards and Objectives (SO); Activities and Materials (ACT); Academic Feedback (FEED); Teacher Content Knowledge (TCK); Teacher Knowledge of Students (TKS); Instructional Plans (IP); Student Work (SW); Expectations (ES)*

## EXAMPLES OF EVIDENCE/ARTIFACTS

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agendas/meeting notes from collaborations with instructional teachers</li><li>• Lesson Plans/Instructional Plans</li><li>• List of objectives and sub-objectives aligned to the rigor of Content Standards and skills of need identified for students in the school</li><li>• Student work products that result from learning experiences <i>in an instructional setting</i> (Progress/data monitoring charts, if applicable and appropriate)</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Documentation/pictures of expectations and processes to follow in the library/media center</li><li>• Pictures of the organization of the library/media center's resources that support content standards</li><li>• Student and teacher feedback/survey results of their use of the library/media center in supporting their learning goals</li><li>• Logs/documentation/reports of teacher and student utilization of library/media center resources</li></ul> |
|---|--|

## LER Observation Support: Librarian/Media Specialist (LMS)

School administrators/evaluators should work with the LMS to identify appropriate times and settings for observation and evidence collection opportunities. The announced observation/evidence collection process will set the stage for unannounced observations/evidence collection later in the year.



# I. PLANNING

## EXAMPLE – INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS

### Planning – Instructional Plans:

#### Instructional Setting Scenario/Example:

After meeting with the 6-8 Social Studies teachers, the LMS identified specific Social Studies content standards of need for students. Additionally, the SS teachers communicated the need for students to strengthen their writing skills in relation to developing written responses to tasks that require multiple texts/sources. The SS teachers shared the CER writing strategy process they were utilizing with students to support this identified need. The LMS located other informational sources that were aligned to the identified content standards and writing needs for students. The LMS developed and taught a three-part lesson that could be done with small groups of students during daily scheduled acceleration time that included aligned activities and materials that supported the identified content standards and writing needs of students. Student written responses produced during these mini-lessons were analyzed by the SS teachers and librarian against identified success criteria to determine progress and growth.

#### Non-Instructional Setting Scenario/Example:

After collaborating with content specific teachers on the campus to identify standards of need to support student learning, the LMS researched and assembled resources available in the library/media center for use in classroom instruction and student research. These collections of resources were made available to teachers and students on the campus. Although the school library/media center may not have an exhaustive collection of resources to offer teachers and students, the LMS also provided information on resources that could be located outside the school such as public libraries or organizations in the community.

# II. ENVIRONMENT

## EXAMPLE – EXPECTATIONS

### Environment - Expectations:

#### Instructional Setting Scenario/Example:

When delivering the developed three-part SS lesson to groups of 6-8 students in the library/media center during acceleration time, activities and materials used during the lessons required students to collaborate and talk about their thinking and learning before writing responses to provided tasks. The library furniture was set up to accommodate 4 pairs of students to engage in discussions with planning and feedback using the CER strategy as the structure/strategy for their written responses to tasks.

#### Non-Instructional Setting Scenario/Example:

The LMS planned, organized, and promoted “open house”/sharing presentations for teachers and students in the fall and spring to become familiar with the resources available for use in the library/media center and how they support state content standards. The presentation included communicating and displaying the expectations for proper use of library/media center resources. After these sessions, the LMS kept documentation of the utilization of resources by teachers and students in the school.

### III. INSTRUCTION

#### EXAMPLE — STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES

##### Instruction — Standards and Objectives:

###### Instructional Setting Scenario/Example:

The three-part SS lesson plan that was planned and delivered by the LMS with groups of 6-8 SS students was aligned to the rigor and expectations of the content standards and writing standards/skills identified by the 6-8 SS teachers. During the lesson, the LMS had the students develop individual learning goals for this series of lessons. Success criteria and exemplary writing was provided and modeled during the lesson so that students had a clear understanding of the expectations for performance in meeting the identified standards. At the end of each lesson part, students self-reflected and self-evaluated their work against provided criteria in order to make adjustments to their work.

###### Non-Instructional Setting Scenario/Example:

A high school LMS leads a project for teachers in the school to create a video to introduce them to the unit/module of study they will be engaging in during the first nine weeks. First, the LMS meets with groups of teachers by content to identify the upcoming learning for the nine weeks (standards, units, texts, etc...). Then, the LMS models for teacher groups how to locate resources that are aligned to the standards and content they will be teaching. Next, the LMS introduces the teachers to the video technology/resources to create short videos that introduce their units/modules of study and how to utilize the school library to support their work/learning during the units/modules.

#### EXAMPLE — TEACHER CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

##### Instruction — Teacher Content Knowledge:

###### Instructional Setting Scenario/Example:

The three-part SS lesson plan that was planned and delivered by the LMS with groups of 6-8 SS students was aligned to the rigor and expectations of the content standards and writing standards/skills identified by the 6-8 SS teachers. During the lesson, the LMS had the students develop individual learning goals for this series of lessons. Success criteria and exemplar writing was provided and modeled during the lesson so that students had a clear understanding of the expectations for performance in meeting the identified standards. While working, students were provided feedback on their progress toward meeting the learning goal/objective that is rooted in identified success criteria.

###### Non-Instructional Setting Scenario/Example:

A high school LMS leads a project for teachers in the school to create a video to introduce them to the unit/module of study they will be engaging in during the first nine weeks. First, the LMS meets with groups of teachers by content to identify the upcoming learning for the nine weeks (standards, units, texts, etc...). Then, the LMS builds “toolboxes” of strategies and resources that will promote and apply different types of thinking and problem solving that are aligned to the teacher-identified topics and standards of focus. Then, the LMS models for teacher groups how to locate resources that are aligned to the standards and content they will be teaching. Next, the LMS introduces the teachers to the video technology/resources to create short videos that introduce their units/modules of study and how to utilize the school library to support their work/learning during the units/modules.

#### EXAMPLE — ASSESSMENT

##### Instruction — Assessment

###### Instructional Setting Scenario/Example:

The three-part SS lesson plan that was planned and delivered by the LMS with groups of 6-8 SS students was aligned to the rigor and expectations of the content standards and writing standards/skills identified by the 6-8 SS teachers. During the lesson, the LMS had the students develop individual learning goals for this series of lessons. Success criteria and exemplar writing was provided and modeled during the lesson so that students had a clear understanding

of the expectations for performance in meeting the identified standards. While working, students were provided feedback on their progress toward meeting the learning goal/objective that is rooted in identified success criteria. Students self-evaluated and adjusted their learning/work against the established/identified success criteria for the writing project.

**Non-Instructional Setting Scenario/Example:**

At the beginning of the school year, the LMS sets a goal for circulation/use of library resources and equipment for each quarter. The LMS develops and asks core content teachers to administer a brief survey on their utilization of library resources during each nine weeks/quarter. The survey includes open-response questions for students to specifically identify how they utilized library resources and how they supported their learning. Additionally, the LMS generates quarterly circulation reports that detail use of library resources/equipment each nine weeks.

# Master Teacher/Instructional Coach

## PURPOSE

Certain subgroups of educators, which are listed in the table below, operate in unique situations that may require additional attention to apply the Louisiana evaluation model with fidelity and provide educators with meaningful feedback. As such, we have conducted numerous focus groups, with educators working in these areas, to develop additional guidance to support evaluation. The accompanying documents are meant to serve as an instructive, although not exhaustive, list of areas to which evaluators should direct additional attention based on the unique instructional or service setting of the educator. These are meant to supplement, not replace, the Louisiana Educator Rubric. Together, the pre-observation questions, key areas for gathering evidence, examples of evidence and artifacts, and examples of excellence present an evaluator with additional resources to use to conduct high-quality evaluations.

## GUIDANCE

The accompanying documents for each educator group are broken down into two types of guidance.

1. The *Observation Guidance* document provides:
  - A quick glance at some guiding questions and overarching concerns for each educator group; and
  - Examples of pre-observation questions, key areas to focus evidence gathering, and examples of appropriate evidence/artifacts the evaluator may collect.
    - NOTE: Key areas for evidence are not intended to replace the indicators in the LER (Louisiana Educator Rubric), but rather are more detailed guidelines for evaluating indicators that educators have identified as particularly tricky to observe.
2. The *Observation Support* document provides:
  - Additional context for the evaluator when considering the responsibilities of each educator;
  - Detailed examples to illuminate some of the key indicators and areas for evidence; and
  - A platform for meaningful discussion between educators and evaluators around best practices.
    - NOTE: This can be especially useful for structuring pre-conference discussions.

### Available observation guidance documents include:

## LOUISIANA EDUCATOR RUBRIC

- Alternative Educators
- Special Education Educators of Students with Disabilities (SWD)
- Interventionists
- Librarian/Media Specialists
- Master/Lead Teachers/Instructional Coaches

# LER Observation Guidance: Master Teachers/Instructional Coaches

School administrators/evaluators should work with their district/school system to identify the roles and responsibilities of Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators whose duties include improving teacher instruction. Evaluation type may be identified on a person-by-person basis. Therefore, the guidance for these individuals looks different than guidance for other school support personnel.

Here are the steps to follow when determining how to best evaluate Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators' professional practice:

1. Determine if the individual is serving on a teacher or leader certificate.
  - a. Those serving at the school-level on a teacher or leader certificate will be evaluated via the Educator or Leader Evaluation.
  - b. Those serving at the district level on a teacher certificate will be evaluated via the Educator or Leader Evaluation.
  - c. Those serving at the district level on a leader certificate could be evaluated via a local personnel evaluation.
2. Refer to the local job description to determine the role and responsibilities for the educator.
3. Determine if the role and responsibilities align more with the Louisiana Educator or Leader Evaluation System.
4. Use this guidance document to develop an understanding of how the Louisiana Educator Rubric or the Louisiana Leader Rubric is applied to these roles.

## ROLE ALIGNED TO THE LOUISIANA EDUCATOR EVALUATION SYSTEM

In this role, there is typically an expectation for the Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators to provide instruction at the student level by modeling lessons, co-teaching, etc. Therefore, *all indicators* in the Louisiana Educator Rubric apply to lessons with students and should be utilized for formal observations.

When duties align more toward providing professional learning with the goal of improving instruction, observations may occur during teacher collaboration, planning, or during other opportunities to provide adult learning. This role supports the learning and growth of teachers on the campus as these individuals are the “teacher of teachers.” *All indicators* in the Louisiana Educator Rubric apply to professional learning for adult learners and should be utilized for formal observations.

## ROLE ALIGNED TO THE LOUISIANA LEADER EVALUATION SYSTEM

Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators may be evaluated using the Louisiana Leader Rubric if the job description allows for it. Those serving on a leader certificate at the school level should be evaluated using the leader rubric in order to renew leader certification.

## LOUISIANA LEADER RUBRIC: KEY INDICATORS OF FOCUS THAT ARE CRITICAL

### DOMAIN: SCHOOL MISSION, VISION AND STRATEGIC GOAL SETTING

#### All indicators:

Purpose: Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators in the Leader Evaluation System must be a strong leader on campus that is a part of the setting, monitoring, and implementation of specific goals for students and staff that reflect high academic expectations for all. Although the school administrator is the lead in the goal-setting and monitoring process, individuals serving in the leader evaluation system must collaborate with key stakeholders to set and prioritize goals to help close the achievement gap in all populations, develop strategies aimed at accomplishing the goals, effectively communicate goals and strengthen

efforts to meet these goals. These leaders must also ensure that staff understand and engage in consistent processes to analyze student data and work in order to reflect on teaching and learning practices. These regular and consistent analysis opportunities provide guidance to teachers to make instructional decisions that positively impact student learning further. Therefore, it is critical to indicate that Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators whose roles align to the Leader Evaluation System play an integral role in ensuring that the school goals are impacted by teaching and learning on a regular basis.

Evidence/Artifacts: school plan (includes all school goals (quantitative & qualitative); goals by content; goals by grade level; short-term goals and long-term goals as well as action plans developed by the ILT and classroom teachers to impact the identified goals in the plan; frequent reflections by the leader on the progress toward meeting identified goals; weekly ILT meeting agendas; weekly teacher collaboration agendas; student performance data; teacher performance data

#### **DOMAIN: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP**

##### **All indicators:**

Purpose: Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators in the Leader Evaluation System must ensure that all instruction in the building is aligned to the rigorous demands of the state standards and are rooted in high-quality instructional materials. Therefore, this individual is knowledgeable of the scope of standards in assigned content and grade level areas. They also have a deep understanding of the adopted HQIM. Additionally, their role includes planning and delivering high quality, weekly professional learning for all teachers on the campus that is focused on curriculum, assessment, and instructional practices. Their focus for weekly professional learning must be rooted in current and high-quality student and teacher data that is planned and delivered along a continuum of learning to meet identified student and teacher needs, utilizing HQIM. These actions should also include methods of measuring student growth and teacher effectiveness.

Evidence/Artifacts: documentation of weekly professional learning opportunities for teachers is supported by current and relevant quantitative and qualitative student and teacher data; documentation also ensures professional learning opportunities include measurable outcomes aligned to school goals; documentation for these opportunities also demonstrates evidence teachers are supported in developing a deep understanding of standards and effectively implementing curriculum and HQIM to positively impact student learning.

#### **DOMAIN: CAPACITY BUILDING**

##### **All indicators:**

Purpose: Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators in the Leader Evaluation System are also tasked with ensuring that all teachers (including themselves) engage in frequent reflective practices regarding the impact their teaching has on student learning and success based on identified areas of growth. Weekly teacher collaboration meetings are planned/structured and delivered within The Five Steps for Effective Learning and ensure transfer of new learning with students (with support) and a means to measure success. These weekly professional development meetings with teachers must first be based on identified areas of student learning need (rooted in current quantitative and qualitative data). Next, these professional learning opportunities should consider data gathered from teaching practices and weave those practices into the new learning, development, and application.

Evidence/Artifacts: documentation of weekly professional learning opportunities for teachers is supported by current and relevant quantitative and qualitative student and teacher data; documentation also ensures professional learning opportunities include measurable outcomes aligned to school goals; documentation for these opportunities also demonstrates evidence teachers are supported in developing a deep understanding of standards and effectively implementing curriculum and HQIM to positively impact student learning; professional learning opportunities should be research-based and field-tested, or piloted with students on the campus prior to large-scale implementation.; documentation should be collected that captures how all new professional learning and application with students (from weekly meetings) is frequently monitored; documentation should also demonstrate how instructional decision-making is responsive and agile and continues to move student learning forward.

#### **DOMAIN: SCHOOL & COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT**



**All indicators:**

Purpose: Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators in the Leader Evaluation System are expected to promote and support a professional environment, community engagement, positive behaviors, access for all learners and cultural responsiveness in conjunction with ensuring high quality teaching and learning.

Evidence/Artifacts: documentation of participation and presentation at weekly ILT meetings; serves on committees and regularly assigned “duty” actions that reinforce and communicate the investment these leaders have in the school’s day to day processes; documentation of support and engagement in school events that promote community engagement; serves and supports the discipline or ILT in developing and implementing a campuswide discipline system; documentation of one-on-one support visits with identified students and teachers to support behavioral challenges that lead to academic success; documentation of support and promotion of events and structures at the school that empower families from all communities.

**DOMAIN: PROFESSIONALISM AND INTEGRITY****Indicators - Professional Norms, and Professional Behavior:**

Purpose: Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators in the Leader Evaluation System serve as leaders to ensure that professional norms are understood and followed by themselves and fellow colleagues. They are the models of professional norms as well as professional behavior. This domain promotes a safe and productive work environment for everyone to ensure that students are successful. There must be a high level of trust between teachers and assigned Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators.

Evidence/Artifacts: documentation of support sessions that promote practices that exuberate a positive and effective system of trust and learning among students, teachers and students, and teachers and leaders. There is evidence/documentation of coaching between teachers and their assigned Master Teacher, instructional coach, or other instructional leader/coordinator (following a developed coaching plan). Other potential evidence/artifacts may include documentation of feedback gained from a student advisory committee to elicit student opinions about their academic progress and instructional practices on the campus. Additional evidence may include documentation of the meetings/conversations with teachers on the campus about their decisions to incorporate activities that are NOT part of the HQIM. Then, decisions and next steps about adhering to the HQIM is documented to be monitored and reflected upon later between the Master Teacher, instructional coach, and other instructional leader/coordinator and teacher.

**LOUISIANA LEADER RUBRIC: KEY INDICATORS THAT MAY NOT APPLY IN THIS ROLE****DOMAIN: PROFESSIONALISM AND INTEGRITY****Indicator: Policy**

Purpose: depending on the identified roles and responsibilities of Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators in the district/school system or school, it may or may not be appropriate or applicable for these leaders to ensure that school personnel follow district policy expectations (that may include and adhere to federal, state, and local laws).

**DOMAIN: SCHOOL OPERATIONS/MANAGEMENT****All indicators:**

Purpose: Although some Master Teachers, instructional coaches, and other instructional leaders/coordinators have roles and responsibilities more closely aligned to those of school leaders, the indicators of Administrative Operations and Fiscal and Physical Management may not apply. However, it is highly recommended that Master Teachers, Lead Teachers, and Instructional Coaches be included in school administrative discussions focused on recruiting, hiring,

and retaining professional staff.

Evidence/Artifacts: potential evidence/artifacts might include interviewing schedules/agendas for new hires/professional staff; documentation of meetings with administrators to make decisions about financial allocation of resources in the school to meet the goals and needs of students and teachers.