



CTA Recommendations for District Modification to CoT Evaluations:

- Reflections should be submitted after feedback is given. It is impossible for teachers to anticipate every possible misinterpretation an observer will make and it makes more sense for teachers to be able to “make their case” after they know how the observer has interpreted their actions. As one teacher stated, we should be able to “respond to” rather than “reflect on” CoT observations.
- Observations should take place before state testing. After state testing, the schedules at most schools go haywire.
- A lesson that scores “4” in all areas should be provided to teachers as a model. Many teachers are confused as to what a “4” looks like in some areas. Many teachers, in fact, doubt that a “4” in every area for a 45 minute lesson could even be accomplished. Teachers share with their students what an “A+” assignment looks like. Showing teachers what a “Total 4” looks like would help us to know what we are striving for.
- Teachers should be observed only twice, both times by building supervisors. The district observer could then serve as an “arbitrator” in the event there is a significant discrepancy between the two administrative observations. If two administrative observations demonstrate competency, the cost of an independent observer seems unwarranted.
- The independent observers should be qualified to evaluate the level of instruction they are observing. Many teachers question if these observers are competent to evaluate the efficacy of instruction on a diversity of levels. Would a career middle school history teacher, for example, be qualified to evaluate a high school calculus class or high level Latin course? Many teachers have pointed out that, based on the observers' remarks in their evaluations, it was apparent they did not understand what the course and lesson was about.
- Observers (both independent and administrative) should not have access to a teacher's other evaluations. Some teachers feel that their evaluation scores have been “coordinated” among observers. Certainly having access to other scores could bias the third or even second observer. This is why in many sporting events judges do not see one another's scores until after competition.
- It should be explained to teachers how the effectiveness of these CoT observations will be judged. Most teachers do not see this system as an improvement over GBE. What criteria will be used to ensure that the end result is stronger instruction or higher student achievement?
- Teachers should be observed the same number of times. Many teachers said they were formally observed more than three times, and many less. The process should be consistent.
- If a teacher scores below 4 in any area, suggestions should be made for how to specifically improve the lesson in order to attain it. It is unclear to many teachers how, exactly, they could have modified their instruction in order to reach the level of 4. If they don't know how they can improve and they aren't shown how they can improve, then how can they improve?