**Hawaii Adapted Framework for Teaching**

***Adapted from the Charlotte Danielson A Framework for***

***Teaching, 2nd Edition***

**Framework: Instructional Specialists**

***Rubric for: Resource Teachers***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 1a** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **1a: Demonstrating knowledge of current trends**  **in specialty area and**  **professional development.** | RT demonstrates little or no familiarity with specialty area or trends in professional development. | RT demonstrates basic familiarity with specialty area and trends in professional development. | RT demonstrates thorough knowledge of specialty area and trends in professional development. | RT’s knowledge of specialty area and trends in professional development is wide and deep; resource teacher is regarded as an expert by colleagues. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *RT is not able to share and discuss, with any specificity, past, current, or future specialty area practices and professional development to support it.* | • *RT is able to share and discuss some details of the specialty area’s practices with limited specifics for anticipated professional development needs.* | • *RT is able to broadly share and discuss details of the specialty area’s practices with specific examples of appropriate professional development.* | • *RT is often asked to participate in complex or state collaboration efforts regarding the specialty area.*  • *RT has developed strategies, guidelines, etc., for implementing specialty area best practices.*  • *State or national recognition of expertise in the specialty area.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Reflection and sharing about various relevant topics, published in collegial groups (Edmodo)/newsletter/agendas of meetings where info is shared.*  • *Certificates of participation/completion in relevant PD or notes from session.*  • *Agendas for PD that resource teacher developed/led.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 1b** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **1b: Demonstrating knowledge of the school’s program and levels of teacher skill in delivering that program.** | RT demonstrates little or no knowledge of the school’s program or of teacher skill in delivering that program. | RT demonstrates basic knowledge of the school’s program and of teacher skill in delivering that program. | RT demonstrates thorough knowledge of the school’s program and of teacher skill in delivering that program. | RT is deeply familiar with the school’s program and works to shape its future direction and actively seeks information as to teacher skill in that program. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *RT does not use data for program planning.*  • *RT researches tools and information that has no effect on the teachers’ skills in delivering the program.* | • *RT uses limited sources of data for program planning.*  • *RT researches tools and information that has inconsistent effect on teachers’ skills in delivering the program.* | • *RT uses various forms of data from multiple sources for program planning.*  • *RT researches tools and information that has consistent positive effect on teachers’ skills in delivering the program.* | • *RT proactively uses various forms of data from multiple sources in anticipation of program needs.*  • *RT continuously researches tools and information that assesses teachers’ skills for delivering the program, including collaboration with other schools.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Examples of tools used and to what end.*  • *Agendas/feedback on support given to learn and implement tools.*  • *Summary of relevant data and examples of how used to improve.*  • *Copy of individual teacher’s professional development plan that clearly connects work to larger goals and initiatives.*  • *Reflection and/or copy of communication with colleagues and/or programs that demonstrate initiative and action taken.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 1c** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **1c: Establishing goals for the instructional support program appropriate to the setting and the teachers served.** | RT has no clear goals for the instructional support program, or they are inappropriate to either the situation or the needs of the staff. | RT’s goals for the instructional support program are rudimentary and are partially suitable to the  situation and the needs of the staff. | RT’s goals for the instructional support program are clear and are suitable to the situation and the needs of the staff. | RT’s goals for the instructional support program are highly appropriate to the situation and the needs of the staff. They have been developed following consultations with administrators and colleagues. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *RT does not use data or other relevant information in order to establish goals.*  • *RT developed goals are not relevant or applicable to the staff.* | *RT’s use of data or other relevant information are too limited to reflect appropriate goals.*  • *RT developed goals are relevant or applicable to only some staff.* | • *RT’s use of data or other relevant information reflect appropriate goals that are understood by staff.*  • *RT developed goals are relevant to the staff.* | • *The RT utilizes ongoing assessment of current practices to establish clear and highly relevant goals to meet the needs of participants.*  • *The RT efficaciously develops goals as a result of collaboration with administrators and colleagues.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Clear goals tied to various types of data.*  • *Notes/observations from consultations with colleagues on goals set.*  • *Clear action steps identified and tied to research and strong impact data.*  • *Reflection on process.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 1d** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **1d: Demonstrating knowledge of resources, both within and beyond the school and district.** | RT demonstrates little or no knowledge of resources available in the school or district for teachers to advance their skills. | RT demonstrates basic knowledge of resources available in the school and district for teachers to advance their skills. | RT is fully aware of resources available in the school and district and in the larger professional community for teachers to advance their skills. | RT actively seeks out new resources from a wide range of sources to enrich teachers’ skills in implementing the school’s program. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *RT is unaware of available resources.*  • *RT is unable to successfully provide assistance that will be beneficial to educators’ needs.*  • *Educators are unable to rely on the RT for resource support.* | *RT is minimally aware of available resources.*  • *RT is able to provide some assistance to educators.*  • *Educators are unable to fully rely on the RT for resource support.* | • *RT has a deep and expanded awareness of available resources.*  • *RT is able to provide assistance to most all educators.*  • *Educators are able to fully rely on the RT for resource support.* | • *RT continuously seeks ways to expand knowledge in anticipation of educators’ needs.*  • *RT uses data and other sources to proactively identify future resource needs of educators.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Evidence of outreach to community (and other) potential resources.*  • *Notes from meetings with families/students and community where problem solving and sharing of resources occurs.*  • *Resource bank (online, posted, flyer, etc.).* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 1e** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **1e:**  **Planning the instructional support program, integrated with the overall school program.** | RT’s plan consists of a random collection of unrelated activities, lacking coherence or an overall structure. | RT’s plan has a guiding principle and includes a number of worthwhile activities, but some of them don’t fit with the broader goals. | RT’s plan is well designed to support teachers in the improvement of their instructional skills. | RT’s plan is highly coherent, taking into account the competing demands of making presentations and consulting with teachers, and has been developed following consultation with administrators and teachers. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *RT’s plan appears unclear and irrelevant.*  • *Lacks documentation to justify content of the*  *plan.* | • *RT’s plan appears to be relevant and useful but not comprehensive in addressing all goals.* | • *RT’s plan is relevant, useful, and comprehensively designed for teachers to*  *improve their instructional skills.* | • *RT’s plan is clear to all staff as a result of*  collaborative planning with staff and administrators.  • Expectations of supports from the RT are clearly understood. |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Attendance at related meetings and professional development to gain understanding of related perspectives and goals when making a plan.*  • *Plan integrated and aligned to school, complex, state, and/or national plans.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 1f** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **1f: Developing a plan to evaluate the instructional support program.** | RT has no plan to evaluate the program or resists suggestions that such an evaluation is important. | RT has a rudimentary plan to evaluate the instructional support program. | RT’s plan to evaluate the program is organized around clear goals and the collection of evidence to indicate the degree to which the goals have been met. | RTs evaluation plan is highly sophisticated, with imaginative sources of evidence and a clear path toward improving the program on an ongoing basis. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *RT does not maintain data to measure*  *program effectiveness and improvement.*  • *RT is unable to report on the success of the support program or areas of improvement.* | *RT develops an evaluation plan using the following processes:*  • *Uses a source of evidence & a plan that is available to all teachers to track & evaluate instructional support.*  • *Has a plan to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the instructional support program by looking at a single variable, either quantitative or qualitative (e.g. teacher efficacy, student achievement, amount of time required for program, cost effectiveness, other required resources, how program can be improved).*  • *Identifies unintended outcomes.*  • *Evaluation information available to stakeholders.*  • *Records information to improve the*  *instructional support program.* | *RT develops an evaluation plan using the following processes:*  • *Uses a few sources of evidence & a plan that is available to all teachers to track & evaluate instructional support.*  • *Evaluates the effectiveness and efficiency of the instructional support program by looking at some variables, both quantitative and qualitative (e.g. teacher efficacy, student achievement, amount*  *of time required for program, cost effectiveness, other required resources, how program can be improved).*  • *Implements strategies to address unintended outcomes*  • *Evaluation information shared with stakeholders’*  • *Uses information to implement strategies to improve the instructional support program.* | *RT develops an evaluation plan using the following processes:*  • *Uses multiple sources of evidence & a plan that is available to all teachers to track & evaluate instructional support.*  • *Evaluates the effectiveness and efficiency of the instructional support program by looking at a variety of variables, both quantitative and qualitative (e.g. teacher efficacy, student*  *achievement, amount of time required for program, cost effectiveness, other required resources, how program can be improved).*  • *Successfully implements strategies to address unintended outcomes*  • *Evaluation includes stakeholders’ contribution as part of the evaluation process.*  • *Uses a continuous improvement process to*  *improve the instructional support program.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Surveys from a colleague.*  • *All the variables laid out & data gathered on each variable.*  • *Evaluation plan.*  • *Notes from collaboration between stakeholders and evaluators.*  • *Improvement plan that resulted from the evaluation.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 2a** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **2a:**  **Creating an environment of trust and respect.** | Colleagues and/or students are reluctant to request assistance from the RT, fearing that such a request will be treated as a sign of deficiency. | Relationships with the RT are cordial; colleagues and/or students don’t resist initiatives established by the resource teacher. | Relationships with the RT are respectful, with some contacts initiated by colleagues and/or students. | Relationships with the RT are highly respectful and trusting, with many contacts initiated by colleagues and/or students. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *Speaks disrespectfully to colleagues and/or students.*  • *Displays a lack of familiarity with or caring about individuals.* | • *Occasional disrespect to colleagues and/or students.*  • *Attempts to make connections, but reactions indicate these attempts are not entirely successful.* | • *Interactions uniformly respectful between RT*  *and colleagues and/or students.*  • *Colleagues and/or students may be willing to offer their ideas in front of others.* | • *Interactions are highly respectful between RT and colleagues and/or students.*  • *There is participation without fear of putdowns or ridicule from either the RT colleagues, or students.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Invited students/colleague requests for assistance and the feedback on the assistance provided.*  • *Documented growth in teachers’/students’ participation.*  • *Provided teacher/student reflection on participation.*  • *Log of requests made and supports provided.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 2b** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **2b: Establishing a culture for ongoing instructional improvement.** | RT conveys the sense that the work of improving instruction or leadership skills is externally mandated and is not important to school improvement. | RT provides scheduled support/PD for students and/or teachers. | RT promotes a culture of inquiry in which colleagues and/or students seek assistance in improving their instructional or leadership skills. | RT has established a culture of professional inquiry in which colleagues and/or students initiate projects to be undertaken with the support of the resource teacher. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *Conveys there is little or no purpose for the work, or that the reasons for doing it are due to external factors.*  • *Communicates to at least some colleagues and/or students that the work is too challenging for them.* | • *Colleagues and/or students exhibit a limited commitment to complete the task on their own.*  • *RT’s primary concern appears to be to complete the task at hand.* | • *Colleagues and/or students seem comfortable requesting and receiving help.*  • *Promotes a culture in which questions and*  *requests for support are invited and valued.* | • *Colleagues and/or students take initiative in improving the quality of their performance through opportunities for growth.*  • *Colleagues and/or students indicate through their questions and comments a desire to improve their instructional or leadership skills.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Provided documentation of working with others by analyzing student work to inform effective instruction in developing leadership skills and its impact on students.*  • *Provided documentation of requests for in-service/support from individual students and the outcome of supports.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 2c** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **2c: Establishing clear procedures for educators to gain access to instructional support.** | When educators want to access assistance from the RT, they are not sure how to go about it. | Some procedures (for example, registering for workshops) are clear to educators, whereas others (for example, receiving informal support) are not. | RT has established clear procedures for educators to use in gaining access to support. | Procedures for access to instructional supports are clear to all educators and have been developed following consultation with administrators and educators. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *Little or no information regarding the RT*  *assistance is available to others.*  • *RT does not respond to request for instructional support.* | • *RT gives infrequent or incomplete information about the assistance available to others.*  • *RT responds inconsistently to request for instructional support.* | • *RT regularly gives information about the assistance available to others.*  • *RT responds consistently to request for instructional support.* | • *RT established and communicated the process and procedures for available support for all potential audience through consultation from stakeholders.*  • *Participants contribute to regular and ongoing projects designed to engage others in the instructional support.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Created documents, such as resource teacher schedule/log, that showed opportunities for in-service trainings/support.*  • *Provided memos/Flyers/brochures indicating in-service trainings/support offerings.*  • *Created monthly/weekly log documenting the in-service training/support requested and provided, including topics covered, attendance record, etc.*  • *Documented collaboration with administrators and others in planning for support.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 2d** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **2d: Establishing**  **and maintaining norms of behavior for professional interaction.** | No norms of professional conduct have been established; educators are frequently disrespectful in their interactions with one another. | RT’s effort to establish norms of professional conduct are partially successful. | RT has established clear norms of mutual respect for professional interaction. | RT has established clear norms of mutual respect for professional interaction. Educators ensure that their colleagues adhere to these standards of conduct. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *The environment is chaotic, with no standards of conduct evident.*  • *RT does not monitor interactions among students and/or teachers.*  • *Some participants disrupt the room, without apparent RT awareness or with an ineffective response.* | • *RT attempts to maintain order in the room, referring to norms, but with uneven success.*  • *RT attempts to keep track of negative interactions, but with no apparent system.*  • *RT’s response to negative interactions is inconsistent; sometimes harsh, other times lenient.* | • *Standards of conduct appear to have been established and implemented successfully.*  • *Overall, behavior is generally appropriate.*  • *RT frequently monitors negative interactions.*  • *RT’s response to negative interactions is effective.* | • *RT silently and subtly monitors behavior.*  • *Colleague’s interactions are entirely appropriate;*  *issues are minor and immediately addressed.*  • *Students and/or colleagues respectfully intervene with peers at appropriate moments to ensure compliance with standards of conduct.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Provided documentation of participant feedback on in-service trainings/support provided by resource teacher.*  • *Documented group norms for trainings and documented discussion indicating effectiveness.*  • *Taken interventions to address situations and the outcome of the intervention.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 2e** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **2e: Organizing physical space for workshops or training.** | RT makes poor use of the physical environment, resulting in poor access by some participants; time lost due to poor use of training equipment, or little alignment between the physical arrangement and the workshop activities. | The physical environment does not impede workshop activities. | RT makes good use of the physical environment, resulting in engagement of all participants in the workshop activities. | RT makes highly effective use of the physical environment, with staff and students contributing to the physical arrangement. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *Students not working with RT are not productively engaged.*  • *Transitions are disorganized, with much loss of instructional time.*  • *There does not appear to be any established*  *procedures for use of training equipment.*  • *A considerable amount of time is spent off task due to unclear procedures and no prior planning for accessing the physical space.* | • *Students not working directly with resource teacher are only partially engaged.*  • *Procedures for transitions seem to have been established, but their operation is not smooth.*  • *There appear to be established routines for distribution and collection of training equipment, but students are confused about how to carry them out.*  • *Routines function unevenly and it is apparent that little consideration was given to*  *utilization of the physical space.* | • *Students are productively engaged during small-group or independent work.*  • *Transitions between large- and small- group activities are smooth.*  • *Routines for distribution and collection of*  *training materials work efficiently.*  • *Routines function smoothly and the physical space is aligned for learning.* | • *With minimal prompting by RT, teachers/students ensure that their time is used productively.*  • *Students/teachers take initiative in distributing and collecting training equipment efficiently.*  • *Students/teachers themselves ensure that*  *transitions and other routines are accomplished smoothly.*  • *Routines function well and the physical space is aligned for optimal learning.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Created handouts/memos/manuals as guides for in-service trainings/support/activities, including training equipment and facility space use.*  • *Documented discussion on in-service trainings/support/activities, citing specifically to routine and procedure effectiveness.*  • *Handed commendations on the success of the events/activities.*  • *Provided documentation of events/activities adhering to scheduled times and within projected budget.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 3a** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **3a: Collaborating with teachers in the design of instructional units and lessons.** | RT declines to collaborate with classroom  teachers in the design of instructional lessons and units. | RT collaborates with classroom teachers in the design of instructional lessons and units when specifically asked to do so. | RT initiates collaboration with classroom teachers in the design of instructional lessons and units. | RT initiates collaboration with classroom teachers in the design of instructional lessons and units, locating additional resources from sources outside the school. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *RT’s relationship with colleagues is characterized by negativity or combativeness.*  • *RT purposefully avoids collaboration.*  • *RT avoids involvement in assisting classroom teachers in instructional lessons and units.* | • *RT has pleasant relationship with colleagues.*  • *When invited, RT has collaborative relationships with colleagues.*  • *When asked, RT assists classroom teachers in instructional lessons and units.* | • *RT has supportive relationships with colleagues.*  • *RT seeks out collaborative opportunities with colleagues.*  • *RT volunteers to assist classroom teachers in instructional lessons and units.* | • *RT takes a leadership role in promoting collaborative relationships between colleagues.*  • *RT takes a leadership role in providing multiple resources to colleagues that contribute to successful student outcomes.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Created units of instruction demonstrating collaborative work with colleagues (aligned to State content standards).*  • *Initiated collaborative opportunities to engage teachers in the design of instructional units.*  • *Implemented strategies to foster professional dialog among teachers.*  • *Maintained resource library for colleagues’ to utilize based on their needs and their rating of its usefulness.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 3b** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **3b: Engaging colleagues in learning new instructional skills.** | Colleagues decline opportunities to engage in professional learning, | RT’s efforts to engage colleagues in professional learning are partially successful, with some participating. | All colleagues are engaged in acquiring new instructional skills. | Colleagues are highly engaged in acquiring new instructional skills and take initiative in suggesting new areas for growth. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *Colleagues turn down offerings by RT for professional learning opportunities.* | • *Some participants are intellectually engaged in the professional learning.*  • *Engagement with the content is largely passive, the learning consisting primarily of facts or procedures.*  • *The pacing of the professional development is uneven – suitable in parts but rushed or dragging in others.* | • *Most participants are intellectually engaged in the professional development.*  • *Materials and resources require intellectual engagement, as appropriate.*  • *The pacing of the professional development*  *provides for the time needed to be intellectually engaged.* | • *Virtually all participants are intellectually engaged in the professional development.*  • *Colleagues take initiative to improve the professional learning by (1) modifying a learning task to make it more meaningful or relevant to their needs, (2) suggesting modifications to the grouping patterns used, and/or (3) suggesting modifications or additions to the materials being used.*  • *Participants have an opportunity for reflection and closure on the professional learning to consolidate their understanding and future next steps.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Implemented strategies to gain understanding of colleagues needs.*  • *Provided opportunities and participation in professional learning activities.*  • *Provided participant’s reflection on in-service training/support, including next steps for improving professional practice.*  • *Based on materials/in-service provided by resource teacher, colleagues implemented professional inquiry.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 3c** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **3c: Sharing expertise with staff.** | RT’s model lessons and workshops are of poor quality or are not appropriate to the needs of the colleagues being served. | The quality of the RT’s model lessons and workshops is mixed, with some of them being appropriate to the needs of the colleagues being served. | The quality of the RT’s model lessons and workshops is uniformly high and appropriate to the needs of the colleagues being served. | The quality of the RT’s model lessons and workshops is uniformly high and appropriate to the needs of the colleagues being served. The RT conducts extensive follow-up work with colleagues. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *Learning tasks/activities and materials require only recall or have a single correct response or method.*  • *RT makes content errors.*  • *Learning tasks and activities are not suitable for many participants.* | • *Learning tasks are a mix of those requiring thinking and those requiring recall.*  • *RT’s understanding of the content is rudimentary.*  • *Learning tasks and activities are suitable for*  *most of the participants.* | • *Most learning tasks have multiple correct responses or approaches and/or encourage higher-order thinking.*  • *RT can identify important concepts of the content and their relationship to one another.*  • *Learning tasks and activities, differentiated where necessary, are suitable to groups of participants.* | • *Lesson activities require high-level thinking and explanations of thinking.*  • *RT cites intra- and interdisciplinary content relationships.*  • *RT uses ongoing methods to assess skill levels*  *and designs instruction accordingly.*  • *Learning tasks and activities are differentiated to encourage individuals to take educational risks.*  • *RT conducts follow up opportunities with individuals as to the outcome of the training/assistance, providing additional support as needed.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Implemented strategies to gain understanding of school-wide and individual colleague needs.*  • *Obtained input from colleagues and administration on design of in-service to best meet the needs of colleagues.*  • *Provided pre/post results of in-service training specific to knowledge and skills gained.*  • *Log of shared resources, rated by teachers for usefulness.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 3d** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **3d: Locating resources for teachers to support instructional improvement.** | RT fails to locate resources for instructional improvement for teachers, even when specifically requested to do so. | RT’s efforts to locate resources for instructional improvement for teachers are partially successful, reflecting incomplete knowledge of what is available. | Resource teacher locates resources for instructional improvement for teachers when asked to do so. | RT is highly proactive in locating resources for instructional improvement for teachers, anticipating their needs. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *RT does not seek and share resources and is*  *non-responsive to requests.* | • *RT seeks and shares limited resources, often failing to fully meet the needs of teachers.* | • *RT shares resources that meets the needs of teachers but does not initiate the effort.* | • *RT seeks and shares a wide array of resources within and outside of school, in anticipation of the teachers’ needs.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Bank of resources (flyer, online, etc)*  • *Data analysis of school’s student data*  • *Documentation (e.g. email, contact log providing a variety of resources for instructional improvement).*  *.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructional Specialists – 3e** | | | | |
| **Component** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Basic** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| **3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness.** | RT adheres to his plan, in spite of evidence of its inadequacy. | RT makes modest changes in the support program when confronted with evidence of the need for change. | RT makes revisions to the support program when it is needed. | RT is continually seeking ways to improve the support program and makes changes as needed in response to student, parent, or teacher input. |
| ***Critical***  ***Attributes*** | • *RT ignores indications of participant boredom or lack of understanding.*  • *RT brushes aside participant questions.*  • *RT conveys to participants that when they have difficulty learning it is their fault.*  • *In reflecting on practice, RT does not indicate that it is important to reach all participants.*  • *Despite evident participant confusion, RT*  *makes no attempt to adjust the lesson.* | • *RT’s efforts to modify the support program are only partially successful.*  • *RT makes perfunctory attempts to incorporate questions and interests into the lesson.*  • *RT conveys to participants a level of responsibility for their learning but also his or her uncertainty about how to assist them.*  • *In reflecting on practice, RT indicates the desire to reach all participants but does not suggest strategies for doing so.* | • *When improvising becomes necessary, RT*  *makes adjustments to the support program.*  • *RT incorporates participants’ interests and questions into the heart of the support program.*  • *RT conveys to participants that s/he has other approaches to try when they experience difficulty.*  • *In reflecting on practice, RT cites multiple approaches undertaken to reach those having difficulty.* | • *RT’s adjustments to the support program, when needed, are designed to assist individuals.*  • *RT seizes a teachable moment to enhance a learning opportunity.*  • *RT implements a process of continuous improvement of support program and provides results of improvement.* |
| ***Possible Examples of Evidence*** | • *Implemented strategies to gain understanding of colleague needs.*  • *Documented and scheduled in-service trainings/support based on target audience needs and the outcomes of those supports.*  • *Implemented a plan for continuous improvement.* | | | |